OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

9-10 GEORGE V, 1919

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1028 Volume II: Pages 1029-2096
" III: " 2097-3192 " IV: " 3193-3996
Volume V: 3997-4702

VOLUME CXXXVI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF MAY TO THE FIFTH DAY OF JUNE, 1919, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
J. DE LABROQUERIE TACHÉ
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Tuesday, May 6, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

Mr. HUME CRONYN presented the first report of the special committee appointed to consider the matter of the development in Canada of scientific research.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of Director of the Military Service Branch on the operation of the Military Service Act, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Copy of Order in Council of the 1st of May, 1919, approving of the General Housing Scheme of the province of British Columbia.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Radio-telegraph Regulations.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 88, to amend The Migratory Birds Convention Act.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Bill No. 89, for the relief of Martha Campbell.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 90, for the relief of Rosa Hirst. —Mr. Fripp.

THE WAR MEASURES ACT, 1914.

BILL TO EXTEND ORDERS IN COUNCIL NOT PROCEEDED WITH FOR THE PRESENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): I wish to make a statement with regard to Order No. 26, Second Reading of Bill No. 71, to extend the operation of the Orders and Regulations passed by the Governor in Council under the War Measures Act, 1914.

This Bill was to have been gone on with earlier, but for the fact that intimation has come from the Prime Minister that the arrangements now in effect as to the Treaty of Peace are such that it is unlikely any treaty of peace will be formally ratified in such a way that a declaration ending the war might be made by His Majesty before approximately the first of August. Consequently, no object would be served by going on with the measure at the present time.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT AMENDMENT—LOBSTERS.

On motion of Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), Bill No. 31, to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

FISHERIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT—BRITISH COLUMBIA LICENSES.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), moved that Bill No. 39, to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914, be read the second time.

Mr. McKENZIE: Explain.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is a Bill regarding cannery licenses in British Columbia. The object of the Bill is to make the annual fee for such license $500, and in addition, four cents for each case of 48 one-pound cans, or the equivalent thereto, of sockeye salmon, and three cents for each case of 48 one-pound cans, or the equivalent thereto, of any other species of salmon, including Steel Head packed in such cannery during the continuance in force of the license. The said $500 shall be paid before the license is issued, and the remainder of the license fee shall be paid as the minister may from time to time by regulation prescribe.

Heretofore, the fee charged to canners in British Columbia was $50 a year, and it was felt by my department that that was altogether too low a fee in view of the privileges they receive. Therefore, the object of this Bill is to raise the fee from

$50 to $500 per annum, with the additional charge of the amounts that I have just cited on the catch of fish. This matter was taken up fully with the canners who, along with the members of Parliament from British Columbia, agreed to it unanimously.

Mr. McKENZIE: A moment ago, the minister moved that Bill No. 31, to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries. Does he intend to refer this Bill also?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That was my intention.

Mr. McKENZIE: It has been reported to me from British Columbia that this high license fee will have the effect of driving the ordinary canner out of business altogether, and that the purpose of raising it from $50 to $500 is to create a monopoly in the fishery canning business in that province. It has been represented to me that the ordinary man doing a small business in canning salmon and possibly other fish in British Columbia cannot afford to pay this high fee, and consequently will be driven out of the trade.

Another matter which I wish to bring to the notice of the minister, so that it can be dealt with before the committee is this: It is stated that those who practically control the fisheries of British Columbia do not pay the ordinary white man in that province a white man's wage, and that in consequence practically every white man in British Columbia has left that business, and to-day the fisheries there are entirely in the hands of Japanese and Chinamen—in the hands of the Japanese, at all events; I cannot say how far that applies to Chinamen. This situation has been brought about by the fisheries of British Columbia being practically in the hands of a monopoly. If these are the conditions, I am sure the minister would like to see them remedied, and if the purpose of raising the license fee is to give further powers to those who have too much power already, it will be advisable for the committee to consider the matter very carefully, in order that everybody in British Columbia may have the privilege of going into the fishery business if he so desires.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: How many licenses are issued under the existing law?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot say offhand, but I will in committee give the information to my hon. friend.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Mr. Ballantyne, the Bill was referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

FISH INSPECTION ACT.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) Bill No. 41, to amend the Fish Inspection Act, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the third reading of Bill No. 70, to incorporate Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): I had hoped that before we reached this the final stage of the Bill the Government would have seen their way clear to make such an amendment as would bring it into conformity with what to my mind are the very first principles of our parliamentary system of government. I regret that they have not been able to do so. I think their departure from what I regard as the sound principles of parliamentary finance is too grave a matter to be passed over lightly. I think we should have a further consideration of the subject; at all events, that we should have a deliberate and recorded vote of the House upon it.

This Bill proposes to apply to one of the largest portions of the public business certain rules and principles which are at variance, I think, with the established principles of our parliamentary system, and entirely at variance with the rules and principles which are applied to all other branches of our public service. A cardinal principle of our parliamentary system is that Parliament, and especially the House of Commons, shall retain full and unrestricted control over the appropriation of public money. That is a principle which applies under all British legislative systems; it is a principle which applies in Canada to-day; it is a principle which will apply after this Bill shall pass, if it is to pass, to all the other departments of public business in Canada. But for some strange reason, it is not to apply to the operation of this railway company.

I shall regret if the motion which I am about to make will be regarded by my hon. friends on the treasury benches as one of non-confidence. I do not think it should be so regarded, for neither in the motion itself nor in anything that I may say in connection with it will there be any justification for such an attitude. I think the question is one on which we may reasonably ask to have a free and open vote. If the motion which I shall make and the reasons accompanying it commend themselves to the judgment of hon. members of the House, I think they should feel free to vote on the merits of the question, and that the Government should be willing to accept the conclusion that they may reach.

It was suggested at an early stage of the discussion of this subject that some exceptional method was necessary in dealing with the finances of this railway company in order to avoid the evils, real or imaginary, in connection with political patronage. Now I do not think any argument can be founded on that. While, under this Bill, we shall transfer a large portion of the public business of the country to one group of gentlemen, separate and apart from the usual principles of parliamentary government, we are not going to turn everything over to them. A very considerable portion of the public business of this country will still be subject to the rules and principles to which I have referred. Each of the ministers of the Crown will still have to do some public business, and some of them much public business, and if the principle of patronage will not enter into the public business in their hands under the old order of things, why must it necessarily enter into the management of the railways if the old rules remain? Therefore, if it be contended for one moment that this departure from what I believe to be the sound principle must be taken in order to avoid the evil of political patronage, my answer is that we shall still have a large volume of public business to be conducted under the old principles; and if that business can be conducted in the old way without bringing in any question of party patronage, why cannot the business of this railway company be conducted in the same manner? So I feel that no well-founded argument can be made along that line.

When this Bill first came before the Committee it was in the form of a resolution in which, as hon. gentlemen will remember, all the clauses of the Bill had been thrown together into one single sentence, so that there was difficulty in understanding it. In consequence of that the minister in charge of the Bill expressed a desire that the discussion should not be protracted at that stage but that the matter might be more properly considered when the Bill had been brought before the Committee of the House. The point I am now making was first raised by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) who called attention to the exceptional circumstances under which the finances of this Railway Board were to be handled. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals then said:

> But this is a matter for the consideration of the Committee, and if there is any objection to the plan proposed, or if the Committee thinks the other way is better, we can change it.

So, at that time, it did not seem that the Government were finally committed to the principle to which I am now taking exception. The minister rather intimated that it was a fair matter for consideration and could be dealt with later on. When the Bill did come before the Committee of the Whole House, the question was again raised and strong reasons, I think, were urged why this Bill should be brought into conformity with the general practice. However, the Government have not seen their way to do so and we are obliged now to consider the Bill in its present form.

On the principle of public ownership, I do not think it is necessary to say much. I think we have now advanced too far to make that an open question for debate. We have, whether we like it or not, a considerable measure of public ownership. It is unavoidable and I have no desire to quarrel with it at all. I accept it as it is. We have to accept it whether we like it or not. I am not as enthusiastic as some hon. gentlemen are in praise of the principle as applied to our railways. On the contrary, I frankly admit that this is a great experiment and I have grave doubts as to its ultimate success. But nevertheless I have no desire to oppose or to obstruct it. On the contrary, if we are to have the principle of public ownership, I should like to see the thing get a fair chance. But, it is not going to get a fair chance under this Bill.

The principle of public ownership, in so far as it is represented in this Bill, commenced with two handicaps. The first was the handicap of the closure. I cannot help thinking that it was unwise on the part of the Government to attempt to force this measure through the House by this excep-

tional method of procedure. I know there are circumstances under which closure may be justified, but they are very rare in our parliamentary history. The very fact that we have in our rules a system of closure tends to prevent obstruction, and it is a rare occasion when the Government is justified in using the machinery that it provides. It is a good thing to have the strength of a lion; it is not a good thing to use that strength frequently. I do not think that the circumstances justified the application of closure to this Bill. This Bill had been before the House in the form of a resolution for a very brief discussion, and when it took the shape of a Bill and came before the Committee of the Whole, it was taken up on a Wednesday; it was debated on Wednesday and Thursday, and on Friday the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) gave notice of closure, which took effect at the next sitting of the House. It was a short time to allow for the discussion of one of the most important Bills of the session. We have not been in a hurry about other legislation. We spent a month, less two days, in the discussion of the Address, a matter of importance, I grant you, but after all, a matter of form. There are Bills on the Order Paper that have been there for five or six weeks. There is no rush about them. We have been leisurely discussing the Immigration Act, a very serious matter, I acknowledge, but we are still slowly getting along with it. We have been, in an equally leisurely manner, discussing the Bankruptcy Act and there is no rush about it. Why then at a time when, although we seem to be busily occupied, when it is common rumour in many quarters not unfriendly to the Government, that the business is not being hurried but that the Government are really marking time and waiting for the Prime Minister to come home, should it have been necessary to apply closure in the case of this Bill? I do not think any good reason was given. That is the first handicap.

The second handicap is the effort to associate with public ownership the disregard of all the safeguards which have been established by the wisdom of parliamentarians in the years gone by. We are asked to associate with public ownership this disregard of a principle, which is not calculated to commend the system to the minds of thoughtful men. I have said that this Bill proposes to disregard the essential principle of the parliamentary control of public finance. There is no question but that the control of the public purse is the first and greatest duty of the House of Commons, and when we depart from that we are certainly taking a very grave step. When we are doing it in this case, and conveying to the public the idea that we must disregard all those safeguards in order to apply public ownership, we are not giving public ownership a fair chance. Instead of advancing public ownership by those methods, I am inclined to think that the members of the Government are rather giving the principle of public ownership a black eye.

This principle of parliamentary control of public moneys is, as I have said, a very vital principle in our system of government. It ought not to be necessary to argue that question at all. But, Sir, since hon. gentlemen have introduced this Bill and since they have, as I say, disregarded all those principles, I think I would be justified in calling the attention of the House to one or two authorities in point, a thing which ought not to be necessary, but the presence of this Bill makes it so. Sir Erskine May, page 56, says:—

> The most important power vested in any branch of the legislature is the right of voting money for the exigencies of the public service. The exercise of this right by the Commons is practically a law for the annual meeting of Parliament for redress of grievances; and it may also be said to give to the Commons the chief authority in the state. In all countries the public purse is one of the main instruments of political power; but with the complicated relations of finance and public credit in England, the power of giving or withholding the supplies at pleasure is one of absolute supremacy.

That power of the House of Commons of absolute supremacy over public money is to be disregarded and set aside by the Bill which is now before us. Section 16 to which I take exception reads:—

> Notwithstanding anything in the Government Railways Act or the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, all expenses incurred in connection with the operation or management of the Canadian Government Railways, under the provisions of this Act, shall be paid out of the receipts and revenues of the Canadian Government Railways. In the event of a deficit occurring at any time during any fiscal year the amount of such deficit shall from time to time be payable by the Minister of Finance out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, the amounts paid by the said minister under this section to be included in the Estimates submitted to Parliament at its first session following the close of such fiscal year; and in the event of a surplus existing at the close of any fiscal year such surplus shall be paid into the said fund.

Now, Sir, that presents this situation to us: That while as respects every other branch of the public service of Canada the

revenue must be paid into the public treasury, and be subject to the vote of this House for its payment out of the Treasury, we are to give to a body of gentlemen in Toronto—estimable and honourable gentlemen; I do not for a moment suggest anything to the contrary—we are going to place in their hands the enormous power of handling I do not know how many millions of the public funds of this country without asking for any parliamentary appropriation. I am amazed that the Government could bring forward such a measure. The members of the Government, in their several departments, have large responsibilities. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs collects a large amount of money. He is not allowed to have at his own disposal one dollar of that money; it must go into the public treasury, and once there it cannot be got out again unless this House has made an appropriation which will cover the proposed expenditure. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has large enterprises; he has to be subject, and will continue to be subject, to this rule of parliamentary appropriation. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is the custodian of large sums of money which come into his hands officially from the various sources of our revenue, and these sums are larger than usual now because we are floating large loans. At one time during the present year, the hon. gentleman was the custodian of an amount which represented six hundred and more millions of dollars. Not one penny of these moneys is placed at the disposal of the Minister of Finance; these moneys are paid into the Dominion Treasury, into the consolidated revenue account, and once paid in, the Minister of Finance cannot draw out enough to pay even for cab hire until there has been an appropriation for it by this House. Now if that has to be done in the case of the Minister of Finance, and in the case of the other ministers of the Crown, why in the world do we make an exception in this case, and say that these gentlemen in Toronto who are managing these railroads are to have an entirely different rule applied to them?

While, as I say, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, or any minister of the Crown, could not pay for the hire of a cab on public account unless he had an appropriation for the purpose, we are proposing to give to this body of gentlemen in Toronto an unrestricted right to handle enormous sums of money. The revenues of these railways will be very large, indeed. We appropriated last year for the expenditure on the Intercolonial, or the Government Railways, $37,000,000. With the enlargements proposed by the present Bill I shall not be surprised—I am only making a guess—if the revenues which are to be received by these gentlemen at Toronto amount to seventy, eighty, perhaps one hundred millions of dollars; and if the larger scheme of public ownership which is often suggested in this House be included—as is also provided for in the Bill,—then the revenues which will be placed in the hands of these gentlemen at Toronto may run into enormous figures—I do not think it would be too much to say $150,000,000 a year. Why in the world these gentlemen should be allowed these privileges, why we should remove all checks and guards with regard to parliamentary appropriations in the case of these and not in the case of the other departments, of the Government, I am quite unable to understand. These gentlemen are to collect these vast revenues, they are to use them, presumably for railway purposes, at their own sweet will. They do not have to come here and ask for any appropriation; and if at the end of the year this thirty, forty, fifty, sixty or one hundred millions of dollars of money, whatever it may be, proves insufficient, they can walk over to the office of the Minister of Finance and say: "Hand us out the balance." And without any further ado, or any further appropriation of money by Parliament, the Minister of Finance is bound to comply with their request. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is a departure from all the sound principles of finance. Later on, after they have done that—after they have collected this money and have spent it without authority other than the general power conferred by this Bill—after they have collected these moneys and have spent them, and any additional sum that they get from the Finance Minister, then they are to come down and tell us what they have done; after it is all over they will come to us, we will take their statement and an estimate will be submitted to this House. I do not think, Sir, that is a sufficient recognition of the principle of parliamentary government to which I have referred.

I have given you the opinion of Sir Erskine May, a recognized English writer on the subject. Let me now quote from one of our Canadian writers who is generally regarded as an authority. Sir John Bourinot at page 404 of his work says:

The rules of the House with respect to the expenditure of public money and the imposition of burthens upon the people are in conformity with the practice of its English prototype. All the checks and guards which the wisdom of English parliamentarians has imposed in the course of centuries upon public expenditure now exist in their full force in the Parliament of the Dominion. The cardinal principle which underlies all parliamentary rules and constitutional provisions with respect to money grants and public taxes is this—when burthens are to be imposed on the people every opportunity must be given for free and frequent discussion, so that Parliament may not by sudden and hasty votes incur any expenses, or be induced to approve of measures which entail heavy and lasting burthens on the country.

In the citations which I have given we have the authority of Sir Erskine May, and we have the authority of Sir John Bourinot which we also respect in this House; so I do not think there is any room to debate the fact that I have stated the principle correctly. If I were to say that there is absolutely no precedent for what hon. gentlemen are doing, I might not be exactly correct; I think they might have a precedent. Probably they would find it by going back some seventy years, or thereabouts, and they would then discover, Sir, that the precedent in question was one under which a system had grown up such as they now approve; but that system was condemned by the British House of Commons, and ever since the year 1854 there has been no return to it. Sir Erskine May, at page 546, says:

Until 1854 estimates were not presented in respect of the revenue departments. Prior to that year the charges of collecting the revenue were deducted by each department from the gross sum collected.

That is exactly what is proposed to be done in this case.

This practice, which withdrew the full produce of the taxes and the cost of collection from the immediate control of Parliament, was condemned by a resolution of the House 30th May, 1848; and pursuant to an Act passed in the year 1854 the whole of the net revenue derived from taxation is paid into the exchequer, and the cost of the revenue departments is included in the annual estimates.

Taxation does not differ, so far as revenue is concerned, from the earning power of our public works. The money received from sale of a postage stamp is as much part of the revenue of the Government as a bill of duties collected by the Minister of Customs.

I have said, Sir, that I would like to see public ownership get a chance, and that it is not getting a fair chance by this Bill. There has been some experience in public

ownership elsewhere: Public ownership is in operation in Australia and in New Zealand. I have under my hand the New Zealand Year Book. From it I learn that the receipts of the Railway Department of New Zealand are paid into the consolidated revenue fund, and the appropriations for that department are made in the same way as in the case of any other department. That is the system which we have in Canada to-day, and that is the system which I would like continued as respects these railways with which we are now dealing. Then public ownership exists in Australia also. I have here the Australian Railway Acts, or some of them, and I find that there it is distinctly provided that the receipts from passenger fares and traffic on the Australian railways must be paid into the treasury. They will be found in the consolidated revenue fund—the receipts on one side and the expenditures on the other. Indeed, in Australia the position is still stronger, for so firmly is this principle held —this principle which my hon. friends of the Government have too lightly esteemed —that it forms a part of the Australian Constitutional Act. In that Act it is distinctly declared that all receipts and revenues of the Commonwealth must be paid into the public treasury—the consolidated fund. So by the experience of other countries where public ownership obtains, and by our own experience in relation to our public affairs generally, it seems to me that we ought to have no difficulty in reaching a conclusion that it is not necessary to give to this board of directors in respect of the management of these railways any powers that we do not give to our own departments of the Government.

I think, Sir, that if the Government sincerely wish to give public ownership a fair trial they will not handicap it by disregarding the rules, the laws, and the customs which have been handed down to us by the wisdom of parliaments in the Mother Country and in all the colonies to which we can look for example. It seems to me, therefore, that it is in every way desirable that the Government should not press this Bill in its present form, and to give them an opportunity to reconsider it, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster):—

That all the words after the word "be" to the end of the question be left out and that the following words:—

"—re-committed to a committee of the Whole House with power to amend the Bill by striking out section 16 and inserting the following section:

16. The receipts and expenditures of the company shall be subject to the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act."

be inserted instead thereof.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Government cannot accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member. He has made an argument which I may described as specious, and, unintentionally no doubt, somewhat unfair. He has asked: Shall Parliament hand over to a few gentlemen in Toronto—and he emphasized Toronto, I thought.

Mr. FIELDING: Are they not in Toronto?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Some of them, not all.

Mr. FIELDING: I understood the office was in Toronto. If that is a mistake I withdraw my remarks.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The office is in Toronto, but the board of directors of the Canadian National Railway system is constituted of gentlemen from all parts of Canada. Therefore it is incorrect to say that the Government is handing over to "a few gentlemen in Toronto" the control and administration of the hundred or more million dollars which my hon. friend has mentioned.

Let me put this to him—the Canadian Pacific Railway Company conducts much larger operations than the Canadian National Railway system as to-day constituted, and yet we find the shareholders of that company, comprising men of the highest business experience and standing,—many of them residing in Great Britain, and in the United States, as well as in Canada,—do not hesitate to entrust to a few gentlemen in Montreal the administration and control of the funds of that great system. I submit that the two cases are absolutely on all fours if we are to adopt the corporate principle of administration, as we are proposing to do in this Bill. I do not believe that any hon. gentleman would rise in this House—certainly not the hon. member who has spoken (Mr. Fielding)—and charge any misfeasance on the part of the board of directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. So far as I know they administer that great system most capably and most honestly. And what the Government is seeking to do as a matter of administration, with a view of promoting the highest efficiency and economy, is to constitute a board of directors, responsible to the Dominion Government, who will administer the affairs of the Canadian National Railway system and receive its revenue and cause to be properly paid out its expenditures in accordance with the practice which is adopted in efficient railway administration in all parts of the world.

I pointed out to the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) when he raised this question in Committee, that there were two modes of administration, either of which might be adopted by the Government, in connection with these railways which have come into our possession. We might directly administer them through the Department of Railways, which is under the direct control of the Minister of Railways, a member of the Government, as the Intercolonial Railway has been administered in the past. Those railways would then be administered precisely as the Department of Railways is administered, as the Department of Customs is administered, as the Post Office Department is administered; as all other departments of the Government are to-day administered. The other way, and the one that we have chosen—and which I shall submit is the one which we should choose in the circumstances—is by administering through the agency of a joint stock company, a holding company, which will either hold the physical property of these railway companies, or control it through the holding of the capital stock.

In the first place, it has been necessary for the Government to adopt the corporation system in connection with the administration of railway companies which have outstanding bond issues, by reason of their having been financed and administered on the corporation principle in the past. It was pointed out when we took over the Canadian Northern Railway system that if we divested it of its corporate character and took over its physical properties by expropriation, we should at once cause to become due and payable many of the trust mortgages securing issues amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. We should thus lose the benefit of all past financing, and we should have to provide in cash an amount representing the value of the physical properties of the Canadian Northern Railway system. The same argument would apply to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system and to the Grand Trunk Railway system of Canada should we take them over. In the case of the Intercolonial Railway Company, the Dominion Government has owned the physical properties, and if the Canadian National Railway

Company should in the future take over the Intercolonial they would take over the physical properties of the road. No difficulty arises in that case as to outstanding bond issues, for there are none; the road has been owned directly by the Government of Canada and not through the intermediary or agency of a joint stock company.

There is a further reason why it is necessary that we should adopt a joint stock system in administering these great railway properties. In the public mind the idea is firmly embedded that direct Government administration and control of government-owned railways results in abuse through the exercise of political patronage. A great deal may be said for that view. Personally I have been impressed with what has been put forth by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding): That if the Government owns a railway system, whether in fee simple or by the ownership of stock, it is the proprietor and must be responsible for the administration of that system. I agree with that. If the Canadian National Railway Company, as administered by the nominees of the Government, is not a success, undoubtedly there will be a reflection upon the Government of the day. The Government of the day will be criticised for lack of success or for inefficiency of the administration of that system. That follows from the fact that the Government is the owner of the system—although the form is that of a corporation—and from the fact that its administration is in the hands of those appointed by the Government and whom the Government may, for cause, remove. But in order to prevent the exercise of patronage in connection with a system of such great importance to Canada, it has been provided that instead of direct administration by the Government, the administration shall be through a board of directors consisting of representative and capable men in whom the Government, Parliament and the country have confidence. I said the other day, and I say now, that the success of public ownership in Canada will largely depend upon the standing, ability and character of the men selected to administer. Public ownership in Canada will have public support in direct proportion to the favourable impression which is made upon the people by the nominees of the Government, who will administer for the people.

Having laid down the principle that for a system such as this it is necessary—unavoidable, if the best results are to be obtained that the mode of administration shall be through a corporation rather than direct, I come to the gist of the amendment proposed and of the argument put forward by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding). When this Bill was in Committee the hon. member directed attention to section 16. I said at the time, and I say now, that I always give great weight to any argument put forward in this House by the hon. member; and I did give his suggestion, at that time and subsequently, my best and most attentive consideration. More than that, I took it up with the responsible officers of my own department, the Auditor General's Department, and the Railway Department, with a view to seeing, so far as I could ascertain, what weight should be attached to the argument put forward and how far, if to any extent, it would be possible to meet the views of the hon. member. When the hon. member was speaking in Committee I was of the opinion that the proposal was impracticable—I do not say, impossible, but impracticable—from the standpoint of efficient, and especially of economical, administration. Adopting, as we do, the policy of administering through a corporation, to carry out my hon. friend's suggestion would mean complete duplication of the entire accounting, clerical and audit staff of the Canadian National Railway system. My hon. friend has said that we are giving public ownership a bad start. Well, we should indeed give it a bad start if we provided that, in competition, as it will be with the Canadian Pacific Railway system, it should incur a double set of costs of so important a character as those which I have indicated.

My hon. friend says it is an essential principle of Government administration that revenues shall be received into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and paid out under the safeguards afforded by the Civil Service and the Audit Office. I agree with my hon. friend with regard to the general principle; I agree that when the administration is directly that of the Government, that principle does and should apply. But where, for convenience and for efficiency of administration and in order to remove all possibility of political patronage, we deliberately adopt a commission system or a system of a board of directors whom we appoint, who engage their staffs and who are responsible for administration, then we are justified in—I shall not say a departure from the principle, but the adoption of another principle which experience has shown is safe, namely, administration with the safeguards afforded by corporate management. Take the Intercolonial Railway.

In the past the revenues of the Intercolonial railway have been received, as my hon. friend says, into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and from the Consolidated Revenue Fund there have been checked out the salaries, wages and other expenses of the railway. From inquiries which I have made, I am able to say that the audit which the Dominion Government has made with respect to the Intercolonial has been of the most imperfect and perfunctory character—and necessarily so. Officials of the Intercolonial Railway Company have received the money into Consolidated Fund and have paid it out under letters of credit.

4 p.m.

In other words, the officials of the Intercolonial Railway Company—that is, of the Dominion Government—have done precisely what the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do; they have received the money and paid it out under the safeguards of audit and of the other checks established by efficient administration. So that in the Intercolonial, which the Dominion Government directly owns and in respect of which the principles that my hon. friend has referred to have been in effect, we find precisely what we find in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, namely, that the officers of the road receive the money and pay it out. How could we adopt, in connection with the mode of administration that we have selected, the method put forward by my hon. friend?

In the first place, in order to carry on corporation administration with regard to the receipt and payment out of moneys, there must be a large clerical staff, an accounting staff and an audit staff. Where are they? There are spread over this immense system practically from the Atlantic to the Pacific, accountants, clerks, agents for the receipt of money, travelling and other auditors. If all the money received from the Canadian National Railway system is to be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and checked out by the officers of the Finance Department or under letters of credit issued to the officers of other departments and subject to the control of the Auditor General, that means a complete duplication of the services to which I have referred. Therefore, as I have said, the suggestion put forward by the hon. member is impracticable and uneconomical, impracticable because the administrative machinery of the Dominion Government to-day is not adequate, although it might be said it could be made adequate to do the work efficiently—and there is no use in doing the work in any other way than efficently—to check up all the receipts and expenditures of the Canadian National Railway system—uneconomical, because it duplicates for the Canadian National Railway system all the services that I have mentioned.

My hon. friend referred to the British system, and without knowledge of the facts, I wish to ask him this question, because he may know. The British Government administers through its various departments, as we do here, and the hon. member was quite correct, so far as I am aware, in stating that all moneys are received into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and paid out subject to the cheques of the Civil Service. Does my hon. friend know whether the accounts of the Suez Canal Company, the shares of which are owned by the British Government, are submitted in detail to the British House of Commons, whether the appropriation is voted in full, or whether that is dealt with as a separate corporation? I do not know.

Mr. FIELDING: I really could not answer the hon. gentleman. I have not had occasion to look into the matter.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend has referred to Australia, but Australia, is administering not through a corporation, but directly, as the Dominion Government administers the Intercolonial. The Australian Government own the railways, the physical property; they built them, I am told, in the first place, and consequently the Australian railway situation is on all fours with the situation which exists here respecting the administration of the several departments of the Government.

My hon. friend has spoken about turning over the administration to certain men. All administration must be turned over to certain men; indeed, we are entrusting officers of the Government here with administration of a most important character, and while the administration of the Canadian National Railway system is through a corporation every member of the staff, every clerk or every agent is, in substance and in fact, a Government employee. Further, the administration of that system can, as it will, be subjected every year in this House to the most minute scrutiny and searching investigation, because, as I stated when this Bill was in Committee, if the Dominion Government pays the deficits each year, then the Dominion Government is interested in

every cent that comes in and every cent that goes out. The Government would not only expect but welcome the criticism which must be made in Parliament of the operations as disclosed by the balance sheet at the end of the fiscal year and would expect that Parliament would obtain such information in such detail as is desired with regard to the whole administration of that system. If that be not so, then suspicion will inevitably be thrown upon the administration of that railway administration.

My hon. friend made the rather startling statement that if there is a deficit, these gentlemen at Toronto will come down to the Minister of Finance and say: You pay out the amount of the deficit without regard to Parliament at all. That is true in one sense and not in another. Under section 16, if there is a deficit at the end of a fiscal year, the Dominion Government makes good that deficit; otherwise, the railway system would have to borrow money for the purpose of making it good, or if they could not borrow the money, they would have to suspend. The reason for that is that the Government is the owner of this system. If there is a deficit at the end of the fiscal year, the Minister of Finance is authorized to make good that deficit, subject to this provision that the amount paid by the Minister of Finance under this section shall be included in the Estimates submitted to Parliament at its first session following the close of such fiscal year; and in the event of a surplus existing at the close of any fiscal year such surplus shall be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

It is open to Parliament at each session to review the operations and the entire administration of the Canadian National Railway system as to deficit or as to surplus. The gist of the matter is that, although the form is a corporation, the Dominion Government owns the system, and that every one connected with it from the board of directors down to the humblest man in their employ is in reality a Government official in the sense that he must be held to strict account, first to the board of directors, and through them to the Government of Canada for his action in connection with the work entrusted to him.

My hon. friend said that we are starting this off with two handicaps, one being closure. I agree generally with the observations of the hon. gentleman as regards the inexpediency of bringing in closure unless it is clear there is obstruction, and this does not refer to my hon. friend, because the criticism which he made of the Bill was such as might not only fairly, but very properly be put forward. His argument was listened to with the greatest attention, and as I said, I took the trouble to consider it, not only at the time, but the next day, and to discuss it with the officials of my own department, of the Auditor General's Department and of the Railway Department, because I desired that it should be very fully considered. And it was my intention, if the Bill had continued in Committee, to speak further to the argument of the hon. member, because I had stated that the matter would have further consideration. But we all know what happened. There was obstruction—I will not say on the part of all hon. members opposite, because that would not be correct—but there was undoubtedly obstruction.

Mr. BUREAU: Not a bit.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not desire to specify, but there was undoubtedly obstruction. I have too high a regard for the intelligence of certain hon. gentlemen opposite to believe for one moment that some of their arguments with respect to certain minor sections of the Bill were merely for the purpose of obtaining information, or of legitimate criticism.

Mr. BUREAU: What sections?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will not go into detail. The hon. member knows as well as any one else.

Mr. BUREAU: The longest speech in the discussion was made by the Acting Prime Minister.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: But he was not the most frequent speaker. I think the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) was the most frequent speaker.

Mr. BUREAU: Will my hon. friend point out one of the minor sections of the Bill on which I spoke too often?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: When my hon. friend sins he sins against the light. No man in this House has a better knowledge than he of corporation law, and when I find him putting forth trivial objections to sections I ask myself why? I do not say that my hon. friend obstructed from any improper motive, but he did obstruct, with other hon. members, and so closure was applied.

Mr. BUREAU: I may be allowed to differ.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The closure is not an unusual thing in British Parliaments, although in this House, I grant, that it may be somewhat unusual.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not unusual in connection with Canadian Northern Railway legislation.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In the British House it is the usual mode of carrying on the business of Parliament. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has stated that a month was taken up by the debate on the Address. Now, so far as the Government is concerned, we do not regard that as a waste of time. For the last four years, the business of administration has had the right of way in this Parliament, and the members from the different sections of the country have had comparatively little to say; not because they did not have much to say with regard to the needs of their various sections, but owing to the demands of the war and the exigencies of the situation, Government business naturally had practically a monopoly of the time of the House. That was true of the British Parliament as well. But when the war was over, it was highly desirable that hon. members should to the extent they desired have opportunity to express their views and those of the people of the different sections from which they come with regard to the public questions of the day. And one of the most useful debates we have in this House, one of the most useful in its effects upon public opinion in this country, was the debate upon the Address, which lasted some three or four weeks. There is a function of Parliament apart from the function of despatching legislation before it, and that is the function of expressing what the people throughout the country are thinking about. If you have debates in Parliament and free expression of opinion here, you are not likely to have turbulent expression of opinion outside, because the people read what their representatives are saying in Parliament and are content with the expression of their views there. Many evils in the state are avoided by free discussion by members in the House of Commons of the questions in which their various sections of the country are interested.

Before leaving the question of closure, let me say that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition showed—I shall not say an eleventh-hour repentance, but a two-o'clock-in-the-morning repentance on the question of public ownership. At two minutes after two in the morning he said: After all, we on this side are not opposed to public ownership. That is one of the good results that followed from the application of the closure. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has said that public ownership starts handicapped by the fact that closure was applied. Now it is very important that public ownership should start with the sanction of the leader of the Opposition, and one of the good effects of closure was that at two minutes after two in the morning the hon. leader of the Opposition informed the House that after all said and done the Opposition had not been opposing the principle of public ownership. So the application of closure was not altogether an evil as suggested by the hon. member, because when closure was applied the leader of the Opposition and most hon. members opposite were most anxious to impress the House and the country that in reality, notwithstanding what they had said, they were really public ownership men.

And as to statements which had been made previously by hon. gentlemen opposite on the question of public ownership when it was not an issue, in order that there may be no doubt where hon. gentlemen opposite stood on this question, I am going to read a few extracts from Hansard. I find that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) said in 1916 (Hansard, p. 3989):

> As to the nationalization of railways I am opposed to it. I believe that we should encourage individual energy, enterprise and initiative instead of putting everything into a common pool, which tends to kill individual enterprise. We should take a leaf out of the book of the United States where there has been little nationalization.

That was his attitude in 1916. In 1917 he said (Hansard, p. 4039-40):

> I have been watching this proposition since he (Sir Thomas) introduced legislation last year for the purpose of appointing the Commission whose report we heard read in part to-day. When that resolution was proposed I said to the minister that if he wanted my opinion it was against the public ownership of railways. I did not expect my opinion to have any weight with the minister at that time. But, I am still of the same opinion that the public ownership of railways, generally speaking, is not a good thing for this country. I say that more particularly with respect to the developing of a country such as the Northwest is. If the people of the West will trust themselves as far as spreading out of the branches of any Government owned railway is concerned to Government ownership, they will find it will be a failure.

And he concluded:

I am opposed to Government ownership under these conditions.

I submit that that gives a clue to the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite on section 20 of the Bill, which was so much discussed in this House. That section provided for the revival of charters owned by the Canadian Northern Railway system, many of which authorized the construction of railways in the West, and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition said in 1917:

If the people of the West will trust themselves as far as spreading out of the branches of any Government owned railway is concerned to Government ownership, they will find it will be a failure.

Again in 1917 he said (Hansard p. 4529):

I am not in favour of public ownership. I am against it. But if we are down to the position when we have to take over the ownership of this road, let us take it clean cut, let us take everything in connection with it that will be of benefit and service to the people.

Later in the same year he interjected into the speech of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) this remark (Hansard p. 4533):

Sir John Macdonald was opposed to public ownership.

To which the hon. member for South York replied:

No, he was not.

In 1917 the leader of the Opposition also said (Hansard p. 5035):

While the Government ownership of railways may be all right in itself, I am not at all in favour of it. . . . . We have the example of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is not a Government owned railway.

And he argued that if default was made we should take everything embodied in the agreement of 1914. In 1918 my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) endorsed the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier so far as railway building was concerned. He added (Hansard p. 1379):

There was a good deal of criticism then (1911) by newspapers supporting the Government of the railways the Government had on their hands at that time.

He went on to say that in my first Budget I had made no complaint of the financial situation, and had said, while making some criticism of the Grand Trunk Pacific, that it "was a valuable asset to the Canadian people." Coming down to the last debate, my hon. friend said:

I was never in favour of Government ownership. I am not in favour of it now, as I think private enterprise will do better in these matters. Particularly in colonization and development will private enterprise do much better than Government ownership.

I am not putting this forward by way of criticism of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He is perfectly entitled to hold the views he does, but what is essential is that it should be known where he and those whom he leads stand on this question, and I submit that the extracts I have read indicate clearly the profound distrust of the leader of the Opposition of the principle of public ownership of railways.

Mr. McCREA: Does the minister mean to say that because persons hold different views from his own they should be gagged?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In the first place I do not admit that hon. members were gagged at all. It was the fault of hon. gentlemen opposite that closure was applied.

Mr. McCREA: The fact that a man is opposed to public ownership is no reason why he should not be allowed to speak.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I entirely agree, but it was not because hon. members were opposed to public ownership, but because the opposition to various sections of the Bill seemed to be carried beyond the proper limits of debate, that closure was applied. What has been the attitude of the first lieutenant of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lemieux) on the question of public ownership? During the present session the hon. member for Maisonneuve said (unrevised Hansard p. 1815):

Speaking again on this question of public ownership, it is a popular fancy at the present; but really those who favour that new fancy should take the time to read some of the best authorities on the question.

He said further, during the present session (Hansard p. 1901):

It is all very well for my hon. friend from South York to say, as he did a moment ago, and as my hon. friend from East Algoma said in the fair statement he made this evening, that Ontario and the West want Government ownership. But give to Ontario and the West a few figures as I have done this evening, and you will find that the business sense of the people of those provinces will pause and they will ponder before launching Canada upon such a venture.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve quoted from the report of a speech by Lord Shaughnessy at the Canadian National Exhibition and referring to that he said that Lord Shaughnessy is a man " who knows whereof he speaks," and added that " the words of Lord Shaughnessy were full of wisdom." Lord Shaughnessy is a very able man, but nobody could accuse him in his present posi-

tion of being partial to the principles of public ownership.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As my hon. friend is giving us what he calls extracts, I would like him to quote what Lord Shaughnessy said. The statement of Lord Shaughnessy at the Canadian National Exhibition at Toronto contained the following words—I am quoting from memory:—

I would not pretend to oppose the Government ownership of railways. What I am asking is that before embarking on this new venture we should be sure of our footing.

That is what Lord Shaughnessy said.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not contradict my hon. friend. This is what is said of Lord Shaughnessy by the Toronto Globe on April 23, 1919:—

The other antagonist of railway nationalization is Lord Shaughnessy who challenges the politicians and the officials of the Government railway service. The officials he says will ultimately become politicians and he adds ironically that Cabinet ministers soon become efficient railway men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have here the exact words spoken by Lord Shaughnessy, and I will read them so as to do no injustice to him.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What was the occasion of that speech?

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was speaking at the opening of the Canadian National Exhibition on August 26, 1918.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The reference I cited was apparently to a different occasion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He said this:—

We shall, within the next short period, have an opportunity to learn the result of our neighbor's management of the railways of the country and probably have a little experience of our own. I do not wish to have it understood that I am taking an attitude opposed to nationalization of railways. When the Government is satisfied that the people of this country want nationalization, we are a democratic people and we shall have it. But whatever our policy, we should be very sure of our footing or it may become a very serious problem.

That is what I quoted to the House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I was quoting the reference to a different occasion, viz., April 23, 1919, as reported by the Toronto Globe. My hon. friend further quoted Mr. Mitchell, president of the National City Company of New York. Mr. Mitchell stated that the cost was too great and that therefore in the United States the "popular fashion for Government ownership and operation has materially cooled during the past year." The hon. member for Maisonneuve also gave the views of the greatest authority on economics in Europe, according to his opinion, who was "absolutely opposed to public ownership." Having done this, he asks the members to pause before committing themselves to "this fancy" adding that "the best friends of the Government" in the city of Toronto were opposed to "this very policy." I submit that the hon. member for Maisonneuve came out as a strong opponent of public ownership. Then, we come to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). One thing I always like about the hon. member for Three Rivers is that he is downright outspoken; there is nothing equivocal about him. He comes out on one side or the other.

Mr. McCREA: He is always intelligent.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: His words are always intelligible and nobody will accuse the hon. member of lack of intelligence. He says:

I am against public ownership; I have stated so.

Hansard, page 1820, of the present session. At page 1822 he says again:

I happen to be against public ownership. I stated on the second reading that I was against it; that I was in favour of private ownership and public control.

Then at page 1825 he says:

I want my good friends to see that in spite of my opposition to public ownership I want to help the system as much as I can.

The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), who is a tower of strength in his party, said at page 1818:

Those who believe that nationalization means necessarily liberty and freedom are mistaken. In many respects it is the very opposite of liberty. Its purpose is to kill competition and erect a bureaucratic state.

I put forward these citations as representing the views of hon. gentlemen opposite because it was stated that hon. members opposite were not opposed to the principles of public ownership.

As I stated I have no objection whatever to a public man being in favour of private as opposed to public ownership. But it is essential to know what a public man's views are; and in the case of a party in this House, to know what their views are upon the subject. I submit that, from the quotations which I have read, it is perfectly clear that the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to the principle of public ownership.

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) said that the other handicap was that we had failed to associate with public ownership all the proper safeguards. I submit that I have answered that fully. I would call the attention of the hon. member to what I believe to be the fact: that the greatest example of public ownership in Canada is the Hydro-Electric Commission under the chairmanship of Sir Adam Beck. I cannot say positively because I have not made the explicit inquiry, but I believe that the commission is administered in the same manner that we propose to administer the Canadian National railway. I do not believe that there is submitted to the Legislature of Ontario an estimate of the full amount required by the Hydro-Electric Commission with every detail of expenditure as is the case with the departments of the Government.

I submit that my hon. friend is mistaken in his view that there is any departure in this Bill from the principles of sound public administration. There is a change in mode but the change is that which is imposed upon us by the necessities of corporation management and for the same reason that it is imposed upon the Canadian Pacific shareholders who entrust to a board nominated by them the administration of the company's system of which they are the owners.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the Acting Prime Minister a believer in the state ownership of railways?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, I am.

Mr. BUREAU: That is all I want to know.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will tell my hon. friend why. Take the situation in Canada at the present time. We have found that private ownership of railways, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific, has failed. I stated the other day in the House, and I state now, that private ownership plus politics have brought about the situation with which we are confronted in this country. The Government of Canada in order to save its own investments—represented by its guarantees and the guarantees of the provinces of this Dominion—and to safeguard the transportation interests, has been obliged to take over the railways that we are administering to-day, and will be obliged to take over practically all the other railways except the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend believes as fully as he would wish us to think he does in the principle of State ownership why except the Canadian Pacific?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am a believer in a national policy of taking one sound step at a time and to the extent that it is necessary. There is another reason: The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is an admirably managed institution serving this country efficiently and well, and I think it desirable at the present time that there should be two railway systems in this country, one of which will be, so to speak, a check, in the sense of efficiency in the administration, upon the other.

An hon. MEMBER: Which one?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, I say to my hon. friend that looking to the farther future—I shall not refer to Canada because I do not want to be specific with regard to it—it may not be in our time, but in Great Britain and in the Overseas Dominions and in Europe, it will be found that instead of the waste of duplication and of competition which is connected with private ownership of separate railway systems, there will inevitably come public control of railway systems. I believe that is the opinion of the ablest men connected with private railway enterprises in the world to-day. In order to bring about efficient administration you must have a board, or a commission, in whom prima facie the public have the utmost confidence—more confidence even than they would have in the Government.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: This Government, for example.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Take the Hydro-Electric Commission in Ontario. The public have confidence that it is being properly administered—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the view of the Minister of Railways?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: ——and looking to the farther future, for the purpose of preventing duplication and waste there will undoubtedly be public control. I was speaking to a gentleman of high distinction from England no later than yesterday, and he told me they were reconsidering the whole railway situation in England. There was duplication of terminals, expensive duplication of tracks, all these things in this period following the war, and for the elimination of waste they are considering, and they are going to bring about, the efficient and economical use of all the railway systems of the country.

An hon. MEMBER: And the shipping.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Possibly the shipping, too, after a time, but that question does not immediately arise. Here the Government of Canada has taken over an immense railway system, and we will add to it. But let us take a pride in it, and try to make a success of it.

Mr. ANDREW ROSS McMASTER (Brome): I will not, I hope, be improperly conducting myself if I propose to bring back the minds and thoughts of the members of this House to the question under discussion, which is not one of public or private ownership, but that of Parliamentary control as distinguished from corporate control. The Acting Prime Minister has so vociferously protested his belief in public ownership that we might think he was a recent convert to the principle, because we have heard of the zeal of the apostate, and perhaps it is possible that the minister is an apostate to the principle of private ownership which he held before.

Now I would submit, in order that we may regard this matter in a calm way, that the question of public or private ownership is not one on which almost religious fervour need be displayed. Is it not rather a question of business? I think it is, and I propose to deal with it on that plane. I am always, Mr. Speaker, most interested in anything the Acting Prime Minister says. I always listen to him with the gravest and most careful attention; and I could not help discerning a strong contrast in what he said to-day as compared to what he said some time ago in connection with the proposal advanced by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). That hon. gentleman, the other night when this Bill was under consideration in Committee, made precisely the same suggestion as he made this afternoon. And what was the attitude of the Acting Prime Minister on that occasion? Rising in his seat and turning with all that courteous graciousness with which he is endowed, he said to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding): "What you say, Sir, is worthy of the deepest consideration. I myself am afraid it is impracticable, but I will consult with the officers of the Government and see whether it would not be in the public interest to meet your views." To-day the same proposal is laid before the House, and what does the Acting Prime Minister say? He declares: This is an unfair suggestion, or an unfair speech, or an unfair argument—this is a specious argument. Why the reason for the change? The change from courtesy, the change from the most kindly consideration to somewhat abrupt negation, is due to the few words dropped by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding). He, alas! said, perhaps not altogether with enthusiasm, that the conduct of these railways was going to be handed over to a group of gentlemen who live in and about Toronto. Is it an aspersion on the Acting Prime Minister that the gentlemen who form the board of management of these railways come from Toronto? I think not. But what caused the heat on the part of my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White)? I will tell the House. It is because the Acting Prime Minister saw in the words of the member for Shelburne and Queens what might be construed into a statement that what the Canadian people did not like about this Bill was that they felt afraid that it was the turning back of the Canadian Northern into the hands of the Mackenzie and Mann group. That was what caused the sudden change in the demeanour of the Acting Prime Minister. That hon. gentleman has declared, and I say, Amen to his statement, that if we are to have a successful experiment in public ownership, the control of the railways must be placed in the hands of those in whom the Canadian people have confidence. The member for Shelburne and Queens has stated that the public ownership proposal contained in this Bill suffers from two handicaps. I say that it suffers from a third handicap—the handicap that the people of Canada believe the Mackenzie and Mann interests are far too closely in touch with the present proposal.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): What alternative to the Bill does the hon. gentleman propose?

Mr. McMASTER: I am not going to answer that question because it does not bear on the issue which is before us at present. The people of Canada have viewed with a feeling of distrust and dislike the fact that when the Acting Minister of Justice—for whom as a lawyer I have great respect—was conducting this Bill through the House he had seated beside him one of the lesser luminaries of that constellation of legal lights which clustered for years around Mackenzie and Mann. Not only that, but he told us that the Bill had been drafted by what I might call the sun of that system of legal lights, Mr. Zebulon A. Lash. These gentlemen are lawyers for whom all Canadian lawyers have great respect. But we would prefer that Government ownership of this great system started without such apparent close connection be-

tween Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann and the Government. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada are not grateful to Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann for their railroad operations in this country? We find them feeling, rightly or wrongly, that the level of public life has not been raised, but rather debased by the operations of those gentlemen.

The Acting Prime Minister took considerable time in defending the corporate form of this company which is to run our railways. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens never attacked the corporate form—so all that argument was absolutely beside the point; the hon. member asked that the control of Parliament over the moneys of the people should be retained. The Acting Prime Minister made a comparison between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway. He said that shareholders, widely distributed, gave the conduct of the Canadian Pacific Railway into the hands of the directors; and his argument was: Why cannot the people of Canada give the conduct of the Canadian Northern Railway just as completely into the hands of those nominated by the shareholders of this company? There is only one answer to that argument, but it is a very complete answer—that the private owners of the shares of the Canadian Pacific Railway are dealing with their own property and have the right to name whom they will as their directors; while this Government is dealing, not with its own property, but with the property of the people of Canada. And we, sitting on this side of the House, at least, say that in dealing with the property of the people of Canada there shall be thrown around that dealing all the safeguards and protection that British traditions and British experience have shown to be wise and necessary.

Another argument advanced by the Acting Prime Minister was that it would save the duplication of auditing. I really think that that is not a serious argument. No one pretends that if the audit of this railroad is carried on by the officers of the Auditor General that another audit will have to be made by the railway company's officials. One audit should be sufficient.

My hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister also brought forward the fact that after a deficit occurs Parliament will have the right to appropriate moneys to meet it. That is quite right, that is left to us. It reminds me of what a Radical member once said in the British House of Commons. "The King generally talks about 'my army' and 'my navy'; but he always talks about 'the national debt'." And our friends, the directors of this railway company, may possibly talk about "our engines and our rolling stock"; but when the deficit comes it will be "the deficit of the people of Canada."

I now come to the least enthusiastic argument of the Acting Prime Minister. He said, "I believe,—I am not sure,—that the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario carries on its business as regards the Parliament of the province in the same way as we propose that this commission or company should carry on its business as regards the Parliament of Canada." I know how busy the Acting Prime Minister is. I spoke in the House the other night of the inhumanity of this Government of twenty-three members allowing him to do two men's work. But really when he comes to tell us what we should do in regard to perhaps the greatest national undertaking that this country has ever assumed, he should be able to give us better arguments than his beliefs; I think we should have accurate information.

Public ownership is a matter on which honest men equally informed may hold different opinions. We have before us the great public ownership scheme in which the Government has embarked, and it is necessary that every man whatsoever his preconceived notions on public ownership may be, give that scheme all his support. But let not the Government endeavour to make political capital out of the fact that there are some men on this side of the House who are not in favour of Government ownership. I believe if we counted heads we would find among the supporters of the Government just as many who are not enthusiastic for government ownership. Government ownership is a principle that I wish I could enthusiastically support, for it seems to me in theory to be right. The idea that a railway is in essence a monopoly, that it can only be successful if it is a monopoly, and that all monopolies should be owned or at least be controlled by the people, appeals to me. But I cannot overlook the facts before me. What are they? Government ownership was tried in the United States, and it ran up tremendous deficits; government ownership was also tried in Great Britain and it ran up tremendous deficits. I know that government ownership was a great success in regard to marine insurance in Great Britain. When the war broke out ships stood in harbour, they did not dare go out because there

were no insurance companies strong enough to insure their cargoes and hulls. The Government stepped in and insured them, and thus did a great service for the nation and the Allies, and it made a handsome profit out of the business. I asked the Government the other night whether they could tell me if the Government of Great Britain paid the premiums into the Consolidated Fund, but I have had no answer.

Now, we on this side of the House are prepared to give this government ownership plan, as outlined by this Bill, a fair field. We wish to see it succeed. We would have no patriotic feelings in our bosoms if we did not entertain that wish, because I do not know what will be the financial future of this country if this plan does not succeed. But what I do say is that the Government, with all the difficulties inherent in the situation, and in the light of recent experiments in public ownership, not only on this side of the Atlantic, but on the other, would be well advised to follow the sage and experienced counsel given to them by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens.

Mr. F. S. SCOTT (Waterloo South): I come from a part of the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, where a great majority of the people believe in the principle of public ownership, and believing as I do also in the principle, I am particularly concerned that at this time we should in discussing this measure come to a proper conclusion regarding it.

It is of the greatest possible importance that public ownership should be started on a proper basis. I have been a member of this House for some years, and I confess that from the first time that I came into the House, as I listened to the discussion of the Estimates of the Intercolonial Railway, my thought was that never could the Intercolonial Railway be carried along successfully by the method then followed. It seems to me that the first thing Parliament has to learn in connection with the public ownership of railways is that Parliament knows nothing at all about railway operation; that the running of railways should be delegated to some other body. If we were to go to the Board of Directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and say that they should submit their budget for each financial year to a body such as this, they would say that the idea was the height of the ridiculous. They would say that they could not hope to make a success of the Canadian Pacific railway by the adoption of such methods as have been employed by the Dominion in past years.

The amendment introduced this afternoon suggests that in the Bill which has been brought down, Parliament is taking a most radical step; that Parliament is making a departure from anything before attempted in this country, and that it is a move in the wrong direction. With that contention I most emphatically disagree. I believe that the only way in which this great undertaking can be successfully carried on is by the method adopted under this Bill. The principle may be a new one to this Parliament. We have had a very clear description of what has governed in these matters in the Motherland. However, the principle adopted by this Bill has been carried out in connection with provincial and municipal finances. While in the past it has been the governing principle that all revenue received by a municipal council shall be under the control of and shall be spent by that municipal council, nevertheless, in Ontario and throughout the Canadian West, where we have had considerable experience with public ownership, it has been found that public undertakings cannot be carried along on the old-fashioned lines. The municipal councils of Ontario and the West have adopted the very principle embodied in this Bill. They have appointed commissions in connection with their waterworks plants, their electric plants, and so on; and these public works are being administered just as it is proposed to administer this great public railway system.

If the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) had stood up in the Legislature of Ontario fifteen or eighteen years ago and made the speech that he made in this House this afternoon, no doubt he would have received applause from both sides of the House. But conditions have changed in this country. The Ontario Legislature found that they could not carry along that great public undertaking, the hydro-electric movement, by the old methods. What did they do? They did just what the Government propose to do in this case; they placed the thing under the control of a commission. What does that commission do? Does it come to the Legislature? Do members on both sides of the legislature discuss, pro and con, all the different works and activities proposed to be entered upon by the Hydro-Electric Commission? No; this commission goes on with its work of administration, just as the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do in connection with

their own undertaking. Each year the commission prepares a report and submits it to the legislature, and the legislature may see whether the operations of the commission show a deficit or a surplus. The matter is open to the fullest investigation on the part of the legislature; any kind of audit that is deemed necessary may be made. I submit that if public ownership is to be a success in Canada, it will only be by the adoption of such methods as have been found necessary in municipalities all through the country, and as have been found necessary in Ontario in connection with that most successful public undertaking which Ontario is carrying on.

I said a moment ago that in connection with public ownership Parliament had some things to learn. I believe that the only way in which we can make a success of this undertaking is by getting the right class of men. The essence of the whole thing is the selection of an efficient board of directors, and the building up of a proper executive. In this connection one thing has always occurred to me as I have followed the deliberations of this House. Perhaps I should not criticise; yet I feel that if we are to obtain the class of men necessary to make public ownership a success, this House of Commons has to learn to use such men decently, not to treat them as if they were pickpockets. What I have in mind is this: if Parliament, for instance, were to get men who have brought distinction to themselves and have made such a success of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—men like Sir William Van Horne or Lord Shaughnessy—to take charge of the Government railways, and if these men were criticised and abused, as I have heard public servants criticised and abused in this House, you could not hope to induce men of that calibre to continue in the public service. We are all concerned about the success of this great undertaking. We may have differences of opinion as to how its operation can be made successful; as to the best way of administering it. But as Canadians we are all interested in its success, and I believe most sincerely that we can make it a success only by carrying it on according to sound business principles and by treating fairly and well the men in public employ.

There has been a good deal of criticism in this House—to-day as well as the last day that this matter came up in Committee—of the application of closure. It was not my privilege to be in the House during the first three days that the Bill was discussed in Committee. I had opportunity of studying it and hearing it explained only on one day in the committee stage, when it was considered under the closure rule. But I had not sat in the House very many hours before I had made up my mind with regard to the Bill. As to the talk about closure, it seems to me that the business of the country would be greatly facilitated and carried out in much better form if we had a little more of the application of closure.

I have seen the same thing happen on several occasions. Some of the best speeches that I have ever heard in this House were twenty minute speeches under the closure rule, and with this Bill in the Committee stage for four days, with its introduction some time before that, and with the opportunity of discussing it on this occasion, this Parliament has surely had ample time to digest and consider everything in connection with it.

Reference has been made to the Canadian Pacific, and it does not seem to be the opinion of this Parliament that this is the proper time to acquire the Canadian Pacific. The financial considerations are indeed, great, but I am convinced that this country cannot go on with one-half of its railways publicly owned and the other half privately owned. In the years to come there is bound to be conflict between the two, and consciously or unconsciously, Parliament, in the end, is not going to give a square deal to the privately owned company. Therefore, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were wise in their day and generation, they would say that the present is the proper time to get together with the Dominion Government and make these two great systems into one large State-owned system. That may not come at the present time, but I am satisfied it will come some time, and it will be one of the best things that could happen to the Dominion of Canada. The railway business is, like every other business, a good one. In any line of business, you will see some persons succeeding while others are doing the reverse, and the success of this undertaking will depend entirely, as I said before, on the class of men secured to handle it. If the Canadian Pacific could be taken over by the Dominion of Canada and combined with the roads acquired or about to be acquired by the Government, we would have, not only control of the railroads of Canada, but the finest organization of railroad administrators in the entire world, because, is there any reason why these men who have so successfully administered

the Canadian Pacific—and we as Canadians are all proud of the way in which they have administered it—could not take over all the railroads of Canada in the public interest and administer them for the public good?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) for a while played fair with this Bill and followed it up in its real purpose. At a certain stage, however, of the proceedings in connection with it he commenced to play politics and to draw a distinction between the two sides of the House by saying that we were opposed to Government ownership of railways and that he was in favour of it, hoping thereby to get some applause from his followers and some kudos in some parts of the country where, for the present, Government ownership happens to be popular. Every hon. member who expects to enjoy public confidence should endeavour to serve the public honestly and squarely with his opinions and not trim his sails to every wind that blows over the country. No man can expect to enjoy the full confidence of the people—and whether he enjoys their confidence or not, to do what is best for the people—unless he has sound principles of his own, and is not capable of being carried away for the moment by a current of public opinion. I venture to tell the Acting Prime Minister that his history is not that of a man who favours public ownership. His history, within a few years, aye, within a few weeks, was that he was a strong supporter and advocate of private ownership. But in playing politics a few days ago he found it advisable to trim his sails to suit the breeze and he became favourable to public ownership.

That question is not before the House at all; it is not under discussion, and it was not discussed at any stage, whether public ownership was popular or not, or whether it was a proper policy or not. We have public ownership of railways, and the purport of this Bill is how best to handle the property which we have as public owners. I challenge the Acting Prime Minister to say that if the Canadian Northern Company was making a success of its business as the Canadian Pacific is he would step in and take it from them and handle it as a publicly owned enterprise. He would do nothing of the kind, and he is simply making a virtue of a necessity. We were forced into taking over the Canadian Northern and because of that we have to make the best of it. The Acting Prime Minister would, I am sure, be the last man, whether intentionally or not, to misquote any hon. member, and I wish to be generous to him and say that, inadvertently, he misquoted me to-day. He quoted me as saying, in connection with this Bill, that I was opposed to public ownership, whereas, he was reading from a statement I made over a year ago, on the first occasion that the Minister of Railways brought in his Estimates, and his report on the Government ownership of a railway which we then had, which we had been running for nearly a year, and for which he was looking for more money. In connection with the business that was before the House then, over a year ago, I made the statement which the Acting Prime Minister quoted as if I had made it the other day.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Did the hon. member or did he not quote the statement in his speech the other day?

Mr. McKENZIE: I did. I wanted to put myself absolutely right before the House and the country when the Acting Prime Minister said that I declared myself against public ownership the year before, and I quoted what I said a year ago, which is this:

> It is important for the people that we should have some conception of what we are doing. If this were a meeting of directors—

And I was talking of the Minister of Railways coming before the House with his Estimates.

> —it would not be a very cheerful one. The directors and shareholders would have discovered that we were spending away up in the millions in the development and working of the road, but that we have made no money. We are in debt. If we were ordinary directors and shareholders of a road we would have to put our hands down in our pockets to find money in order to make betterments and to run the road, and that would not be a cheerful prospect. However, we are new beginners in this enterprise. I was never in favour of Government ownership—

I said that over a year ago. I am honest about it. Life is too dear, peace too sweet, approval of my own conscience is too dear to me to bother with anything but what I believe.

> I am in favour of it now—

That is what I said a year ago.

> —as I think private enterprise will be better in these matters. Particularly in colonization and development will private enterprise and private energy do much better than Government ownership, but by the force of circumstances, we are in this net, and we must stay

in it and make the most of it—that is the way I view it.

I went on to say that I hoped the minister would come back to us the next year with a statement that would compare favourably with the position of the Canadian Pacific. I said that I knew of no reason why the minister could not get just as good men to run the road as the Canadian Pacific had. Now, I have not changed my position one wit from what it was a year ago. In discussing this Bill I had no occasion to say anything about private ownership. It was merely a question of how best to handle the property that we already had, and it was not fair for the Acting Prime Minister to switch off into a discussion of private ownership, because that was not involved in the question at all. When I was addressing myself to the people of the West, not only last year but some time before, I said that if the people of the West wanted the development of railways, wanted enterprise in building lines in different parts of the West, they would be disappointed in Government ownership. Why did I say that? I said it because the province from which I come and parts of the province of Quebec had had fifty years of Government ownership of the Intercolonial, and during that time not one inch of branch line had been built in the province of Nova Scotia. I had a right therefore to say to the people of the West that it was better for them to have the energy and enterprise of private ownership. I knew what the Canadian Pacific had done in the West, and I knew what Mackenzie and Mann would do if they had the money. I knew the country would develop more rapidly under private ownership of railways.

Mr. BURNHAM: What is the hon. gentleman's alternative to this Bill?

Mr. McKENZIE: That seems to be a sort of chronic attack of my hon. friend. He is a brainy business man, and I think I will leave it to him to find the alternative. I say that we are discussing this business, and we have a right to discuss it; we have a right to stick to the real business before us, and not switch off into a discussion of public versus private ownership. We already have the road, and all we have to do is to determine what principles shall be applied in the management of it. That is the real question before us, and I cannot understand how the minister could get away from it. Why, what do we see in the very preamble of the Bill, which is the context of the Act, explaining what the Act is about? The preamble says:

> Whereas His Majesty on behalf of the Dominion of Canada has acquired control of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and of the various constituent and subsidiary companies comprising the Canadian Northern System.

The preamble says we have acquired the road. We are now simply dealing with the management of it. I have stated as clearly as I can my own position on government ownership. If the people of the West are to have government ownership, I trust that they will have a more cheerful experience than the people of the province of Nova Scotia have had, because our experience has not been good. I sincerely hope that theirs will be better, and that government ownership of railways will give them a better development than it has given to the Maritime Provinces. I was quoted by the Acting Prime Minister this afternoon as having said some years ago that that was one of the reasons why I did not think the good people of the West would be improving their position by substituting for the enterprise and energy of private ownership government ownership as we had experienced it in the East. Perhaps what was a failure with us will be a success in the West. I hope so; I hope that as years go by matters will improve in connection not only with government-owned railways, but everything else.

We were held up to contempt and obloquy the other night, and spoken of as traitors more or less to our own interests, because we were supposed to have said something in favour of the Canadian Pacific. Personally, I did not hear anybody say anything in favour of the Canadian Pacific. I did hear the Acting Prime Minister say to-day that the Canadian Pacific had served the country faithfully and well. Now, if the Canadian Pacific has served the country faithfully and well and given us a splendid service, should a public man in this House be found fault with for saying a good word on behalf of that institution, of which the Acting Prime Minister speaks so well? Obviously, no stigma can attach to any hon. member in this House who may have said something favourable to the Canadian Pacific.

The amendment before us cannot possibly have taken the Government by surprise. This Bill was founded upon a resolution, which was discussed very fully. When the resolution was before the House I told the minister that I could not agree to the principle of taking away from Parliament control of the revenue of Canada, and that

I would continue to oppose that principle. I still adhere to that position. I believe that Parliament should know—whether it takes a few more clerks or not, matters nothing—how the money is coming in and where it is coming from, and at the last accounting we should have an opportunity of saying how the account shall be settled. That has been the principle that has been upheld and practised in the old land for hundreds of years, and is the principle that prevails there to-day. It has been explained to us by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) that although the principle was departed from for a short time prior to 1854, since that year the practice has been followed in the old country of not spending a single farthing of the public money until the expenditure has been approved by Parliament. I think that is a safe principle to follow. If we are going to relegate the management of our railways to an independent concern over which we have no control, what is the use of Parliament at all? It is proposed that we should put thousands of miles of railway and millions and, in time, billions of money beyond the control of Parliament. If we are to do that, why should we meet here at all? Why not let us meet one year and grant a charter to some private corporation to run the whole business of the country and then slam the door and go home, leaving that corporation to run the business? If the principle is good in one thing, it is good in another. If this proposal is the proposal par excellence that it is painted to be in connection with the handling of railways, surely the same principle holds good in other things and can be applied to every department of Government business. I submit that the Canadian people or the British people or any other well-governed people would not for a moment listen to such a proposition. It is better to stand by the old principle. Let us have absolute control over our own revenue, and let us spend it as the wisdom of Parliament may decide. If section 16 of the Act had said that the deficit would be made good after the money had been voted by Parliament, it would not be so bad; but it does not say that. It says that when a deficit occurs the manager of the company may simply walk into the office of the Finance Minister and say: "I am $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 short this year; kindly give me your cheque for that amount, under the provisions of section 16 of the Act."

If the minister should question him about it he says: "You have nothing to say about it; by virtue of this Act of Parliament I am entitled to the money, you have no further control over it; give me your cheque so that I may get the money." It is the privilege of the minister, six months afterwards when he is bringing down his Estimates to say: "We have been obliged to pay out $20,000,000." What are we going to do about it? The money is spent. It is a most ridiculous thing to say that we have any control over it at all. We have given it away in advance. We have expropriated this money out of the pockets of the people and we have passed it over to this company. Afterwards we are told that we have the opportunity of sitting down wisely together and reading that so much money was spent last year, and we have simply to pass this ex post facto legislation that will confirm the action of the minister in handing over the cheque. We believe that there should be the most minute inquiry into the proceedings of this company. Where is the machinery under this Act to furnish any such inquiry? There is not a line or a word in this Act to say that the Auditor General has anything to do about it, that the Auditor General can report upon or make any inquiry, and there is not a vestige of authority to submit these accounts to the Public Accounts Committee and let them come under the control of Parliament.

As a last word let me say that the Acting Prime Minister seemed to justify the action of the Government in putting on closure to prevent further discussion of this Bill. The very last man who made a speech of any length was himself just within three or four hours of the application of closure. The hon. gentleman spoke for about an hour and a half before closure was applied. Is it to be supposed by the Canadian people that it was necessary for the Acting Prime Minister to speak for that length of time explaining and defending the Bill before closure was applied? If a proper and useful discussion was being carried on by the Acting Prime Minister then surely there could not have been very much obstruction, because obstruction aims at keeping the House from doing things that should be done. But, within a few hours of the closure being applied it was thought necessary in order that the Bill might be properly understood by the House, that the minister should make a speech for an hour and a half. And yet, he told us to-day that closure was necessary. He told us the night before he made that speech, when the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) was speaking, that

clause 16 was to stand. He said that it was a most serious objection that was taken to it and that it would receive consideration. What did the Acting Prime Minister do? He left the House after he had made his long speech and he never gave a second's consideration to this clause of the Bill. He never gave the Committee or the House an opportunity of dealing with it any more, but he applied the closure, and the section to which he had promised serious consideration was never considered, and the closure was applied without considering it. Is he going to tell the people that it was necessary to apply the closure without carrying out what he had promised?

I submit that the revenue derived from the operation of public railways should be absolutely under the control of Parliament and that the motion moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens embodies the only method by which this Bill should be dealt with and which brings the operation of these railways and public ownership absolutely and properly under the control of this House.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to delay the House for a moment if it is waiting to divide, but I can assure you that I shall endeavour to confine what I have to say to the limits of such a speech as I have always thought should be made on the third reading of a measure. The hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) has struggled manfully with a situation, which he, himself, feels to be difficult. He had every appearance of a man who was struggling with difficulties that he reared himself, started off and he said that he believed in a man who was not carried away with every breath of doctrine. I quite believe in the honesty of my hon. friend; I quite believe that he wants to think that he is such a man and I quite agree that he is nearly always such a man, but he has given evidence of having fallen a little short upon this occasion.

In regard to Government ownership, I must say that I think the whole matter does not arise on the discussion at all. But I watched the proceedings very carefully on a certain Friday night and a certain Monday night; I saw my hon. friend rise and read what he stated was his attitude in regard to Government ownership in the previous session, and my recollection is that he led the House to believe that he read it to show that he had not changed and that he was in that position still. If that be his position it is a perfectly honourable one, although I did think that on the Monday evening he showed just a little sign of wavering. I may have been wrong in my impression; I should have been glad to have believed that he had stuck to his position of Friday night. I do think at the present moment that that was still his position on Friday night, but I know his attitude did not convey the same impression to the House on Friday night that it did on Monday night. I am not impressed, nor edified, when he stands up and wants us to think of him as a man who is not carried away by new breaths of doctrine.

In regard to what my hon. friend said about the closure, and whether there was obstruction or not, I should apologise for referring to this matter in view of the debate we had on Friday night and on Monday night. But I think I can give an illustration that even my hon. friend would have difficulty in getting over as to the existence of obstruction. My hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) rose, with a broad smile which indicated a good deal of internal amusement at the role he was playing, and I am perfectly sure that he said ten times in not fewer than as many minutes, that he was seeking information. Well, that is a perfectly harmless remark, and the most of us might have agreed with the need for information. But when he repeated that statement ten times within ten minutes I submit to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that that was coming pretty near obstruction. I do not want to press the point. We all know what obstruction is. Needless repetition has been the definition which has been given to obstruction in the Parliament of Great Britain. I do not think the hon. member for Pontiac would not say that he was needlessly repeating himself when he said again and again in my hearing that he rose for information, that he had not the information and that he wanted it.

Now, with regard to the matter before the House, Mr. Speaker, I should always wish to give the utmost attention to anything that was advanced here by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). It may be conceded that this is a new departure or partakes of the nature of a new departure, but I cannot help thinking that that is more apparent than real. As to its being a new departure, Sir, I would just say this: That not only this country, but the world is in the midst of new departures, and we cannot help ourselves. We are in the midst of new

departures, and any man who thinks that we have not to try and be prepared to deal with new departures in the present condition of this country and of the world, is in danger of rapidly finding himself a back number in any guidance he gives to the affairs of the nation.

I think that my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister gave a most lucid, most cogent, and most forcible argument to the House, and I am bound to say, in all honesty, that it carried to me complete conviction. There were the two methods of dealing with this question after we decide upon public ownership; and even my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is constrained to admit that such is the condition in which these roads are, we are bound to decide upon it. Then I take it, either we were to administer the Canadian National Railroad as the Intercolonial has been administered, or we were to adopt the corporation method. Now, with regard to the Intercolonial railway, I must ask hon. gentlemen opposite (who are better acquainted with it than I am, who have lived in that part of the country and watched its operations) is it not a fact that under all Governments that road has reeked and smelt with political patronage? Is not that the case? If it be the case can this Government and Parliament lightly think of adopting a method for the Canadian National railroad which has led to the wholesale use of patronage in the limited experiment that we have been making on the Intercolonial in regard to this great question of Government ownership? The Acting Prime Minister says the Government has deliberately chosen the other method. For what purpose? To get rid, if possible, of political patronage; and if the Government does not get directors who will co-operate with it in this matter, it will be brought to very strict account by the people of this country. I believe that here is the crux of the whole thing. Let the Government say to its directors: We want this railroad run upon business lines, and we want the best men put in for doing any specific work in connection with it, and we do not want politics to interfere. If the Government does less than that it will very rapidly be brought to task by the people of this country. If the Government does that, I have stated my previous faith in Canada's ability to sustain this railroad, and to build it up to a degree of wealth and efficiency equal to that of the Canadian Pacific, and the two railroads will be part of the wonder which the Canada of the future is going to be in the world. The whole thing depends upon getting the right men to carry the undertaking out—getting men in whose trustworthiness and ability you can have confidence, and Canada being behind the road it is bound to be a success. If we do not produce, and cannot produce, such men in Canada import them. Get honest, trustworthy and able men. Tell them they have got to run this, as a railway proposition, to success, and that they are not to consider political questions at all. Then I have such confidence in my country that I have faith in the future of this road.

As to the control of Parliament, I have said that this is a new departure. I think that in the case of Britain's handling of the Indian Accounts there may be a precedent for this line of action. But we do not forfeit, that I can see, any of our rights as a Parliament to look into the way the roads are being run. Something has to be done on trust in connection with such a large concern. Do the Canadian Pacific shareholders do nothing on trust in regard to their railroad, one of the biggest concerns in the world? Have the shareholders to do nothing on trust in connection with that road? Surely we can find men in Canada—or our politics and our public life are corrupt beyond description—surely we can find men to do for the nation what the directors of the Canadian Pacific are doing for the shareholders of that railway. I hope we can. I hope so from the bottom of my heart, for the sake of the future of the enterprise, for the sake of the future of the public life of Canada, for the sake of the prosperity, progress, and real welfare of this great Dominion. But I would appeal to my hon. friends opposite to take this attitude and force home from time to time—and I will help them in doing it if it is necessary—the points that I have made in my brief utterances. Force home these points, and criticise and observe all you can, but let us give Canada and her railroad a fair trial.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I was somewhat pleased with the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Michael Clark) when he said that he had heard me repeat some ten times in as many minutes the remark that I was unable to get any information from the Government regarding the various clauses of this somewhat complicated Bill. I am glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that after having repeated ten or twelve times a plain, simple statement, it may have penetr ted

the brilliant brain of the hon. gentleman. He did not tell the House that after we on this side had asked questions repeatedly the Government were not able to, or at any rate did not, answer those questions. I undoubtedly stated a dozen times that we had been asking for information that we had not got, or could not get; and when this Bill was subjected to the closure there were at least ten of the clauses in it that had not been debated in this House, many of the most important clauses in the most important piece of legislation that has perhaps been before Parliament for some years. The clause to which my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has moved an amendment was under discussion on a Monday, the first evening of the debate. I was not present on that occasion. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that when I heard that the Government and Mr. Lash were co-operating with the Mackenzie and Mann group it gave me such a headache I was unable to be here that evening. Had I been here I would have spoken about that clause as I did when the resolution came before the House, because there is nothing about the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) which renders it impossible to adopt.

The Acting Prime Minister makes the statement that you will have to duplicate the staff. Nothing of the kind. Every big corporation—for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway—employ auditors and then have an outside audit as well. The auditing staff of the Canadian National Railways could be under the jurisdiction of the Auditor General, and one audit would suffice for the company and for the country.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said that I was obstructing. I heard other hon. members say the same thing. Perhaps I did not make myself clear in some instances. When we were dealing in Committee with section 17, relating to the date of the annual meeting, which is to be held in April, some hon. members thought that that was a matter of very little importance. It simply means this, Mr. Speaker, that if you have the annual meeting of this company on the second Thursday in April, instead of on the 31st of December, you will be getting a report—if you get one at all—presented to Parliament a year later; whereas if you made the statistical year end on the 31st of December you would get the report of the previous year's operations presented to Parliament during the session. As the section passed the Committee it is not likely the annual report will be presented to Parliament until the following year, and it will be so far gone then that the minister in charge will simply say: "This is last year's accounts. We have had this deficit, we have paid the money; that was a year ago, and we are doing better now." I think that the amendment I proposed was important, Mr. Speaker. The statistical year of the Dominion ends on the 31st of December. Why not make this National Railway system conform to it? No information was given me on that subject. There must be some reason why the Government want to have the annual meeting in April. Is it because it will not be convenient to bring the report of the company's operations before Parliament that session? I do not see how the amendment can bring about any hardship on the Government or on the management of the railway. If you have the Auditor General's Report, members of Parliament would be in a position to intelligently discuss the management of the people's railways; but there would be no such chance a year after payments have been made out of the treasury without the sanction of Parliament.

The adoption of my suggestion would entail practically no added expense. It is just as necessary to have an audit of the expenditures of a company, the directors of whom are appointed by the Government, as it is to have the expenditures of the people's representatives audited. The people are not satisfied to trust the Government or Parliament with the expenditure of money without any independent audit; so provision has been made for an Auditor General, who is independent of the Government. That being the case, surely it is just as essential that we should have an audit when the Government hand over the spending of money to a third party. There will be in the neighbourhood of one hundred million dollars spent on this enterprise, and so far as the Bill at present provides there is absolutely no provision made for an audit. I asked the Government when the Bill was under discussion if a report would be presented to Parliament, and that is one of the numerous questions to which I received no answer.

Now, there is not an hon. member who listened to the whole discussion on this Bill from start to finish who can tell me that the Government ever said they would bring before Parliament at any particular date a full report of the receipts and expenditures of this undertaking. I do not know whether the Government are withholding the information intentionally or not. But there are a number of things in

this Bill that do not look good to me, and they do not look good to the people. When I criticised the Bill a few days ago I was not only expressing my own opinion, in a large measure I was expressing the opinion of a great many people of the country. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there is a feeling abroad that if this enterprise is to succeed we must get clear of the Mackenzie and Mann influence, lock, stock and barrel. The gentlemen selected as directors were directors of the Canadian Northern railway, and, according to the statement of the Government, they made a failure of its management. Have the Government looked around to find competent railway men, or even public ownership enthusiasts, who would assume control of this road. It seems to me it would be the simplest thing in the world to get a body of the best railway men in Canada, pay them good salaries, and relieve them as far as possible from political control. Hon. members now say that the directors are relieved from political control. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways has a string on every one of the directors; he can pull them back at will, and he does not have to come to Parliament to give any explanation of his action. I made a suggestion when the Bill was in Committee that the directors should be appointed in the same way as the members of the Railway Commission. Some hon. members asked me if I wanted to have them appointed for ten years. I replied that I did not suggest that, because possibly ten years might be too long a period to keep in office some older men in an undertaking of this kind; but I suggested they could be appointed for four or five years in much the same way as are the members of the Railway Commission. The Government would not lose control; they could always add to or withdraw from the directorate. But those directors would feel that as long as they were giving good service their positions would be assured.

I also made the proposal that there should be a profit sharing arrangement. At present we have a commission sitting on a proposal for co-operation between capital and labour. If there is to be any co-operation it must be based on profit sharing of some kind or another. Here is the biggest undertaking that we will ever have directly under our own control where we can adopt a profit sharing system.

We are dealing with a road that is losing some millions of dollars. It would be a simple matter to work out a plan under which, when the road earned a certain amount, all employees of the system, the directors included, would share in the profits.

An hon. MEMBER: How about the deficits?

Mr. CAHILL: The deficits would not be affected adversely by such a plan; they might even be reduced. You could start with the deficits—with the deficit of this year, if you wanted to, or with the average deficits over a period of years—and begin to share profits even before dividends were earned on the investment. There would be nothing wrong about that. You would be getting the hearty co-operation of every man working on the road; every man interested in the enterprise would have an opportunity of sharing in its profits, and if the commission was appointed for a term of years would feel that he was free from all political control. It would be in his interest and in the interest of all the men on the road, individually and collectively, to make the road pay as far as possible. The deficit, Mr. Speaker, we must get rid of. We cannot go on multiplying these deficits indefinitely. If we do, we shall kill not only public ownership, but the reputation of Canada as well. We must get people into this country. We must get immigration.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CAHILL: (Continuing) Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, we were discussing the Canadian National Railway system and public ownership generally, but the latter subject is not one that should be discussed on the third reading of this Bill as we own the Canadian National Railways and public ownership of railways is a matter of fact. The only question at present before the House is the best means of obtaining for the people of Canada efficient management of the Canadian National railways. The Opposition was somewhat criticised for seeking for information from the Government in regard to this Bill, although, a number of clauses looked as if they could be amended with advantage to the people of this country and in the interest of public ownership. When the Bill was in Committee and before closure was brought in, the acting Prime Minister asked that clause 3, pertaining to the capital stock of the company, should stand, the question being whether capital stock should be held by the Minister of Finance without power to dispose of it. When I asked the Minister

of the Interior, who was handling the Bill, what was the purpose of leaving this clause so that the Government might dispose of the stock, he said that there was an arrangement with some of the holders of Canadian Northern debenture stock who might wish to exchange it for stock of the company. In the first place I do not believe that the people of Canada want to divide the control of the Canadian National railways with any person. We have this railway system now; we have an opportunity of testing out public ownership of railways, and until the people of Canada decide that they cannot manage this system, the stock of the Canadian National railway company should be vested absolutely in the hands of the Government, and no part of it should be disposed of until the matter is brought before this Parliament. The acting Prime Minister the other day, in making a speech in which he intimated that there was obstruction, stated, in reply to a question, that the press of Canada was with him. He said:

> We practically have all the press now. The press of the country is above all things an intelligent press, and it is inconceivable that it should not strongly support this Union Government.

I do not know whether he meant in its every action or not, but presumably he meant in connection with the railways. I have here a clipping from the Toronto Globe and also one from the Montreal Star, two reasonably respectable journals of this country, two journals that are supporting Union Government in most of its legislation, but they are not altogether convinced that the action of the Government in connection with the National railway is the best for the country. The Toronto Globe, of April 30, says in an editorial:

> The people are restive and apprehensive when they learn that Mr. Z. A. Lash, K.C., was engaged by the Government of Canada to draft legislation for the National railways, and that although the original Mackenzie and Mann are no longer doing contracting work for the Canadian Northern railway, there are still gentlemen of the same name operating as the North ern Construction company. There would be more confidence in the intention of the Government to make a real fight for the creation of an efficient National Railway System were one or two outstanding advocates of public ownership given seats on the National Board and a conspicuously efficient member of the Grand Trunk operating staff chosen as principal assistant to Mr. Hanna. There is no reason why the officials of the defunct Canadian Northern should crowd all others off the public ownership bench. If they continue to do so, there will inevitably be bred in the public mind the suspicion that public ownership is merely camouflage for the same old crowd of promoters and contractors operating in the same old way.

[Mr. Cahill.]

The Toronto Globe is, by the way, an ardent advocate of public ownership. The Montreal Star, which is, I believe, opposed to public ownership and in favour of private ownership, says under date of April 28:

> Why the rush? Sir Thomas White, the Acting Premier of Canada (by the way, when is Sir Robert coming home?), declares that the Government is pledged unalterably to public ownership of railways and that public ownership has come to stay.

It says further on:

> Sir Thomas White and Mr. Rowell broadly insinuate that the Canadian Pacific railway's fear of public ownership is the main-spring behind all movements in opposition to their socialistic policy.
>
> Per contra, many men are beginning to wonder what is the pressure behind this anxious haste to involve the country in new railway obligations, at this time of financial and industrial crisis. Once it was "Cox can't wait." Who is it who is in such a hurry now?

That, I think, expresses pretty generally the sentiment of the people of this country. The Canadian people are, I believe, in favour of the nationalization of this railway; they are in favour of efficient management of this railway. Many people believe that if this railway is efficiently managed, it will be in a position in the near future, when we get more immigration into Canada to develop the land, to decrease western freight rates and freight rates generally throughout Canada.

Since this road has come into the hands of the Government the rates have been increased, and we have been spending large sums of money without any detailed information as to the purposes of the expenditure. There is no doubt that the people will get tired of this kind of thing and there is absolutely no doubt that they will hold the Government accountable—accountable to the extent that they will vote them out, perhaps at the next election. But that is not soon enough to save the railway situation for the people of Canada, and unless the Government are willing to lay all their cards on the table and give this House all the information that has been asked for there will be a suspicion in the minds of a great many people in this country that they are not treating this question fairly and honestly; and once there is that suspicion there will be inefficiency in the management and lack of co-operation among the people of this country. This undertaking has every possibility of success; it is already owned by the people and if the people are satisfied that the money they are paying in passenger and freight

rates on this railroad is all going into the treasury of Canada and is being honestly expended, naturally they will want to patronize the railway in preference to the Canadian Pacific or any other road, and then it will only be a matter of time before their patronage of the National railway will make it a profitable undertaking. I think possibly my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and myself are about the only two men in the House who hold the view that this undertaking will be profitable. I can see a great future for it in developing the western country; that is, if lines are laid down for the honest purpose of developing the country, and not for political purposes. There is no reason why this railway should have the preference over another road running into the same territory. For instance, if the Canadian Pacific can build a road into a certain territory cheaper than the National road, and can give a cheaper and better service, there should be no hesitation on the part of the Railway Committee of this House in granting the Canadian Pacific a charter to construct in that territory; let us have the competition. If, on the other hand, the Canadian National railway can develop the territory more cheaply and give a better service than the Canadian Pacific, there should be no hesitation on the part of the Railway Committee in saying that the Canadian Pacific shall not go into that territory. But we must be honest with ourselves, honest with the undertaking, and honest with the Canadian Pacific. Give both roads a chance to develop along their natural lines; let them both develop their natural territory, so that we may have cheaper rates, efficiency in management, and a development of the territory to the best advantage. When we develop the territory the traffic will be created that will make the road pay.

One of the objections I had to the renewal of these blank charters was that there are any amount of corporations in Western Canada holding large blocks of vacant land for speculative purposes, and who will use all possible pressure to get the Canadian National Railway to build in their territory and develop their lands. If the road builds in that territory the lands will be advanced in value by the people's money, and at the expense of the producer, who will go in there after the railway is built and have to pay an increased price for this land. To my mind, the main essential in our railway problem is to free the land from the speculators; get immigration into the country; get people to produce on the land, and you will make the railway profitable. Some hon. members opposite have criticised the late Administration for the cost of the National Transcontinental. It would seem, when they speak of railways, they cannot help criticising the Laurier Administration for assisting in the development of the railway policy of this country. They say that the National Transcontinental cost upwards of $200,000,000. Let me tell hon. members that if the National Transcontinental did cost $200,000,000, or in that neighbourhood, it was paid for out of revenue, and that when this Government came into power the national debt, including the Transcontinental, amounted to less than $400,000,000. I might also tell them that when the Canadian Northern wanted to build from Edmonton to the coast, through British Columbia down to Vancouver, and parallel to the Canadian Pacific, the Liberal Government at Ottawa refused to grant them a charter for that road. What did the Canadian Northern do? They got a charter from the Government of the province of British Columbia.

The Government of British Columbia—I do not wish to mix politics with railways, and no hon. member can say that I ever said that any one person was responsible for the railway situation, except perhaps when some one asked me a question—the Government of British Columbia guaranteed the bonds of that road, which duplicated the Canadian Pacific practically for 200 miles from west of Edmonton to the coast. It was the most expensive construction the Canadian Northern ever had. I do not think it is good business for the people of Canada to try to cover up our responsibility by saying that it was a Liberal or a Conservative Government that was responsible for the national railway situation to-day. We have to face the situation, and I think the solution is feasible and quite workable. But we must get the railways out of the hands of the politicians, out of the hands of the men who made a failure of them, and into the hands of railway operators.

When the question was raised here a few days ago of having representatives of labour on the board, it was objected that that would be unconstitutional and could not work. Now we are doing something that is far more unconstitutional. We are taking out of the hands of the Auditor General the supervision of the expenditure of Canada's money, and as we are going to that length, I cannot see any reason why we cannot have on the board representatives of labour. It would be the simplest thing in the world to have labour represented on the National

Railway Board, and then we would get the co-operation of all the labour organizations of the country. If you get the best men possible to manage the railway, and pay them good salaries—pay them anything in reason, because they can save their salaries in a day on this undertaking—and give them a free hand, make the undertaking as free as possible from politics, and get the co-operation not only of the labour organizations and the railway employees but of everybody in the country, the undertaking will be a success instead of showing a deficit. But an audit of the expenditures should be submitted to Parliament, so that the people's representatives can see what is being done with the people's money; because if you do not show that you are honest, if you are unwilling to lay your cards on the table, you cannot expect the people of this country to have confidence in the undertaking. They would not go out of their way to patronize the road or do anything they could to further its interests because they would have the feeling that it was not the interests of the road, their own interests, they were advancing, but the interests of some private individual. Let the Government give us freely and frankly the information they have in their possession, so as to secure the co-operation of everybody.

Some hon. members have suggested that I have been obstructing more or less. Well, at the time to which the hon. member for Red Deer refers, I brought to the attention of the Committee a question which I have since seen repeated in the press, and it is this: The Minister of Railways told us that the deficit would be about $7,000,000, and that the earnings of the road above operating cost would be about $3,000,000. As I pointed out then, our liabilities in connection with this road amount to something like $470,000,000, the interest on which would be in the neighbourhood of $18,800,000. Deducting $3,000,000, the surplus earnings over operating cost, leaves a deficit of about $15,000,000. I maintain that it is unreasonable for the Government to accuse the Opposition of obstructing when they refuse to give such information as I am asking for now. The minister made that statement; when I asked him to explain, he did not refute it at all, but simply refused to answer. I might say that when I put the question, we were then under closure, and as soon as any hon. member on this side of the House asked a question the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) would say: "I move that the further consideration of this question be postponed." A number of the clauses of this Bill have never been debated in the House, and I think the Government are giving the National Railway Company a very bad start. In the first place, the Bill is being forced through under closure; the vital clauses are not being debated, and the Government will not agree to have an annual report of the undertaking submitted to Parliament.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I should like to draw attention to what I think was an unintentional mistake on the part of the leader of the Government, when he said that the Bill we are now discussing contains provisions similar to those contained in the Hydro-Electric Act of the province of Ontario.

I took the trouble to look up the Hydro-Electric Act and, although I have not had time to read it carefully, I find that such is not the case but that it is the exact opposite. It appears to contain every possible safeguard for the expenditure of money. In the first place, it provides for a controller who is not an officer of the Hydro-Electric Commission but of the Government and who appears to occupy a position somewhat similar to that of the Auditor General here. It is his function to countersign every cheque that is issued by the Hydro-Electric Commission and no expenditure can be made except it is countersigned by the comptroller. The comptroller is responsible to the Government and it is his duty to see that every expenditure is authorized. Provision is made in the Act for an annual statement of expenditures, similar to the provision which is made here, but it does not stop there. The Act also provides for an estimate for the coming year, something that is not contained in this Bill. In order that I may make no mistake about this, I will read one or two sections to the House. The section providing for the controller is as follows:

> The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint an officer to be know as the Comptroller of the Commission who shall hold office during the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and shall countersign every cheque issued by the Commission, but before countersigning shall satisfy himself that the issue of the cheque is authorized.
>
> The Commission, through the Comptroller, shall before the 15th day of February in each year, make to the Treasurer of Ontario an annual report for the information of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and for the information of the Assembly, and such report shall contain, among other things, clear and comprehensive statements disclosing and exhibiting—

(a) The actual condition as to the amount and character of the assets and liabilities (direct and indirect) of the undertakings conducted by it as on 31st December last preceding;

(b) The cash transactions, including receipts and disbursements for the year ending on 31st December last preceding;

(c) The revenues, income and interest earned and the amount of the costs, expenses and other items chargeable there against in connection with the operation, maintenance, administration and conduct of the undertakings controlled by it for the year ending 31st December last preceding;

Now, we come to the provision relating to the ensuing year:

(d) The amounts, with the expected sources of the same, which it is estimated will be received in cash or its equivalent and the payments, loans and advances with the purpose of the same, which it is contemplated shall be made in cash or otherwise, in the next succeeding year;

(e) The amounts and particulars of the obligations and liabilities which it is contemplated shall be incurred in the next succeeding year;

(f) The securities or evidence of indebtedness which it is contemplated shall be created, issued, sold or otherwise disposed of, together with the method of dealing with the same in the next succeeding year

You see, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of the Hydro-Electric Commission to provide the Legislature of Ontario with an estimate of the money that they expect to expend during the coming year. This Bill fails to do that. This Bill gives the board of directors power to expend money without any reference to Parliament at all. It provides that an accounting shall be given after the money is spent. That is what we object to. That is locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. The Hydro-Electric Commission has to give an estimate of every dollar it expects to spend in the ensuing year and it is authorized by the Legislature. Then, there is this other section:

Where the Legislature has appropriated money for the purposes of the Commission, such money shall be payable out of such appropriation to the Commission from time to time, upon the requisition of the Chairman of the Commission and the direction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in such amounts and at such times as shall be stated in the requisition and direction, and this section shall have effect notwithstanding that there may be sums due from the Commission to the province and notwithstanding anything in The Audit Act contained.

This shows that the system that is in force with regard to the Hydro-Electric Commission in Ontario is exactly the system that is advocated by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). There is a provision for the accumulation of a reserve fund but that reserve fund has to be under the supervision of the comptroller and the cheques have to be signed by him. If the cheques and guards that are furnished under this Hydro-Electric Act had been contained in the Act which is now before the House, there would be no cause of complaint in regard to this matter on this side of the House and the amendment of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens would not be necessary. The hon. the Leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) cannot get any comfort at all from the system adopted by the Hydro-Electric Commission in the province of Ontario.

My hon. friend stated to the House that it is impracticable to adopt the proposition of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens. But he does not tell us why it is impracticable. He has given no good reason. It has not been found impracticable in the case of the Intercolonial railway for the last forty years; in the case of the New Zealand railways, and in the case of the railways of the Commonwealth of Australia. The Commonwealth of Australia is a very large country. The transactions in connection with the railways are scattered over that vast continent; yet the system we advocate here has not been found impracticable there.

My hon. friend has said that it is impracticable, but he has not given us good ground for that statement. The difference is that in the one case we have parliamentary control, and in the other case we have not. I also object to the provision of section 26 of this Act because it enables the company, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to bond the whole line up to $75,000 a mile. There are no bonds on the Intercolonial railway at the present time, but as I understand this Bill it gives the power to the directors of this company, with the consent of the Governor in Council, to bond some eighteen hundred miles of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways, up to the amount of $75,000 a mile. That would secure some $112,000,000 which they could use in building railways and railway extensions in Western Canada, or elsewhere in this country, without any consent on the part of this Parliament. The whole question is amply provided for under the existing law; we have the Audit Act which makes very careful provision in regard to the expenditure of money. The moneys paid in to the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Railways, and the Postmaster General, all become part of the consolidated revenue of Canada,

and not one dollar can be paid out without Parliamentary authority. I believe in Parliamentary control of the people's money and for that reason intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. T. E. PEDLOW (Renfrew South): There still seems to be a misunderstanding, even in the minds of several members of the Government including the Acting Prime Minister, in regard to the subject under discussion. As I read the measure I find that the Government already owns the railways for whose management we are endeavouring to draft rules and regulations. For instance, the preamble states:

> Whereas His Majesty on behalf of the Dominion of Canada has acquired control of the Canadian Northern Railway Company—

Not that the Government is about to acquire the railway, but that it has acquired it.

> —and of the various constituent and subsidiary companies comprising the Canadian Northern System, as specified in the First Schedule to this Act, and it is expedient to provide for the incorporation of a company under which the railways, works and undertakings of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System may be consolidated, and together with the Canadian Government Railways operated as a national railway system.

I think that very much of the discussion that has taken place is entirely beside the question. We are not discussing, and have not been—unless forced to assume the defensive on this side—the question of the public or private ownership of the railways under consideration. We are here to devise ways and means of managing the railways that we already own, or are supposed to own—there seems to be grave doubts in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite as to whether we really own these railways or not; in the one breath we are told that we do own them, and in the very next breath we are given to understand by members on the Government side that we are not the owners. But we are supposed, according to this Bill, to own these railways, and therefore public ownership, I submit, is not the question under discussion in this debate. I am surprised at the Acting Prime Minister insisting that we should put ourselves on record on this subject, when the question of public ownership, or otherwise, is not the issue. That hon. gentleman has accused members on this side, including the leader of the Opposition, of obstruction. I would like to call attention to some of the methods of so-called obstruction that have been adopted by gentlemen on this side. For instance, on Thursday, April 24th, when this Bill was up for consideration in Committee for the first time, the members on this side endeavoured to obtain some information from the Minister of Railways, and spent two full hours in the effort to do so. Can hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of obstruction under such circumstances? The Minister of Railways absolutely refused to give us the information we demanded from him, and which we had a right to receive. And after two long hours of debate, the information was vouchsafed; and what did it amount to? The Minister of Railways was trying to withhold from us, at least he pretended that he did not know, what salary was being paid to the man who was managing the Canadian Northern railway—the trifling sum of $25,000 was not worth noticing in the estimation of the Minister of Railways —and yet this is the man to whom we intend to trust the management of the railroad system of this country under the present Bill. Then, Sir, coming to the following day, Friday, April 25th, we spent nine weary hours endeavouring to extract further information from the Government in regard to this Bill. The Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) was leading the House on that occasion, and we endeavoured to elicit from him details respecting the right of way of the forty-four railway lines that, according to him, the Government intended to commence operations on immediately. The minister refused to give us that information, or any information whatever, as to the location of these roads, and finally, when he rose to reply to gentlemen on this side, he sneered at the idea of the House wanting information of such a character. Now, if the Government is going to start the construction of these railroads in a few weeks, it should at least have the location of the railroads in question fixed. Yet the hon. gentleman sneered at the request for information in that regard—it was a trifling thing in his opinion for the people of this country to know where these forty-four railroads were to be located. These are examples of the kind of obstruction that the House has been subjected to, and because of which the Government, forsooth, considered it absolutely necessary to introduce the closure and shut off further discussion of the terms of this Bill. I repeat that we are not opposing the Bill on its public ownership provision, but purely and simply because we wish to see proper arrangements made for the management of this gigantic proposition. The member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) this afternoon made a

very sane and sensible remark, in which I heartily concur, viz.: that if we are going to frame the Bill along proper lines we should see that provision is made for having the right men placed on the management of this great public undertaking. I agree most heartily with the hon. gentleman. But, Sir, do you consider that the man who has been a failure already in connection with the operations of the Canadian Northern, and who has been losing money already in the management of our railroads—do you consider men of that type capable of managing the affairs of this great railroad system successfully? For my part, I object to it, and decline to support any proposition of the kind. A man who has already proved himself beyond doubt a failure, a man who has already lost money in railroad operations, a man who has run the Canadian Northern Railroad system to the ground, as shown by the figures quoted in this House, has no right or title to be entrusted with the management of a great system such as this.

Now, it is contended that the criticism of the Opposition has not been of any advantage. I beg to call the attention of the House to one matter wherein we succeeded in inducing the Minister of Railways to amend this Bill, and that amendment, in the years to come if not now, will be of inestimable value to this country. I refer to the amendment of Section 23. In this section as originally drawn there was no reference to authorization by Parliament of the necessary expenditure for the construction and operation of railway lines and extensions by the directorate. As a result of our criticism the Minister of Railways found it convenient to amend the section by the insertion of the following words:

in respect to the construction whereof respectively, Parliament may hereafter authorize the necessary expenditure, or the guarantee of an issue of the Company's securities.

That is an important addition to the Bill and is quite a safeguard of the country's interests. Yet we are told that the criticism by hon. members on this side of the House has been of an obstructive nature. I insist that it has been entirely in the opposite direction; it has been of a constructive nature and has greatly improved the Bill. We are told that we should fall down and worship this measure because it has been proposed by the Government and should instantly accept all its provisions without demur. But, as I have already stated, there is room for an honest difference of opinion on the question of public or private ownership, and I submit that the evidence on the subject of public management is not of the rosiest nature. Take for instance, the Intercolonial railway, which from its inception has been under Government control; has it been an unqualified success? Take the Canadian Northern railway under its present management; has it been an unqualified success? Take the telegraph and telephone systems under public management; have they been an unqualified success? I was privileged to look into a statement on that subject recently, and I find that the operating cost of our government telephones and telegraphs is in the neighbourhood of $800,000 per year, while the entire revenue is only $200,000 per year, an annual loss of $600,000. I understand, too, that the minister in charge of that department has received a report from an expert appointed to investigate the possibilities of the telephone system to the effect that he can abandon and give away enough of those lines to make a saving of between $300,000 and $400,000 a year, and still give as good a service to the public.

We have heard a good deal in this House of the success of the Australian National Railway system. In to-day's issue of the Montreal Gazette I find a statement which, with your permission, Sir, I would like to place upon Hansard, because it is of particular value at the present time:

Australian Railways.

Direct Losses More Than $11,000,000 Yearly: (Boston Commercial.)

The report of the Railway Commissioners of Australia for the year ending June 30, 1918, has lately been issued. The report shows that the losses amount to more than $11,000,000 for last year and $11,500,000 for the year 1917. The Commonwealth transcontinental line, which was opened for traffic in October, 1917, has, therefore about eight months of operation. The loss on this line and the other short lines own by the Commonwealth, amounted to $2,280,000. The length of the transcontinental line is 1,051 miles and the cost has been $33,000,000 so far, but it will require an expenditure of several millions more to put the road in fair shape.

I wish the House to mark this particularly, because it is a very important point in connection with Government operation. Notwithstanding the large loss sustained by the Commonwealth in the last three years of operation there is a further loss on taxation, which is as follows:

Thus, in round numbers, the losses in 1915-16 were $8,000,000; in 1916-17 they were $11,500,000, and in the last year they were $11,000,000. These losses do not take into account any displacement of taxes.

Up to June 30, 1918, these railways had cost a little over one billion dollars and there were 20,259 miles.

If we reckon the tax loss at $600 per mile and we tax the railways in this country $622 per mile per year, this loss would amount to $12,000,000 a year.

But more important still is the fact of high freight rates on all the Australian lines. They are nearly three times as high as in this country, taking the year 1915 as an example. Last year, the people of Australia paid $65,000,000 for their freight bill. In 1917 rates in Australia were increased by 10 per cent, but most of them were fixed at 5 per cent increase the following year.

These facts, from the official reports of the Government itself, show: Direct losses of $8,000,000 to $11,000,000 a year, loss of taxes and on high freight rates total $40,000,000 a year, or a total loss of some $50,000,000 annually, and on top of this wages averaging 30 to 40 per cent less than in this country for the railroad employees.

This is a mighty burden upon the taxpayers of Australia. The socialized telegraph and telephone lines lose $800,000 a year and there are large losses on nearly every other socialistic scheme that those states have plunged into. It is feared that the people have created a pauper state, and at any rate they have created the largest public debts in all the world.

Now, I do not wish that this country, the land of my adoption, should emulate the policy of the Commonwealth of Australia. There are some things we do not wish to excel in, and one in particular is the incurring of debt. I have much pleasure, therefore, Sir, in supporting the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Fielding.)

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens. His address was convincing, cogent and logical; it must have appealed to the good sense of this House. Section 16, if adopted in its present form, would introduce legislation of a revolutionary character, and it behooves all true Liberals to see to it that the necessary protest is made before it passes into law. When this question was originally before the House, the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) said that he could not see very much objection to the theory propounded by the member for Shelburne and Queens, but that at the moment without giving it due consideration he thought impracticable. I submit that neither he nor any of his colleagues have presented any argument to justify us on this side of the House in adopting his conclusions. The House of Commons should have full control of the funds of the country, and if this Bill is passed you abrogate one of the most important functions of Parliament.

[Mr. Pedlow.]

I listened with interest to the remarks of the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) this afternoon, in fact, whenever he rises I listen with attention and respect, because every one in the House will, I am sure, agree that whether he adopts the views of one side or of the other—he has adopted both on various occasions—whatever he says is worth listening to. I admire his diction and his style; he is one of the most finished orators in Parliament, and is an ornament to this House. Sometimes, in my leisure moments, I read the speeches of the hon. gentleman, for information and instruction. I have a distinct recollection of a speech he delivered on April 12, 1918, on this very question, which came before the House on the following motion of the Minister of Railways (Hon. J. D. Reid):

9 p.m.

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the working expenses of the Canadian Government railways and of any railway under the charge, management or direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be paid out of the receipts and revenues of the said railway, and in the event of a deficit occurring at any time during any fiscal year the amount of such deficit shall be payable out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, the said deficit to be voted by Parliament at its first session following the close of such fiscal year.

The member for Red Deer spoke with his usual eloquence on that occasion. He said, as reported on page 692, Volume 1, Hansard, 1918:

I trust these railways will be so managed, and I have sufficient belief in the future of Canada to think that if they are well managed they will not show deficits, but whether there are deficits or surpluses the principles of sound finance demand that the statements in regard to them should be placed before Parliament in an annual financial statement. I very well remember listening to speeches, as well as reading all the speeches he made during my lifetime, of that great master of finance Mr. Gladstone. There was nothing he insisted on more than that the expenditures and the incomes of a country should be presented to Parliament each year and be debated by Parliament each year. If that is a sound principle—and in every constitutionally-governed country in the British Empire the principle is one of parliamentary practice—then this is a departure from the universal parliamentary practice of all the constitutionally-governed countries in the British Empire, including the Old Country herself. Before the point was raised by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) the analogy between the Post Office and the railways occurred to my own mind, and I must say the Acting Minister of Finance was very unsuccessful from my point of view in showing the analogy was not perfect. I think all he said upon the point was really making a distinction without a difference. The analogy to my mind was as perfect as one could find. What was the analogy? The post offices form a department of

the public service. In so far as the government-owned railways are concerned, they constitute a department of the public service. The analogy to that extent is surely perfect. They are both departments of the public service which one might call "carrying departments." In the one case they carry letters, and in the other case they carry goods and persons. You might compare the various stations on your railroad to the various post offices. You might compare your station-masters to your postmasters. You have public expenditure in each case, and you have public incomes in each case. The analogy is absolutely perfect from Alpha to Omega.

I cite this as the view of the hon. member for Red Deer twelve months ago;—you have heard what he said on the same question to-day when it is again brought up by the member for Shelburne and Queens. What has caused this change of attitude in such a short time? Is it that his association with the Union Government has caused deterioration of his mind? I should be very sorry to think so, because for some time the hon. gentleman has been flirting with us on this side of the House. I only hope that when he does come back he will be mentally in as good a condition as he was when we turned him over to the pre sent Government.

Mr. A. M. DECHENE (Montmagny) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks before this debate closes. I am particularly anxious to state my views, considering that the second reading of this Bill has been secured solely through the use of the gag; and to say where we stand on this side of the House as regards public ownership of our railways and other great services of public utility.

For many years past, this country has made several attemps in that direction, but without avail. For nearly forty years, we have managed the Intercolonial railway, covering some 1,800 miles in length, and I don't think that there can be found many statements issued by the management of that road and by the Minister of Railways up to now, showing surpluses. And yet the present Government had placed the management of that road in the hands of experienced men, to whom they were paying very large salaries, men who were borrowed from the Canadian Pacific Company and who had put into practice the ways and means in force on that system; however each year there are tremendous deficits on the Intercolonial railway. This shows clearly that it is impossible to get any return, out of the great public services, under political management.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you read carefully clause 16, which it is proposed to amend today, I think that even the mover of that clause had a doubt in his mind as to the possibility for the country to get any returns from that new road (Canadian Northern) or from any of the subsidiary companies.

As a matter of fact, if you study closely that clause, which includes some fifteen lines, you notice that it refers almost entirely to deficits and to the way such deficits should be met. In the last three or four lines, it is provided that should there be a surplus, it can be disposed of without the consent of Parliament. Therefore, is it not equivalent to an admission on the part of the Government, that they do not expect any surplus nor that the company, created by this Bill to administer the railways of this country, is likely to give any profits in the near future?

If there be any doubt that the present managers—and these managers will in all likelihood be retained—are unable to show a profit in their present undertakings, while we have before our eyes the example of what has happened in the past; that with vast subsidies being voted every year, the Government or the managers appointed by the Government were not able to gain any financial success, then there was certainly good reason for including the following proviso in section 16: "if any profits should accrue then the said profits are to be administered in such and such a way;" which amounts to this: they could be thrown back into the mill again to emerge in the form of a deficit.

But, Sir, this section, along with the others, allows the Government, allows the directors to take over the monies of the various companies and use them as they see fit. No doubt, we members of Parliament sent here by the people to look after their interests, have something to say on this matter.

I believe the country would be very anxious to know just what percentage of shares we have in the capital stock of the subsidiary companies mentioned in the schedule attached to this Bill.

My own opinion, and I believe that I am at one in this with several hon. members on this side of the House, is that our interest in several of these companies is decidedly small, although sufficient to give us control. In several of them we have, I believe, merely 51 per cent or 55 per cent of the stock. Else, how comes it that, since we have taken over the Canadian Northern and its subsidiary companies the Govern-

ment has granted to some of these subsidiary companies the subsidies set forth in the report of the Minister of Railways for the current year? It is self-evident that if the present Government has seen fit to grant over three hundred thousand dollars to the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway, one of the subsidiary companies mentioned in the present schedule, we do not own all the capital stock of this company; hence we shall be forced to find the money necessary to make a success of these different companies. Where are the men who are going to come along and offer us the 40 per cent or 45 per cent of the stock that is out of our hands and that will be drawing dividends. Are they not the same men who sold us the capital stock of the present company and who were not in a position to deliver the capital stock of the various subsidiary companies?

In the presence of these facts we have the right to be sceptical and to wonder whether public ownership of these railways will be succesful.

We evidently have the right to feel dubious in this regard and we on this side of the House are really very, very doubtful.

But we own the railways, say some hon. members on the other side; we own the capital stock of the railway companies; the Acting Prime Minister himself tells us: "We own the capital stock but we do not own the real estate." Why? Because this real estate is in the hands of the same notorious speculators who sold us this worthless stock, and who to-day are waiting for us to revive it at the public's expense, so that they may get back the value of the railway bonds they never parted with.

Even before Confederation, under the Union—an administration that worked untold harm to the country—the foremost orators and the most ardent patriots of the day fought for the establishment of the Budget system so as to bring all expenditure under the control of Parliament. The fight was a hard one. Some members of Parliament, a few ministers even, had to resign their seats in the Assembly, and it was only after years of struggle that Parliament finally obtained control of all expenditures drawn from the Public Treasury.

Now, this very day, by accepting section 16 which has been brought down to the House, we will go back to those frightful days of 1840 and 1845 when the country was governed by an exclusive clique, a sort of family compact.

However, I am not surprised to find this clause here. Last session we witnessed a similar attempt to withdraw several hundred million dollars from the control of Parliament. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, a certain resolution presented by the hon. Minister of Railways whereby he asked the House to authorize the spending of some $50,000,000 for the purchase of railway material not only for the Government railways but for those railroads also which were financially unable to help themselves, and not for one year alone but for the duration of the war? Thanks to the opposition of members on this side of the House the resolution remained on the Order Paper until the last days of the session, when the hon. Minister of Railways, realizing that he would never succeed in getting it passed, withdrew it himself.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the same attempt is being made, this year, in a more concrete form. As the hon. minister has not succeeded in the course of last session, he is trying again, this year, in a way which is far more grievous and more dangerous to the country, by entrusting to the care of his officials the management of an important part of the people's money. Therefore, I think we are now doing away with the principle which should guide all legislation, whether federal or provincial, that is the control by Parliament of all the monies spent in behalf of the country. After so many battles fought for the control of those monies, especialy in Nova Scotia previous to Confederation, I am in no way surprised at the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen (Mr. Fielding) proposing to-day an amendment to do away with such abuse. He is merely yielding, here, to the experience which he has acquired when he was himself Minister of Finance and when he saw, in his youth, the public men of his province fighting to obtain a right which we are now about to be deprived of. Those are the reasons why I shall gladly vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne.

The House divided on the amendment of Hon. Mr. Fielding, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	d'Anjou,
Boivin,	Déchêne,
Bourassa,	Delisle,
Boyer,	Demers,
Brouillard,	Denis,
Bureau,	Desaulniers,
Cahill,	Deslauriers,
Casgrain,	Duff,
Chisholm,	Ethier,
Copp,	Euler,

Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Kay,
Lanctôt,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Leger,
McCrea,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pedlow,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Robb,
Ross,
Savard,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Verville,
White (Victoria).—59.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Anderson,
Andrews,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brien,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Butts,
Calder,
Campbell,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Davidson,
Davis,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Rich.),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Finley,
Foster (York),
Fripp,
Glass,
Green,
Griesbach,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Hartt,
Hay,
Henders,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Johnston,
Keefer,
Knox,
Lalor,
Lang,
Loggie,
Long,
Mackie (Renfrew),
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York),
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McLean (Royal),
McLeod,
Maharg,
Manion,
Martin,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Munson,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Algoma),
Nickle,
Paul,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Richardson,
Rowell,
Scott,
Sexsmith,
Simpson,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lanark),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tweedie,
White (Sir Thomas),
Wigmore,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon),
Wright.—110.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Sifton,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Lafortune,
Foster, Sir George,	Béland,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Sinclair (Guysborough),
Bristol,	Kennedy,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Peck,	Baldwin,
Allan,	Proulx,
Spinney,	Lapointe (St. James),
Carvell,	Lemieux,
Whidden,	Lesage,
Wallace,	Power,
Smith,	Cannon,
Merner,	Cardin,
McQuarrie,	Vien,
Tudhope,	Gladu,
Stacey,	DuTremblay,
Sheard,	Seguin,
Chabot,	Devlin,
MacNutt,	Molloy,
Fraser,	Pardee,
Tremaine.	Denis.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I was paired with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I was paired with the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CARVELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BELAND: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto East (Sir Edward Kemp). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McCOIG: I was paired with the hon. member for Elgin East (Mr. Marshall). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is now on the main motion.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is finally disposed of, I desire to draw the attention of hon. members to the section providing for the amalgamation of the several railway systems. It provides that the Canadian Northern Railway company and its constituent and subsidiary companies as specified in

the first schedule, together with the Canadian Government railways, shall be operated as a national railway system. My understanding is that prior to the taking over of the Canadian Northern, the lines of railway known as the Canadian Government railways comprised the Intercolonial railway, running from Montreal to Halifax, Sydney, and St. John, and the branches connected therewith; the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Transcontinental railway.

I do not propose to take up very much time in discussing this question, but I wish to register my protest against the amalgamation of the Intercolonial railway with the Canadian Northern system. The Intercolonial railway, as every hon. member knows, was built in the early years of Confederation. As a matter of fact, it was one of the terms of Confederation that the Lower Provinces, known as the Maritime Provinces, were to be connected by railway with the other provinces forming the Confederation. That promise was never properly implemented for many years. The railway extended from the cities of Halifax, Sydney and St. John to its western terminus at Levis, in the province of Quebec. A short time after the Hon. A. G. Blair became Minister of Railways in 1896, the Intercolonial was extended to the city of Montreal by the purchase of the Drummond County railway (so called). From that time down to 1908 the road was owned and operated by the Canadian Government as a government enterprise, presided over by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the Hon. H. R. Emmerson occupying that portfolio for some time. While I am not prepared to admit that during that time the road was always run and managed as it might have been, nevertheless, after its extension to Montreal we undoubtedly had a better train service, and the roadbed was improved; in fact, the roadbed of the Intercolonial is known to be one of the finest, if not the finest, on the continent of America. The Ocean Limiteds were put on, and the service generally was improved. In the year 1908 or 1909 a change was made in the management of the road. Up to that time a gentleman named David Pottinger had been manager for many years. He had grown up with the railway and had an intimate knowledge of it from one end to the other in all its workings. Associated with him were men who had entered the railway in their younger days, and knew all there was to know about its operation. In 1908 or 1909 Mr. Pottinger was not dismissed, but arrangements were made by which a board of managers was appointed to manage the road, of which Mr. Pottinger became one. Since the appointment of that board down to the present day the Intercolonial has been bedamned and bedevilled by mismanagement and extravagance. Men have been brought in from outside at high salaries and forced upon us who did not know the conditions or understand the operation of this railway. The higher the salaries and the more officials we imported the worse the management became, so that to-day the Intercolonial is not as well operated as it was in 1907 and 1908 and the years previous thereto. Furthermore, since the Government have taken over the Canadian Northern, the Transcontinental, and the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Intercolonial has been robbed of its rolling stock, and we have not been given the train service that we had every reason to expect.

I register my protest against the Intercolonial being hooked up to the Canadian Northern Railway system and the supplanting of the Intercolonial railway employees who have spent half a lifetime on this road, know the operations and are just as capable of occupying prominent railway positions in this country and fulfilling the duties appertaining to them as any person brought in from the outside. The employees of the old Intercolonial railway throughout the Maritime Provinces are being supplanted by other employees who are not any more capable, but are, if anything, less capable, than the men who have occupied prominent positions on that road. I have no word to say against those who will manage the Canadian National Railway system or the Canadian Northern railway. I do not know what their success may be. I trust it will be of the very best. I have nothing to say against the Government for passing this measure and operating the Canadian Northern railway, as it has been forced upon them. But I do protest against the amalgamation of the Intercolonial railway with that system. It never was the intention at the time of Confederation that we should be linked up with that system. It never was the intention at the time of Confederation that we should be linked up with, and operated as, a company road. I protest as strongly as I can because of the fact, which the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) referred to a few moments ago, that under this measure the Government, or the company, have the power of bonding, or mortgaging, the Canadian National

railway to the extent of $75,000 per mile. I am firmly of the belief that in carrying out the terms of Confederation we should own the Government railway. It should be operated by the Government through the department, and Minister of Railways and Canals. That was the intention of the Confederation pact and it should be carried out to the letter.

The Intercolonial railway is not in as good a position as it was years ago. The road-bed has been allowed to deteriorate, the cars are not kept in the same condition, our train service is not as prompt and regular as it was, and the more outside management there has been brought in the worse it has been for the Intercolonial railway. I do not know what other members, particularly from the Maritime Provinces can think of this matter, and it is possible that some may say that it is local. While it may be somewhat local, on the other hand, I claim that it is Dominion-wide. You cannot successfully build up the Dominion of Canada by tearing down one part and handing it over to some other part. The Intercolonial has always had its head offices at Moncton. We have magnificent shops and buildings to house and take care of the Intercolonial staff. We have upwards of 2,000 miles of railway including the Intercolonial proper and the branches that have been purchased, leased and otherwise acquired, and that is a sufficient system for a manager and his official staff to take care of. I have nothing to say against other systems of railways. What I ask is that the Government and the Minister of Railways should realize that the people of the Maritime Provinces have regarded the Intercolonial railway as one of the reasons of their coming into Confederation. The other provinces have had a quid pro quo for all we have had from the Intercolonial. They have their canals. There is no move being made to hand the canals over to any company. The Intercolonial was never intended to be a paying proposition. All that was expected was that it would pay its running expenses. I strongly believe that if the road were freed from political agitation and if the Minister of Railways would take hold of it and put practical, straightforward men who have had some experience on that railway, we would have a system by itself equal to any other system and which would be a great benefit to this country, particularly to the people of the Maritime Provinces. I would ask the minister to consider well the question of the conditions under which we are to have our produce shipped from the Maritime Provinces and whether this road should be operated as a Government proposition. I move, seconded by Mr. Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough):

That Bill No. 70 be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to be amended by adding, after the word "railways" in the tenth line of the preamble thereof, the following words: "save and except that portion of the Canadian Government Railways known as the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway and the branch lines connected therewith, owned, leased or operated by the Government of Canada."

I make that motion seconded by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair).

Mr. BUTTS: Does my hon. friend know of any greater political machine than the Intercolonial was under his Government?

Mr. COPP: I do know of several greater political machines and I fear I see now, and will in the very near future, a much greater political machine than the Intercolonial ever was.

Mr. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate on this Bill but I feel that I should say a few words. I could not possibly accept the amendment. What the hon. member (Mr. Copp) asks us to do is to except the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways from the provisions of the Bill in regard to the operation of the Canadian National railways

Before answering the hon. gentleman's references to the amendment he has moved, let me refer to a few things he has said about the Intercolonial Railway. He states that as agreed on at Confederation the Intercolonial was originally constructed between the Lower Provinces and the City of Quebec, and there is no doubt about that. I also wish to say that so far as I can remember the road was well managed under the former manager, Mr. Pottinger. Mr. Pottinger was a very fine man and had the confidence of all the people in the provinces through which this road runs. But let me say to the hon. gentleman that during the period of Mr. Pottinger's management—during the operation of the road under a commission, and under a general manager, if my memory serves me right—there was always criticism in this House and in the press that political control and political patronage prevailed, and that therefore the railway was not a success. That has been the cry from the very day the Intercolonial Railway was first constructed and operated.

Mr. COPP: That surely was not true during the time of my hon. friend's administration?

Mr. J. D. REID: It was not true of recent years for the reason that a general manager was placed in control of the railway, and its operation has been left entirely in the hands of that official and his staff, and during the last few years the road has been gradually getting away from political control.

My hon. friend states that the service given on the Intercolonial Railway and the condition of the whole road is not nearly as good as it was several years ago. If my hon. friend, when he says that, has reference to the last three or four years during which the great war was in progress, that can be explained by reason of the fact that the Intercolonial was taxed to its fullest capacity carrying troops to and from the scene of operations, and transporting the necessary war materials and equipment. Being a single track road there is no doubt that by reason of that congestion the travelling public would not enjoy as good a service as they did prior to the war on this railway. But previous to the outbreak of hostilities I believe the Intercolonial was as well operated as any other railway in the Dominion of Canada. At least that was the report which I received from the travelling public prior to the commencement of the war.

The hon. member states that if this Bill goes into effect the employees of the Intercolonial will not enjoy the same opportunity of advancement as they formerly had under separate control. I take issue at once with the hon. gentleman on that point. Already a number of the employees on the Intercolonial have received advancement by reason of its incorporation with the Canadian National Railway system which they would not have gained had the change not been made. The employees, as a whole, I think, have a better opportunity now with a system comprising ten or fifteen thousand miles of railway, than they would have if Government operation were simply limited to the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways. Let me explain, in proof of that, a number of promotions that have occurred. The hon. member knows that Mr. Hayes was traffic manager of the Government system between Montreal and Sydney. To-day he is traffic manager of the whole Canadian National system clear out to the Pacific. That surely is a big advancement. Mr. Smart, who formerly was merely head of the car department of the Intercolonial, is now in charge of the car department for the whole Canadian National Railway system.

Mr. COPP: Where did he come from?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think he came orignally from the Canadian Pacific railway, but he was for a number of years on the Intercolonial. There is also the case of Mr. Appleton, who was head of the engineering or mechanical department at Moncton, and who now superintends that work on the whole of the Eastern lines, I think, between Port Arthur and Sydney. Another case of promotion is that of Mr. Brady, formerly general manager of the Intercolonial, and afterwards of the Transcontinental, and who is now general manager of all Government lines from Port Arthur eastward.

Mr. COPP: He is one of the importations.

Mr. J. D. REID: He has been employed on the Government roads probably for the last fifteen years. I mention these cases to show that the staff on the Intercolonial will enjoy opportunities of promotion which would never be within their reach if the Government system were confined merely to that railway.

I take strong exception to another statement by the hon. gentleman to the effect that if the present Bill were passed the Government could issue bonds on the Intercolonial railway to the extent of $75,000 per mile. The hon. gentleman must have known that statement was not correct, because he has read clause 26, which states that the bonding powers of the company shall not apply to the Canadian Government railways.

Mr. COPP: I overlooked that feature of the Bill, and made the statement inadvertently.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is what I say, the hon. gentleman evidently made a mistake. While the Intercolonial railway is transferred for operation purposes to the Canadian National Railway system, no power is given to the company, or to the Government, to issue bonds in connection with the Intercolonial, the Prince Edward Island, or the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY: Why is there not any such power in the Bill?

Mr. J. D. REID: We felt that if we wished to do that, we should come and ask authority from Parliament. There are no bonds on the Intercolonial railway now. In

the future if we wished to remove the Intercolonial from under the operation of this system, it will be free from bonded indebtedness in any way, shape or form.

Now with respect to the operation of the Intercolonial, how could we operate that railway successfully, or extend to it the advantages that it should enjoy, without incorporating it in the whole railway system? If we left the road under the Minister of Railways, according to my hon. friend, we must keep up the same operating staff that we had in the past.

Mr. COPP: If we can operate the Intercolonial in that way why does the minister want to adopt the course that he mentioned in answer to my hon. friend just now? He said that he did not intend to bond the Intercolonial because he may want to take it out of the system.

Mr. REID: The Intercolonial Railway has no bonded indebtedness against it at all; it is free from encumbrances, and we have so left it, and if at any time in the future we wish to take it out of the system it is in exactly the same position as it was at the time of Confederation. By linking up the various roads we can operate them in the most economical manner. We have now the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Moncton divided up in this way: the management at Winnipeg that operate part of the western lines control as far east as Cochrane; then we have the other part under the management at Montreal and that management has control of the Intercolonial. Now we have linked them together under the same management and the same staff in order to save operating expenses. When it comes to quoting freight rates, the tariff man in charge of the Canadian National Railway system must be able to figure out rates from the West clear through to the Atlantic ports. If you have this as part of one co-ordinated system, is it not fair to say that those who are operating the road to make it a success will want to route all the business they can by their own system? My idea, when the Intercolonial Railway was linked up with the Canadian National Railway system, was that it would throw so much more business down through the Lower Provinces that it would make the Intercolonial pay where it has not paid in the past. The whole trouble with the Intercolonial Railway was that it started at Sydney and ran to Montreal, but the other railways had no interest in giving it traffic, and consequently it was hard work to make it pay. Now that it is part of our national system all the traffic from the West that can be sent over the Intercolonial to Halifax, St. John and Sydney will be so routed. I cannot for the life of me see why the hon. member can suggest that the Intercolonial should be kept out of the Canadian National Railway system.

Although our national system is under a company incorporated by this Bill, still it is all subject to the control of Parliament, and if the operation is not carried on successfully, hon. members can discuss the system just the same as they were accustomed to discuss the Intercolonial in the past.

The hon. member (Mr. Copp) has emphasized the idea that the employees of the Intercolonial are not in a position to receive the advancement now that they would have received had it not been incorporated in the national system. So far as my information goes, the employees of the Intercolonial are better satisfied that it is part of the Transcontinental, for the reason that a young man starting on the Intercolonial to-day has hundreds of opportunities of getting a position on our system of fifteen thousand miles as compared with the meagre opportunities open to him on the Intercolonial alone.

In my opinion one of the reasons why the hon. member objects to the change is this. We have heard him, so long as he has been a member of this Parliament, complaining day after day bitterly of the patronage in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. He knows well enough that when it goes into this system that ends any opportunity he has of dominating the patronage. The Board of Directors are going to operate this system independent of any members of Parliament or even of members of the Government. That is where the trouble is with the hon. member; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. COPP: Judge not,—

Mr. REID: No man in this House has fought as hard for political patronage on the Intercolonial railway as has the hon. member; there is no doubt about that. He can stand up here and abuse us on this side of the House about political patronage on the Intercolonial, but he knows that when his party were in power—

An hon. MEMBER: Cochrane was the bad spot.

Mr. REID: —He was the man right on the job so far as patronage was concerned.

Mr. POWER: The Government was absolutely innocent.

Mr. REID: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway under the operation of the Department of Railways for a year or two, and while I believe the department did their very best to operate them as successfully as they could be operated under government control, yet I feel it is in the interest of the railways and of the public that these should be operated by an independent commission such as is being organized in connection with this Canadian National Railway system. I feel that it is also in the interest of the employees. I do not see how we can operate successfully if we continue the Intercolonial independent of the Canadian National Railway system. I am sorry the hon. member has moved the amendment, I do not think it is in the interest of any one concerned, and I hope the House will reject it.

Hon. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken I feel it is incumbent upon me to say a word or two in as much as I am one of the ministers representing that portion of Canada traversed by the Intercolonial railway. This matter came up some months ago when the operation of the Intercolonial was transferred to the Canadian National railways by Order in Council, and it was done with my full knowledge and consent. I purpose to vote against the amendment of my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) and I shall do so not only with a clear conscience but with the feeling that the adoption of this amendment would really be going back to the old principle of operation of the Intercolonial as we had it in the past as long as I can remember.

There has been a great deal of discussion on this Bill regarding the virtues of public and private ownership, but for the life of me I fail to see wherein it was necessary to discuss the question at all. We have got the railways on our hands to-day—it is not a very rosy prospect I must confess—and it is the duty of Parliament and of the Government especially to try and see that they work out the problem in the best way possible. I repeat that I fail to see how the question whether or not a man is in favour of public ownership or of private ownership of a public utility is raised in connection with the Bill now before the House We have the Canadian National Railway system on our hands, we have the Canadian Northern, we have the Grand Trunk Pacific, we have the National Transcontinental, we have the Intercolonial; and it is the duty of the Government and of Parliament to devise the best possible method of making the operation of these roads a success. I am not going to hark back to what has taken place in connection with the operation and management of the Intercolonial Railway from its inception. It has been a political machine, pure and simple, and any man who stands up in this House and says that it has not been a political machine up to the last two years or so—well, he is simply talking to hear himself talk. If I thought that the Canadian National Railway system was going to be run as a political machine, as Government railways have been run in the past, I would vote and fight against the whole thing; I do not know what I would not do to prevent its going through. We have not received the service in the Maritime Provinces to which we have been entitled; and it has cost fifty per cent more money to give us the service we did get than it should have cost. In this respect one party has been just as bad as the other. Now, instead of fifteen or eighteen hundred miles of railway, as we had in the Intercolonial, we have about twelve thousand miles—and it looks as if we should have considerably over twenty thousand miles before very long. I tell you, Sir, that unless this system is run as a business proposition, Canada will be faced with a most serious problem; with something more serious even than the debt incurred by the war. Much, therefore, as I would like to see advantages given to my own part of Canada; much as I would like to see the Intercolonial Railway run for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces, I cannot as a public man agree to any proposal which will cause this or any other portion of the system to be operated as anything but a business proposition. The operation of these Government railways may not be perfect, but it will be under the control of a board of directors entirely independent of the Government, except that they are appointed by the Government. If ever a body of men had absolutely a free hand in the running of a railway, the board administering the Canadian National Railways have had a free hand up to the present time—I know what I am talking about. I can promise that so long as I remain in this Government there will be no question, so far as I know, about their having a free hand to run the National Railway system as a business proposition. Unless we do run

it that way, we might as well throw up our hands and say that the whole thing is a hopeless mess. But I believe that it can be done; and because we want to run the whole thing as a business proposition I want to see the Intercolonial railway put in with the rest of it. The Minister of Railways has pointed out the impossibility of operating the Canadian National Railways down to Montreal and stopping there, not going on to Halifax and St. John. It is not in the interest of the Maritime Provinces that that should be done. The Government railways can be operated much more economically and in a much more businesslike manner if taken as a whole than they could if part of the system is run by the Canadian National Railway Company and part by the Minister of Railways.

I said in beginning that I did not intend to say very much, but I would not feel like giving a silent vote on a matter of such great importance to the Maritime Provinces. I believe that by incorporating practically the whole system of railways in the Maritime Provinces into this railway system, we are doing the Maritime Provinces the greatest possible benefit. If the operation of the national railways goes on as it has gone on during the last year and as I believe it will go in the future, it will not be many years before the people who now oppose this proposal will stand up to bless it and to say that the elimination of politics from the administration of the Government railways and the operation of those railways as a business proposition means the accomplishing of a great work for the people of Canada as a whole.

My hon. friend referred to freight rates. There may be some dislocation of freight rates; there may be cases in which we shall have to pay a little higher freight rates in the future than we have paid in the past. But there will also be cases where we shall get an efficient service, which we have been unable to get in the past. The member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) knows the trouble he had in his own county in an effort to get service under political management. He does not believe that there is any possibility of a repetition of these things in the future if the Government railways in the Maritime Provinces are run as a business proposition.

Mr. COPP: But I have no faith in the assumption that they will be run as a business proposition.

Mr. CARVELL: That is where we disagree. Until it is proved to me that they will not be run as a business proposition, I purpose considering that they will be. My hon. friend knows that if this railway system is run as a business proposition it will do much more for the Maritime Provinces in the future than it has done in the past. For these reasons, I intend to vote against this amendment. I am satisfied that if the amendment is voted down the House or the country will never regret the incorporation of the Intercolonial railway in the great Canadian National Railway system.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would the minister inform the House why it is necessary to finance the Railway Department on a basis different from that on which the department that he controls is financed?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that question is in order; it has been decided by the vote which has just been taken.

Amendment (Mr. Copp) negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): I realize that the House is anxious to give a final vote on this Bill, and I shall trespass upon its time no further than to make a few brief remarks. First, I wish to correct a statement made by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), who represented me this afternoon as being a strong opponent of public ownership of railways. My hon. friend certainly misconstrued my words if he found in them an expression of opposition to the principle of the nationalization of railways. I merely said that nobody had the right to excommunicate from Liberalism those who were opposed to that principle. My speech was made to protest against the lectures on Liberalism which certain hon. gentlemen on the other side are prone to inflict upon us. I said then, and I repeat now, that public ownership, the nationalization of industries, is not a principle of Liberalism; it is state socialism. That does not mean that I am opposed to it. I am not afraid of words. My view is that it is a huge experiment—and I have not the same confidence in its ultimate success as some of my friends in the House seem to have. But we have no choice in the matter. We are the owners of a great system of railways, and we must try to make it the best system possible. We must, as many hon. members have said, give public ownership a fair chance.

I rise, however, for the purpose of giving my hon. friends opposite, who are so eloquent in their professions of Liberalism, an opportunity of registering their votes in favour of what I consider to be a true Liberal principle. When the House was in committee on the Bill I moved that labour be given a fair share in the management of the railway, and I purpose now moving an amendment to that effect. The Government, by the voice of the Minister of Labour in the Senate, has already recognized the soundness of that principle, and at the present time a commission is travelling throughout the country investigating industrial conditions in order to apply this principle to private industries. The Government should demonstrate its good faith and sincerity by embodying the same principle in the management of the National railways which are the very property of the state. The workingman who has, by the exercise of his franchise, a voice in the management of public affairs in this country, believes he has also a right to a voice in the management of the industries which by his work he helps to build up. He claims his industrial citizenship as well as his political citizenship. This desire comes, I believe, from a high sense of service. Most students of labour and industrial conditions in the world to-day are in favour of allowing labour a share in the management of industries. They believe that by raising the employee to a state of partnership with his employer, by acquainting him with the conditions of the undertaking or the business which is common to both, his sense of responsibility will be enhanced and much trouble will be avoided. The British Government has accepted that principle with regard to mines. Let me refer, in this connection, to the commission presided over by Mr. Justice Sankey. The commission was composed of four eminent men—Mr. Justice Sankey, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir Arthur Duckham, and Sir Thomas Royden. Here are a few words from the report of that commission:—

> It is in the interests of the country that the colliery worker shall have an effective voice in the direction of the mine. For a generation the colliery worker has been educated socially and technically. The result is a great national asset. Why not use it?

The British Government has accepted that report, and the principle of a share in the management of the British mines has been accepted and will be carried out. This Government should embody a similar principle in this legislation which it is endeavouring to induce the industrials of the country to accept at the present time. By so doing the Government would give effect to the first clause of the resolution adopted by the Peace Conference and proposed to be incorporated in the Peace Treaty. This resolution, which was communicated to the House yesterday by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), contained this principle:—

> First—the guiding principle above enunciated that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce.

The best way to recognize that principle is to accept the amendment which I now purpose moving. I move, seconded by Mr. Verville:—

> That Bill No. 70 be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, in order that the following words be inserted at the end of clause 1 of the said Bill: "At least two of said directors shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the employees of the Canadian National railways."

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (St. Denis): Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the amendment of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe), although it seems almost unnecessary for any hon. member on either side of the House to have to move an amendment of this nature. I was not here all the time when this Bill was under discussion, but I was surprised to hear that a provision of this kind was not inserted by the Government in the Bill. Many hon. members on this side and many who were on this side prior to Union Government have, time and again whenever opportunity offered, declared that labour should, to some extent, be represented on as many commissions as possible, because the practical knowledge of the labour man was probably more effective than the technical knowledge of many men who are appointed on commissions. We have now reached a stage in the development of this country when we must, willingly or otherwise, recognize this principle that labour should be represented, and any Government, whether federal, provincial or municipal, must also recognize it and put it into operation. Any hon. member who is in business must have long ago concluded that the most valuable information he has ever received in his private business has, generally speaking, come from those who have had the most practical experience. The Minister of Labour has, time and again, and rightly so, consulted the best element of labour in the country in connection with framing legislation or Orders in Council towards a better understanding between capital and labour.

The mover of this amendment stated that the principle of the representation of labour was recognized in the Senate. I claim that it was not recognized in the Senate, because the Minister of Labour should belong to the House of Commons. I know the Minister of Labour very well, and I have great confidence in his ability as well as in his practical knowledge. If any one should be appointed on the Board of Directors apart from the great financiers of the country, or men who have experience in the management of a railway, those who have the most knowledge are surely the railwaymen of the land.

Many of them have grown up with the road from boyhood; they have served their apprenticeship and have acquired the most valuable kind of knowledge for a position of this sort. I hope that hon. members will not think that this proposal is put forward for a political purpose. I thought I heard someone laugh on the other side of the House, but I must have been mistaken. Judging by the present conditions in the labour world, I am afraid that if the Government does not grant to the labour organizations what they have a right to expect, they will take the means to get it. This may seem radical, but any one who has studied the feeling of unrest there is throughout the country must realize that there is only one way of salvation, and that is by co-operation to the fullest extent. The Government may not have said that it will not appoint labour men; I do not know whether it has or not, but I am afraid there will be influence enough brought to bear to prevent the appointment of labour men to this directorate. Ever since I have been in this House I have said that a Minister of Labour in this Government would not make a success of his department unless he was a practical man. The Government, fortunately, have seen fit to appoint a practical man to the head of that department. Now what applies to the Department of Labour surely ought to apply to one of the greatest enterprises this country has ever undertaken. The Government have everything to gain by adopting this amendment. They will find among the railway men some of the ablest men in America, and able not only for their practical knowledge; some members of the Government would no doubt be surprised at the technical qualifications of some of our railway employees, and perhaps they are more advanced in finance than some of the ministers may think. Those of them who have acquired a home of their own know exactly what a dollar is worth, and might do better in financial matters than others whom the Government may appoint to the board. I do not know of any government, federal or provincial, that has made a mistake through trying to get all classes of society represented on the commissions it appoints. Furthermore, a practical knowledge of all the great economic questions of the day will perhaps be worth more than all the technical knowledge put together. I am proud to second the amendment, and I trust the Government will accept it.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Among all the remarks made by the mover and the seconder of this amendment I am able to find only one with which I very cordially agree, namely, that we have at the present time in charge of the Department of Labour a gentleman of very great practical ability, of devotion to duty, and of fidelity to the cause of labour. With anything else that has been said I am afraid I must differ. In fact, I must express surprise that so strictly logical a mind as that of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) could be brought to support the amendment now before the House. The amendment is to the effect that the Government in appointing the directorate of this board must accept at least two members chosen by the railway employees. Had the hon. gentleman really meant that the amendment should be considered as a practical step, he would have added to his amendment provisions that would have enabled the Government to ascertain what the recommendation of the railway employees would be. Without the machinery for its ascertainment, the amendment would be impossible of execution, for there would be no way in which it could be carried out.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: At the present time the employees of the Government railway vote every winter for two representatives of the Pension Board in connection with the Provident Fund.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Through what organization? There are at the present time, I am told, fifteen or seventeen different organizations of the railway employees, absolutely distinct in every way. Are these fifteen different organizations going to make their recommendations?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend ought to know that it can be done very easily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite free to remark that the method of doing it was not

made clear by the mover or the seconder of the amendment, and one would have thought that would have been their duty.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend could easily devise a way of recording their votes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The devising of the way would be the part of the proposer of the idea. To make the amendment practical some way should be devised.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend will accept the principle I will devise the way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will come to the principle in a moment. I am now making this point: That the law as proposed to be put into effect by the hon. member would be impracticable of execution. There would have to be machinery provided for carrying it into effect, and because the machinery is absent, the hon. gentleman cannot expect the House to accept the amendment. Presuming that there was only one organization which represented all the employees of the road, what should be done with the amendment?—and now we come to the principle of the amendment. If the principle is to be adopted, it means this: That the Government which has to appoint this directorate, and be responsible for its appointment, which has to be responsible in general for the management of the road after the appointment, is to have no say in the appointment of two of the directors. If that is the case, why should it have any say in the appointment of any? If the Government is to be responsible for the conduct of men in the selection of whom it has no voice at all, and if that applies to two of the directorate, why should it not apply to all? Why is the Government to be held responsible for the conduct of large operations by men whom it does not choose? If, in a word, the principle of Government responsibility is to stand, how can the amendment carry?

In the next place, if the amendment were to carry, it would be an admission on the part of this Parliament that while we represent, as the Parliament of Canada to which the Government is responsible, one section of the people of this country, and therefore can nominate men to represent that section on the directorate, we do not represent another section, namely, the labour element. Is Parliament prepared to take that position? Is Parliament prepared to declare that we the representatives of the people hold an altogether different relationship to the proprietary interests of Canada, as opposed to the labour interests of Canada? This Parliament, if it is a Parliament at all, represents labour in the very same sense that it represents proprietorship or capital, and must take the responsibility, in appointing members of a directorate of a great Government railway system, of seeing to it that all major sections of the community of Canada are fairly represented on that directorate so far as may be necessary for the efficient management of the system. No one who understands the English language, or who knows the attitude of the Government, would, for one moment, suggest that the Government is opposed to the appointment on this directorate of men who have peculiar knowledge of the interests of those employed upon the road. It would seem to me obvious that, other things equal, it would be of great advantage to the system that there should be on the directorate men intimate with the needs of the employees of the road and peculiarly qualified to speak for them. That is one thing, but to say that these men must be selected finally, not by the Government which is responsible for the success of the undertaking but by others who have no such responsibility, is to affirm a principle that this Parliament has never before affirmed and one which I really cannot suppose that the hon. member for Kamouraska is serious in asking us to affirm. If we were to do so, if we were to take the ground—let me repeat it in another form of words—that Parliament, or the Government, is not qualified to select in the name of labour in the same way that it selects in the name of other classes of the community, either upon the basis of language, religion, occupation or in whatever manner, then we must also assume that we are not able to select in the name of any other section of the community and any other section would be in just the same position to come to Parliament and say: What right have you to select representatives on the Board of the National Railways who are peculiarly conversant with our interests in the management of these roads, or what right have you to select them if you permit one section of the community to select its own? Were the amendment to be adopted, Parliament would be landed in an anomalous and impossible position, in a position inconsistent with the best principles of constitutional government, in a position that no parliament in a constitutionally governed country has ever before occupied.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the motion of my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), so eloquently supported by my hon. friend from St. Denis (Mr. Verville), but logically I fail to see any good reason for it. I sympathize heartily with the argument that labour ought to be represented on this Board. I hope the Government will keep that in mind and see that labour is represented on the Board, and, if it be possible, labour connected with the railway itself. But there are other classes also that we would like to see represented on the Board, and I do not think it is wise to select one particular class and dictate as to their appointment. For example the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) suggested—and I like the suggestion—that among the returned soldiers of the engineer corps, there are a number of very capable men and that it might be desirable that one of this class might be found to go on the board. There is not only the consideration that we would have the benefit of his skill as an engineer, but the fact that he is a returned soldier means a good deal to us all. But I do not think that you should put it in an Act of Parliament that there must be one. This board ought to represent different interests in the community and if the Government do not see that all legitimate interests are represented, that will be a grievance for which we have a right to call them to account. But I must say that I do not see the logic of saying that as respects one particular section, we will put that in the Bill, but as respects all other elements we will not say anything about them at all. I do not think that is reasonable. I sympathize warmly with the argument that labour ought to be represented on the board, and if the Government fail to provide in some way or other for the representation of labour on that board it will be pursuing a course for which at a later stage it should be called to account in Parliament.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Ernest Lapointe, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS:

Messrs.

Archambault
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brouillard,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Casgrain,
Chisholm,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Duff,
Ethier,
Fafard,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauthier,
Gervais,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Kay,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Leger,
Lemieux,
McCrea,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pedlow,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Robb,
Savard,
Seguin,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Verville,
White (Victoria),
—60.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Anderson,
Andrews,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Blair,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brien,
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Butts,
Calder,
Campbell,
Carvell,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Davidson,
Davis,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Fielding,
Finley,
Foster (York),
Glass,
Green,
Griesbach,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Hartt,
Hay,
Henders,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Johnston,
Keefer,
Knox,
Lalor,
Lang,
Loggie,
Long,
Mackie (Renfrew),
Maclean (Halifax),
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLean (Royal),
McLeod,
Maharg,
Manion,
Martin,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Munson,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Nicholson (Algoma),
Nickle,
Paul,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Richardson,
Rowell,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Simpson,
Steele,

Stevens,	Tolmie,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Tweedie,
Stewart (Lanark),	White (Sir Thomas),
Sutherland	Wigmore,
Thompson (Weyburn),	Wilson (Wentworth),
Thompson (Hastings),	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Thompson (Yukon),	Wright,—110.
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),	

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Messrs.

Sifton,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Doherty,	Marcil,
Borden,	Sinclair (Guysborough)
Bristol,	Kennedy,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Peck,	Baldwin,
Allan,	Cardin,
Macnutt,	Molloy,
Fraser,	Pardee,
Chabot,	Devlin,
Fripp,	Ross,
Burnham,	Gauvreau,
Scott,	Euler,
Kemp,	Gladu,
Foster Sir George,	Beland,
Spinney,	Lapointe, (St. James),
Whidden,	Lesage,
Sheard,	Cannon,
McQuarrie,	Vien,
Stacey,	DuTremblay,

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, my duty compels me, much as I regret it, to draw your attention to the fact that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. W. A. Clarke) entered this Chamber after the vote was about half taken on this question, and, consequently, he did not hear the question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member for North Wellington if he was present in the House and heard the question put?

Mr. W. A. CLARKE: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk will strike the vote from the record.

Yeas 60, Nays 110.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: I was paired with the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS: I was paired with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. H. S. BELAND: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto East (Sir Edward Kemp). Had I voted, I should have voted for the amendment.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. A. B. McCOIG: I was paired with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

The House divided on the main motion for the third reading of the Bill which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Ames (Sir Herbert),	Hughes (Sir Sam),
Anderson,	Johnston,
Andrews,	Keefer,
Argue,	Knox,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lalor,
Arthurs,	Lang,
Ballantyne,	Loggie,
Ball,	Long,
Blair,	Mackie (Renfrew),
Blake,	Maclean (Halifax),
Bolton,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Bowman,	McGregor,
Boyce,	McIntosh,
Boys,	McIsaac,
Brien,	McLean (Royal),
Buchanan,	McLeod,
Burrell,	Maharg,
Butts,	Manion,
Calder,	Meighen
Campbell,	Mewburn.
Carvell,	Middlebro,
Casselman,	Morphy,
Chaplin,	Mowat,
Charters,	Munson,
Clark (Bruce),	Myers,
Clark (Red Deer),	Nesbitt,
Clarke (Wellington),	Nicholson (Queens, (P.E.I.),
Clements,	Nicholson (Algoma),
Cochrane,	Nickle,
Cockshutt,	Paul,
Cooper,	Redman,
Cowan,	Reid (Grenville),
Crerar,	Reid, (Mackenzie),
Cronyn,	Richardson,
Crothers,	Rowell,
Crowe,	Sexsmith,
Cruise,	Shaw,
Davidson,	Simpson,
Davis,	Steele,
Douglas (Strathcona),	Stevens,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.),	Stewart (Hamilton),
Edwards,	Stewart (Lanark),
Elkin,	Sutherland,
Finley,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Foster (York),	Thompson (Hastings),
Glass,	Thompson (Yukon),
Green,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Griesbach,	Tolmie,
Guthrie,	Tweedie,
Halladay,	White (Victoria),
Harold,	White (Sir Thomas),
Hartt,	Wigmore,
Hay,	Wilson (Wentworth),
Henders,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Hocken,	Wright.—110.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Bureau,
Boivin,	Cahill,
Bourassa,	Casgrain,
Boyer,	Chisholm,
Brouillard,	d'Anjou,

Déchêne,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Delisle,	McKenzie,
Domers,	McMaster,
Desaulniers,	Marcile (Bagot),
Deslauriers,	Mayrand,
Duff,	Michaud,
Ethier,	Pacaud,
Fafard,	Papineau,
Fielding,	Parent,
Fontaine,	Pedlow,
Fortier,	Pelletier,
Fournier,	Prévost,
Gauthier,	Proulx,
Gervais,	Robb,
Hunt,	Savard,
Jacobs,	Séguin,
Kay,	Sinclair
Lafortune,	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Lanctôt,	Tobin,
Lavigueur,	Trahan,
Leduc,	Truax,
Leger,	Turgeon,
Lemieux,	Verville.—56.
McCrea,	

PAIRS.

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.	
Sifton,	Lapointe,
Doherty	Marcil,
Kemp,	Gladu,
Foster, Sir George,	Béland,
Borden,	Sinclair (Guysborough),
Bristol,	Kennedy,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Peck,	Baldwin,
Allan,	Cardin,
Macnutt,	Molloy,
Fraser,	du Tremblay,
Chabot,	Devlin,
Fripp,	Ross,
Burnham,	Gauvreau,
Scott,	Euler,
Spinney,	Lapointe (St. James),
Whidden,	Lesage,
Sheard,	Cannon,
McQuarrie,	Vien,
Martin,	Power,
Pardee,	Copp,
Smith,	Murphy,

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 80, to authorize the appointment of an Air Board for the control of Aeronautics.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Bill No. 75, to amend The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Crerar.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Wednesday, May 7, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1918-19.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1919, was presented by Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

STRIKES IN CANADA SINCE THE ARMISTICE.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. How many workmen's strikes have occurred in Canada since the signing of the armistice?

2. How many days of labour have been lost to workmen in Canada, as a result of the said strikes, to date?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. 70.

2. 217,913 working days.

TRANS-ATLANTIC FLIGHT.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

What efforts, if any, are being made to enable Canadian flying boys to gain the honour of being the first to fly across the Atlantic?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Exactly the same privileges are accorded to Canadian airmen as to British airmen in the competition for the prize that is being offered to the first airman who flies across the Atlantic. The British admiralty has made certain provisions for the care and protection of the airmen, and these are available to Canadian as well as to British airmen.

"THE ONE BIG UNION."

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is the Department of Labour aware that an Interprovincial Labour Convention was recently held at Calgary, at which a resolution was unanimously adopted, authorizing members of Labour Unions throughout Canada to consider, by referendum, the question of recommending the enactment of a measure by which a workman's week shall consist of five days and not more than six hours' labour per day?

2. Is the Minister of Labour aware that a certain organization, "One Big Union," as it is called, are now distributing bulletins and literature throughout Canada, inviting adherents to join and effect a general strike?

3. What does the Department of Labour intend to do in the matter?

4. Are the principles and objects of "One Big Union" and the I.W.W. identical? If not, how do they differ?

5. Has the Government had any intercourse or correspondence upon this matter with the Secretary of "One Big Union," Mr. Midgley, 210 Labour Temple, Vancouver, B.C.?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. The department has secured reports of the proceedings of a convention held at

Calgary on March 13 and the three following days, at which was passed a resolution urging the enactment of a measure providing that a workman's week shall consist of five days and not more than six hours' labour per day.

2. The Minister of Labour has received copies of various documents apparently emanating from what is termed "One Big Union" and favouring a general strike.

3. The Minister of Labour is following the matter closely and is advising with his colleagues as to action to be taken to meet any situation arising.

4. So far as the Department of Labour has learned, the principles and objects of "One Big Union" have not been yet determined. What is termed the "One Big Union" would appear to be yet in the formative stage only. The framework of a general organization does not yet exist. A central committee alone has been appointed with temporary officers. It is impossible therefore to state if the principles and objects of "One Big Union" are identical with those of the I.W.W.

5. A communication was addressed to Mr. Midgley as acting secretary of the Organization Committee of "One Big Union," requesting copies of the official reports of the proceedings at the Calgary gathering of March 13. Mr. Midgley replied promising to forward the copies as requested.

THE SALE OF SALVARSAN.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What is the date of the Order in Council authorizing the granting of licenses for the sale of salvarsan, such as "606" and "914" as it is called?
2. What commercial houses in Canada have taken out such licenses?
3. What fee is charged to a person or persons obtaining such license (a) for export trade, and (b) for domestic trade?
4. Will the Government lay upon the table of this House a copy of the said Order in Council?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. 2nd October, 1914.

2. (1) Ernest Neil Macallum and Charles Newton Candee, jr., both of Toronto, trading there under the name of the Synthetic Drug Company, subsequently incorporated as the Synthetic Drug Company, Limited. (2) Dr. Gustave Archambault, of Montreal, transferred to the Phenarsenyl Company, Limited.

3. $10 in respect of each patent covered by the license. The license permits sale generally without referring to export or domestic trade.

4. Yes.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

CANADA REGISTRATION BOARD.

Mr. McGREGOR:

1. What is the name of the Registrar who conducted the registration under the Canada Registration Board for the constituency of Pictou, Nova Scotia?
2. What remuneration did this officer receive?
3. What was the total cost for Pictou County?
4. What was the cost per registrant of the registration in this constituency?
5. What remuneration was received by the registrar of the constituency of Antigonish and Guysborough, N.S., for the registration in that constituency?
6. What was the cost per registrant, and what was the total cost?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. J. Ed. Macdonald.
2. Nothing.
3. $1,034.13.
4. 3.77 cents.
5. $300.
6. 11 cents. $1,811.59.

TAX ON FISHERMEN.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is there a Federal tax on fishermen in the district of Montreal?
2. If so, what is the tax and who is the collector?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Not by the Department of the Naval Service.
2. Answered by No. 1.

ST. ZOTIQUE-RIVER BEAUDETTE ROADWAY.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Owing to the inundation of the public roadway extending from the parish of St. Zotique towards River Beaudette, in the county of Soulanges, which is caused by the overflowing waters of Lake St. Francis, as a result of the dam which was necessarily built in order to protect the construction work of the canal, and to which the attention of the Government has been directed for several years, is it the intention of the Government to raise the said public roadway?
2. If so, what amount is being appropriated therefor?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The present condition of the road between St. Zotique and River Beaudette, the causes resulting in its present condition, and the Government's liability in connection therewith, are now under investigation.
2. Answered by No. 1.

SPECIAL DOMINION POLICE FORCE.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. Is the Special Police Force of the Dominion still under the command of the Provost Marshal?

2. Has the Department of Justice any jurisdiction over this force? If so, to what extent?
3. Are there some men still under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, exclusively?
4. If so, how many?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.
2. Yes, exclusively.
3. Yes.
4. 218.

MISS YVETTE LAMONTAGNE.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Has Miss Yvette Lamontagne of 91A Jeanne Mance St., Montreal, received a bonus in connection with her services in 1918, as an employee of the Montreal Board of Registration, Military District No. 4, of which Mr. Eugene Godin, K.C., was the Chief Registrar? If so, what amount did she receive?
2. Did any other employee of said board receive a bonus?
3. Was the entire staff belonging to said board entitled to a bonus? If so, did each member receive this grant?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.
2. No.
3. No.

THE ICEBREAKER EARL GREY.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.):

1. Was the Canadian Government icebreaker "Earl Grey" sold? If so, to whom?
2. At what price was she sold?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes, to the Russian Government.
2. $493,000.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ARBITRATION.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

1. For how many days did the Canadian Northern Arbitration Board sit at Toronto in 1918?
2. For how many of said days was Mr. Fairweather, the Department Solicitor, in attendance?
3. For how many days in 1918 was Mr. Fairweather in actual attendance before the Committee of the Senate during the consideration of the Consolidated Railway Bill?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Fifty-one days—January 28th to May 16th, 1918.

2. No official record kept. In attendance at most of hearings during first part of arbitration, January 28 to March 6, 1918. Not present during last part, April 9 to May 16, 1918.

3. Was in attendance whenever the Bill was under consideration or likely to come up for consideration, between the introduction of the Bill, March 21, 1918, and third reading of the Bill, April 26, 1918.

FUEL CONTROLLER.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. What salary is being paid by the Government to the Fuel Controller?
2. What is the Government expenditure to date in connection with fuel control?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. No salary is, or has at any time, been paid by the Government to the Fuel Controller.

2. From November 6, 1917, to April 30th, 1919, $170,398.16.

RATE OF EXCHANGE.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Is the Government aware that on the 26th April last the rate of exchange on New York was 2 11/16 per cent?
2. Does the Government intend to remedy the situation in this connection?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Yes.

2. The rate of exchange in question is governed by general international conditions beyond the control of any government.

THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INFORMATION—U.S. REPRESENTATIVE.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is the rumour published some time ago in the newspapers, that Honourable Mr. Rowell intended to have an agent or representative of the Bureau of Public Information appointed in New England, either at New York or Boston, an accomplished fact or not?
2. If so, where has such agent been stationed?
3. What salary and other expenses have been provided for the position and the agent?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: The rumour referred to has not been brought to the attention of the Government. It is not the intention of the Government to appoint an agent or representative of the Department of Public Information either at Boston or New York.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

*Mr. STEELE:

How many Orders in Council were passed in each calendar year from 1910 to 1918, inclusive?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: 1910, 4,811; 1911, 5,782; 1912, 7,015; 1913, 6,795; 1914, 5,859; 1915, 6,297; 1916, 7,343; 1917, 7,048; 1918, 6,301.

NATIONAL SERVICE REGISTRATION.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What persons have been employed by the Government in connection with National Service Registration (a) at St. Antoine de Richelieu; (b) at Contrecoeur, County of Chambly-Vercheres?

2. What amounts were paid therefor to the said persons by the Government?

3. What amounts, if any, were paid as rental for the use of the schools or other buildings, in connection with the said registration at St. Antoine de Richelieu and Contrecoeur, respectively?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. St. Antoine—Marie Lapointe, Leontine Viau, Caroline Gaudette, Glorina Bousquet, Arzelie Archambault, Alice Guertin, Alfred Desaulniers, Sylvain Archambault, Jos. St. Germain, Emile Desaulniers, Henri Archambault, Ernest Archambault, Jos. Ignace Archambault. Contrecoeur—A. Charron, Gabriel Hurteau, Gaston Gervais, Pierre Gervais, Moise Martin, Jos. Papin, Alice Fisette, Bertha Papin, Alex. Papin, Leo. Papin, O. Bienvenu, Hermina Beauthillette.

2. St. Antoine de Richelieu, $73.50; Contrecoeur, $59.50.

3. St. Antoine de Richelieu, $5; Contrecoeur, $10.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. What has been the refit cost for Canadian trawler Vimy during the year 1918?

2. Did the firm of Burns & Keeler, Halifax, do any work on trawler Vimy?

3. If so, what was the amount paid for such work?

4. How long was trawler Vimy in Halifax during the year 1918?

5. What were the duties of that vessel while in Halifax?

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. Was H.M.C.S. Stadacona repaired by the Halifax Shipyards, Ltd., during the summer of 1918?

2. If so, why were repairs necessary?

3. What was the cost of the repairs?

4. Did the Stadacona strike a rock on the Cape Breton coast during the year 1918?

5. If so, who was held responsible for the striking of said rock?

6. How many times during the war has the Stadacona been aground?

7. Where was the vessel during the month of July, 1917?

8. Did she, during July, 1917, take a party of naval officers to Labrador?

9. If so, what was the purpose of this trip?

10. Was the ship in constant communication with the Naval authorities during that trip?

11. Was the Stadacona used as a yacht, or to provide living accommodation for any officers in the Canadian Naval Service during 1917 or 1918?

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. What are the names of the private cars that were in the wreck on the Toronto and Ottawa train (Canadian National Railways, 21st-22nd April last), and the name of the respective minister to which each private car is assigned?

[Mr. Archambault.]

2. Who paid for the attendance, transportation and supplies for these private cars respectively, during the trip?

3. What is the amount of damage which resulted from this wreck for each private car and by whom will the said damage be paid?

4. How many private cars are used by ministers and high officials of the Government, what is the name of each car, and the name of each minister and high official using same?

5. How many of these private cars, if any, have been used from time to time since 1911, by members of the family of the ministers or high officials exclusively for social and pleasure trips?

THE PEACE TREATY.

SUMMARY OF ITS TERMS READ BY HON. MR. ROWELL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Council): On Friday last I promised that the Government would give to the House information in reference to the terms of the Peace Treaty so soon as that information was available for publication. A summary of the Peace Treaty, consisting of some ten thousand words, was received by the Government this morning with the proviso that it might be released for publication at one o'clock to-day, and a despatch to that effect was also received from the Colonial Office. Subsequently, a despatch came from the censor stating that it should not be released to the press until to-morrow morning, but as the Government learned that it had already been published this morning in a special edition of a Montreal paper, as a cable from the London Times, and as the summary was being released to the American press at one o'clock to-day, the Government decided, as a matter of fairness to the Canadian press, to release the summary to the press at the same hour. It has therefore gone out to the press of Canada.

The House will be interested to hear a few of the most important provisions of this momentous document, which is made between the twenty-seven Allied and associated powers of the one part and Germany of the other.

The treaty does not deal with questions affecting Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey, except in so far as binding Germany to accept any agreement reached with those former Allies.

Following the preamble and deposition of powers comes the covenant of the League of Nations as the first section of the treaty. The frontiers of Germany in Europe are defined in the second section; European political classes given in the third; and

extra European political classes in the fourth.

Next are the military, naval, and air terms as the fifth section, followed by a section on prisoners of war and military graves, and a seventh on responsibilities.

Reparations, financial terms, and economic terms are covered in sections eight to ten.

Then comes the aeronautic section, ports, waterways and railways section, the Labour covenant, the section on guarantees, and the final clauses.

Germany, by the terms of the treaty, restores Alsace-Lorraine to France, accepts the internationalization of the Saar Basin temporarily and of Danzig permanently; agrees to territorial changes towards Belgium and Denmark and in East Prussia, cedes most of Upper Silesia to Poland, and renounces all territorial and political rights outside Europe, as to her own or her Allies' territories, and especially to Morocco, Egypt, Siam, Liberia, and Shantung.

She also recognizes the total independence of German-Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, and Poland.

Her army is reduced to 100,000 men, including officers.

Conscription within her territory is abolished

All forts 50 kilometers east of the Rhine are to be razed; and all importation, exportation, and nearly all production of war materials stopped.

Allied occupation of parts of Germany will continue till reparation is made, but will be reduced at the end of each of three five-year periods if Germany is fulfilling her obligations.

Any violation by Germany of the conditions as to the zone 50 kilometers east of the Rhine will be regarded as an act of war.

The German navy is reduced to six battleships, six light cruisers, and 12 torpedo boats, without submarines, and a personnel of not over 15,000.

All other vessels must be surrendered or destroyed.

Germany is forbidden to build forts controlling the Baltic, must demolish Heligoland, open the Kiel canal to all nations, and surrender her 14 submarine cables.

She may have no military or naval air forces, except 100 unarmed seaplanes until October 1 to detect mines, and may manufacture no aviation material for a six months' period.

She agrees to return to the 1914 most favoured nation tariffs without discrimination of any sort, to allow Allied and associated nationals freedom of transit through her territories and to accept highly detailed provisions as to pre-war debts, unfair competition, internationalizations of roads and rivers, and other economic and financial clauses.

She also agrees to the trial of the ex-Kaiser by an International High Court for a supreme offence against international morality, and of other nationals for violation of the laws and customs of war.

Holland is to be asked to extradite the former German Emperor and Germany being responsible for delivering the latter.

The League of Nations is accepted by the Allied and associated powers as operative and by Germany in principle but without membership.

Similarly an international labour body is brought into being with a permanent office and annual convention.

Germany accepts full responsibility for all damages caused to Allied and associated Governments and nationals. She agrees specifically to reimburse all civilian damages beginning with an initial payment of 20,000,000,000 marks, subsequent payments to be secured by bonds to be issued at the discretion of the Reparation Commission.

Germany is to pay shipping damage on a ton-for-ton basis by cession of a large part of her merchant, coasting and river fleets, and by new construction, and to devote her economic resources to the rebuilding of the devastated regions.

A great number of international bodies of different kinds and for different purposes are created, some under the League of Nations; some to execute the peace treaty. Among the former is the commission to govern the Saar Basin till a plebiscite is held fifteen years hence. A High Commissioner of Danzig, which is created into a free city under the League, and various commissions for plebiscites in Malmody, Schleswig and East Prussia. Among those to carry out the peace treaty are the Reparations, Military, Naval, Aviation, Financial and Economy Commissions; the International High Court and Military Tribunals to fix responsibilities, and a series of bodies for the control of international rivers.

Certain problems are left for solution between the Allied and associated powers, notably details of the disposition of the German fleet and cables, the former German colonies, and the values paid in reparation.

Certain other problems, such as the laws of the air and the opium, arms and liquor

traffic, are either agreed to in detail or set for early internaticnal action.

The preamble names as parties of the one part the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, described as the five allied and associated powers, and Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, The Hedjaz, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Roumania, Serbia, Siam, Tzecho-Slovakia and Uruguay, who with the five others are described as the Allied and Associated Powers, and on the other part Germany.

It states that: Bearing in mind, that on the request of the then Imperial German Government an Armistice was granted on November 11, 1918, by the five Allied and Associated Powers in order that a Treaty of Peace might be concluded with her, and whereas the Allied and Associated Powers being equally desirous that the war in which they were successively involved directly or indirectly and which originated in the declaration of war by Austria-Hungary on July 28, 1914, against Serbia, the declaration of war by Germany against Russia on August 1, 1914, and against France on August 3, 1914, and in the invasion of Belgium, should be replaced by a firm, just and durable peace, the plenipotentiaries (having communicated their full powers found in good and due form have agreed as follows):

"From the coming into force of the present treaty the state of war will terminate. From the moment and subject to the provisions of this Treaty official relations with Germany, and with each of the German States, will be resumed by the Allied and Associated powers."

This treaty was submitted to the German plenipotentiaries at Versailles to-day. If accepted by Germany and ratified by the Governments who are parties to it the treaty will go into effect and peace will be declared.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the minister any announcement to make as to what portion of the indemnity will be paid to Canada.

Mr. ROWELL: No.

WAR MEASURES ACT, 1914.

BILL TO EXTEND ORDERS IN COUNCIL NOT PROCEEDED WITH FOR THE PRESENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Yesterday the Acting Minister of Justice made a statement which left an inference on this side of the House and in the press that he was going to withdraw Bill No. 71, to extend the operation of the Orders and regulations passed by the Governor in Council under the War Measures Act, 1914. I notice that the Bill is still on the Order Paper. Is it there by inadvertence, or did we misunderstand the minister?

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): I did not intimate that the Bill would be withdrawn. I said that the reason why it was not advanced was the fact that intimation had come that His Majesty's proclamation which would terminate the War Measures Act could not in all probability be made until about the first of August, and that consequently this Bill need not be gone on with because it could not with advantage be considered pending that time.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): In view of that, does the Government intend to introduce legislation to define what is to be considered the end of the war? The British Parliament has enacted that a proclamation will be issued by His Majesty in Council declaring the end of the war, such proclamation to be issued not later than the date of the ratification of the Peace Treaty. Will the Government pass similar legislation, or at least give some interpretation as to emergency measures and other war legislation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government has given no consideration to amending the War Measures Act which now defines when it shall cease to be effective. I would not consider that there was likely to be need for such consideration. It is purposed to review such legislation as has been passed under the authority of the Act with a view to determining what should be done in relation to each piece of legislation having regard to the fact that it goes out of effect on the termination of the war.

It may be that will involve a modification of this Bill which was intended only to tide over the present period, it having been apprehended that the war might terminate suddenly. As the war will not terminate suddenly, or at all events it does not appear likely for some time to come, we would like to have time to consider each separate piece of legislation, and determine and submit to Parliament our proposals in regard thereto.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): Are we to understand that it is

possible for a state of war to continue in Canada, or in any of the British Dominions, after the war is declared to be at an end by an Imperial proclamation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is presumed that the war will be declared to be at an end by an Imperial proclamation. That proclamation will end the war so far as Canada is concerned, and the operation of the War Measures Act will cease.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue) Bill No. 42, to amend the Weights and Measures Act, was read a second time, and the House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1—" Inspector " defined.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister please say if the amendment which is proposed here changes the territorial jurisdiction of any of the officers at present at work?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, this clause merely provides for the transfer of the administration of weights and measures from the Inland Revenue Department to the Department of Trade and Commerce, which transfer was made some months ago. Further, the clause gives a definition of the word " Inspector." I think perhaps my hon. friend's question refers to another clause.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Contents of French foot.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: On the first reading of the Bill the object of this clause was explained very fully. The change proposed is consequent upon the recommendation of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures to secure what is expected to be a more accurate definition of the French foot. So far as Canada is concerned, the French foot is employed only in the province of Quebec, and in connection with land surveys. The French foot as at present defined contains 12·79 inches, and the correction only amounts to ·001. I understand this change is approved of by the Incorporated Society of Surveyors in the province of Quebec, and I do not think there can be any objection to it.

Mr. McMASTER: Should there be a hyphen after the word "eighty," in the fourth line of the clause? Should the figures there be seven hundred and eighty-nine thousandths, or seven hundred and eighty—nine thousandths?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The figures should be seven hundred and eighty-nine thousandths, there should be a hyphen.

Section agreed to.

On Section 3—Superintendent may be appointed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There really is no substantial change contemplated by this clause. Under the law as it at present stands the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue was the chief administrative officer of weights and measures. Inasmuch as this branch is being transferred to another department, the administrative work is being placed under the control of an officer, to be called the superintendent. That is the important change which the clause makes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it intended to increase the number of officers engaged in this work? I see that by subsection (3) the Governor in Council is empowered to divide the country into inspection divisions, and to decide the number of officers to be appointed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That provision was contained in one of the clauses which this Bill repeals. It is considered advisable to have the power referred to, although the departmental officers advise me that there is no intention to make additional appointments at present.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Then it is not intended at present to increase the number of officers?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Frequency of inspections.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How often is inspection of weights and measures and weighing and measuring machines to be made? Some dealers complain that they are greatly worried by the inspectors in that regard.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not intended to inspect all scales annually. But there are certain scales, such as those in elevators and railway stations, which are used daily, and it is considered desirable that they at least be subject to annual inspection.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Penalty for short weights, measure or count.

Mr. ROBB: In making the regulations I suppose the department will take into con-

sideration natural shrinkage? Certain commodities shrink in weight while other commodities gain. For instance, butter and flour shrink slightly, oatmeal and wool gain slightly in weight.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is always considered in the inspection of goods subject to shrinkage. This is a new clause. The officers of the department think that it will facilitate the administration of the Act and will be in the public interest as well. The only penalty now for short weight delivery is under the Criminal Code, and that is rather a harsh measure to invoke. The amount of short weight delivery in Canada —and I suppose it is true of all other countries—is very substantial indeed, and one would be surprised at the great number of complaints that are made to the officers of the Weights and Measures Branch in regard to it. But when the officers attempt to prosecute offenders for fraud they encounter very serious difficulties. For instance, the proprietor of a store from which short weight delivery has been made may know nothing about it; somebody in his employment may be responsible, or the business may be carelessly managed. Experience has led our officers to ask for this legislation, for they feel that if dealers are punished in this way it will be more easy to secure convictions, and the resulting publicity will act as a deterrent. New South Wales at the present time has the same law. I think Great Britain is adopting it this year. The section appealed to me as being a pretty good way of dealing with such offences Of course, whatever similar provisions are contained in the criminal law will still prevail dealing with aggravated cases.

Mr. JACOBS: Where does the minister read into the law that the provisions of the Criminal Code will stand, notwithstanding this new provision, 61 (a)? It would seem to me that this would abrogate the section of the Criminal Code dealing with theft or obtaining money under false pretences. It is a specific instance where the law sought to be introduced would over-ride the existing law.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I consulted the law officer of the Crown, and he thought it was quite proper to have that section. I do not think it will repeal whatever is applicable in the Criminal Code. It is practically impossible to invoke the Criminal Code in these matters. I do not know whether my hon. friend has had any experience himself in the prosecution of offenders under the Act; I have not myself.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. JACOBS: It does seem to me that a trader who sells goods under weight should be prosecuted to the full limit of the law. He is committing theft, he is obtaining money by false representations, and the public ought to be protected against such dishonesty in the most careful manner. But I think we are simply putting a premium on crime by abrogating the provisions of our criminal law which deal in a proper way with these cases. In the poorer parts of the larger cities people of modest circumstances should be protected by legislation of a vigorous kind. As I said before, the trader will take his chances and sell goods under weight when the only risk he faces is this trifling fine of $25. It seems to me it is a dangerous departure, and as far as I am concerned I would be in favour of striking that clause from the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I agree with my hon. friend that there should be no modification of the existing law which would lessen the protection to the public. However, my hon. friend will realize that in criminal proceedings you must prove wilful intent, and if he reflects upon the matter he will realize that it is practically impossible to prove it; and that is the experience of all men engaged in administering laws of this nature. For instance, a few days ago an inspection of sugar in bags supposed to contain 24 pounds revealed a shortage in a great number of the bags, although some were above the specified weight. Take it all in all there was nothing to indicate wilful intent on the part of the manufacturer or dealer; perhaps it was due to carelesness. That state of affairs can be corrected more readily, I think, by giving the department this power to fine such persons. The officers of the department inform me that if they have this section available, a great many prosecutions will be undertaken and considerable publicity given to violations of the law. I think it is a provision that will work out all right in practice, and I should like at least to see it tried.

Mr. P. R. McGIBBON: People in farming communities sometimes trade grain, lend and exchange grain and so on. Are they obliged to have their scales tested, as traders are?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Act applies to every one who sells or deals in articles sold by weight.

Mr. MORPHY: Is this clause comprehensive enough to meet the object aimed at? "Any person who sells"—what about

the agent or the servant of the man who sells? The clause should read:

Any person who, by himself, his servant or his agent, sells, delivers or causes to be sold or delivered, anything by weight, etc.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The intention is to have the law directed or levelled against the principal, not against the agent.

Mr. MORPHY: We should make the principal liable for the fraudulent act of his servant or agent. Further, what are you going to do if the fine is not paid? Does the original Act provide for further penalty in default of payment? And what jurisdiction is to determine the conviction?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 78 of the original Act contains a clause with regard to the recovery of penalties, and to procedure.

Mr. MORPHY: What about visiting a penalty upon the proprietor for the acts of his servants or agents?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If a sale is made by an employee, the principal would still be liable, because the sale is made by the employee on behalf of the principal.

Mr. MORPHY: But in that case the principal does not sell it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Oh, yes; the principal sells by his agent.

Mr. MORPHY: Not necessarily. The employee might do it in a fraudulent way, without the knowledge of the principal. The employee could not, perhaps, pay the fine, and might not be there to suffer punishment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: An employee making a sale would make it on behalf of his employer, and, in law, the sale would be by the principal.

Mr. JACOBS: Is this fine exigible whether or not the selling party is aware that the goods sold are under weight?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, if his employee or agent sells the goods by weight and does not deliver the proper weight, the selling party is responsible. His business should be so organized and conducted that the public will be protected. Of course, frequently there might be short deliveries for which nobody would be very much to blame. In such cases one would expect the officers of the department administering the Act to exercise discretion and sense.

Mr. MORPHY: In section 8, the word "knowingly" is used. Why should it not be used in this section, so that the provision would read:

Any person who knowingly sells, delivers or causes to be sold or delivered, anything by weight, measure or number short of the quantity ordered or purchased, etc.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Then the department would have to establish knowledge, and we would again be under the present disabilities of the criminal law.

Mr. JACOBS: Put the onus on the proprietor.

Mr. MORPHY: If the word "knowingly" was put in and a sub-clause added to provide that the onus should be upon the person charged, then the magistrate might use his discretion as to whether he should impose the fine or not. He could distinguish between the criminal and the innocent man who happened to send out short weight.

Mr. LOGGIE: Does this clause refer to package goods?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. LOGGIE. Some commodities which are of certain weight when packed are subject to shrinkage, and the longer they are held on the shelves of the store the greater that shrinkage is. If a clerk sold a package stated to contain one pound when packed but actually containing one ounce less than that at the time of delivery, what would be the position of the storekeeper who had bought that commodity in good faith from the manufacturer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Inspection and Sales Act provides that such discrepancies as my hon. friend refers to— those due exclusively to different atmospheric conditions in different places, or to ordinary exposure, evaporation, absorption of water and so on—shall not exceed five per cent of the original weight when sold to the consumer.

Mr. JACOBS: There seems to be no provision in this section for second and third offences. It seems to me that when a proprietor wants to engage in the luxury of continuing the habit of selling goods under weight, he should be made to pay the price. I suggest that after the words "twenty-five dollars" at the end of the section, the following words be added:

for the first offence, and $100 for the second or any subsequent offence of the same nature.

We should not permit any one to continue this practice without bringing him to book rather sharply. A fine of $25 may be

sufficient for the first offence, but if a merchant becomes an habitual offender, the law ought to reach him in a more drastic way. I would also suggest that there be inserted in the section some provision whereby it should be declared definitely and conclusively that the section in no way interferes with the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting false pretences, and I move that the section be amended to read:

61A. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 405 of the Criminal Code, any person who sells, delivers or causes to be sold or delivered anything by weight, measure or number short of the quantity ordered or purchased, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding $25 for such first offence and $100 for any subsequent offence under this section.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know that there is any objection to the amendment moved by my hon. friend, although I very much doubt the wisdom of expecting observance of the law by the imposition of an increased penalty for second and subsequent offences. I hardly think that frequent prosecutions and the imposition of excessive penalties would bring about the desired result, but if the public know that a dealer has been fined for delivering short weight goods, those practices would, I think, very soon cease.

Mr. PEDLOW: One of the first difficulties underlying this section is the possibility of a merchant being made responsible for the carelessness of an employee. Under the common law, an employer is at present held responsible for the actions of an employee.

Mr. McKENZIE: Not criminally.

Mr. PEDLOW: But under this measure, any person may at any time be subjected to petty annoyances. An instance has been cited this afternoon of a number of bags of sugar having been weighed up and exposed for sale, the weights not all being uniform. As the human element is not as exact as some mechanical device for measuring, if some customer of a merchant purchased one of those bags and it happened to be short weight, that particular merchant would, under this measure, be liable to a penalty of $25. That is placing the merchant in a very unfair position, and it should not be the attitude of this Committee to place the mercantile community of the country in a position of this kind. I have many employees labouring for me distributing merchandise. How can I control all their actions? I employ the best help I can obtain, and I warn them to be careful in their actions as regards matters of this nature, but if they are careless, then I am not only held responsible, but subjected to the petty annoyance of being hauled up before a magistrate and exposed to the odium of being fined for their carelessness. They are not fined, but I am.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Surely the consumer who has bought the goods and has paid for something he has not received is entitled to protection.

Mr. PEDLOW: As a matter of fairness to the mercantile community, the minister should insert in the first line of this section, after the word "who" the word "knowingly." Then, if a merchant knowingly permits a careless employee to continue distributing short weight or short measure, the section would be a good one. The section is not carefully enough framed, and in a subsequent paragraph the word "knowingly" is used, thereby giving some measure of protection in matters of this kind.

Mr. MACLEAN: If the section were to be amended as the hon. member suggests, there would be very little protection for the public. If a dealer has careless employees in his store and they grow accustomed to delivering short weight or short measure, that employer should suffer the penalty. Further, I do not think those in mercantile business will object to this section, because it is for the protection of the man who is careful and honest as well, in measuring or weighing the goods which he sells to his customers. My hon. friend would be surprised if he knew of the great quantities of goods delivered in this country which are actually short weight. It would be impossible to establish knowledge on the part of the principal, and it is not a difficult matter to deliver proper weights. The delivering of short weight or short measure is due to carelessness or dishonesty against both of which the public should be protected. If short weights were delivered by any merchant and that fact came to the attention of the officers of the department, the merchant would not be prosecuted for the first offence; he would be warned and consideration would be given to his reputation in the community, the character of his staff and so on. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the section might be abused, but I do not see how the public can be protected in any other way.

4 p.m.

Mr. JACOBS: I might come to the assistance of the minister by pointing out

that under the Liquor License law, the fact that liquor was sold is sufficient to justify a conviction, whether the owner knew of the matter or not.

Mr. PEDLOW: That is a different thing altogether.

Mr. COWAN: Is there in existence now any law compelling parties putting up goods to label or stamp the can or package with the net weight of the contents? Just this morning I received a letter from one of the largest wholesale men in the West, complaining that all of the packages which came from Eastern Canadian manufacturers are short from four to six ounces, and he finds that American cans and packages all contain exactly what they are labelled to contain, the result being that he cannot sell Eastern Canadian goods to the western people. Is there any means by which that can be dealt with, or will it be dealt with under this Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We have now on the Statute Books such a law covering a large number of articles, and it is my intention to introduce at this session another Bill on the subject, which Bill passed the House of Commons at the last session, but which was, for some reason or other, defeated in the Senate. When that is enacted, we shall have complete legislation requiring all containers to have on the label the exact contents of the packages.

Mr. COWAN: I am glad to hear that, because I know the eastern manufacturers are suffering greatly in the West by reason of the practice I have mentioned. If this condition continues, eastern manufacturers will lose their trade in the western market. There is no reason why they should be allowed to defraud our people, for that is what it amounts to.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think the minister is not giving this point the consideration it deserves. As the hon. member for Huntingdon has pointed out certain commodities after being carefully weighed will shrink in weight, while others will increase; it depends upon the atmosphere in which the goods are kept. Textiles for instance, will shrink in weight in a dry atmosphere, and increase in weight in a damp atmosphere. If the minister does not accept my suggestion to insert the word "knowingly" in the first line, I think this clause will be a most dangerous one, and will subject the mercantile interests of this country to a great deal of annoyance. I am informed by legal gentlemen in the House that the Criminal Code already covers the cases which this clause seeks to cover. It is impossible for any merchant to measure goods exactly at all times. How then can we possibly hold him accountable for the acts of his employees? The human element enters into the transaction; it is impossible to be always exact. If this clause passes in its present form, the proprietor of a store will be liable to be hauled before the magistrate and fined $25 because his clerk on one occasion happened to give short weight, not with any intention of defrauding, but simply because the human element entered into the transaction. Furthermore, it will cause a whole lot of trouble for the department.

Mr. MARSHALL: In putting up canned goods, we do not guarantee the quantity. We use standard cans, and we fill them. I think the hon. member is very much mistaken when he says that the cans are sometimes short in weight from four to six ounces. Speaking for the Dominion Canners, while we may have had complaints as to quality, we have had none as to quantity. All our cans of corn and peas are filled by machinery at the rate of from 70 to 100 cans a minute. At this rate, it is possible for an occasional can to be not quite as full as others, but generally they are all full. A shortage in weight is more likely to occur in canning fruits which are filled by hand. For corn, peas and tomatoes we use the standard can used, same as used in the United States. We could not get help enough to fill these cans by hand and keep up our output. I have never heard of anything relating to short weight except perhaps with regard to fruits. We buy a great deal of produce, and we used to have trouble over raspberries and strawberries, but now all our produce is bought by weight. In my opinion this Bill is along the right lines.

Mr. LEGER: I believe this clause should be amended to protect the merchant. A dissatisfied clerk who is about to leave may try to get even with his employer by giving short weight for the whole day before he leaves. Under this clause the merchant would be fined while the clerk would go scot-free. If short weight is given, I would make the merchant make good the shortage. I think that the clerk who deliberately gave short weight should be looked after, as well as the merchant.

Mr. CASSELMAN: As one who is engaged in the mercantile business and has a fairly good knowledge of the conditions, I approve

of the principle of this clause. I do not think the argument that merchants will be penalized for the acts of their clerks is well founded, because if a clerk habitually gives short weight or short measure the customers will soon bring it to the attention of the proprietor, and it will then be his duty to discharge the clerk. I think it is the proprietor who should be penalized The tendency of the trade is to deal more and more in package goods. The retail merchants buy a quantity of package goods which frequently happen to be short weight. The minister referred a moment ago to packages of sugar, and I suppose he meant packages that were put up by the factories and marked, as is usual, 20 pounds. In such a case the manufacturer should suffer and not the merchant, who can hardly be expected to weigh every one of the packages and cull out those of short weight. Packages frequently come short in weight, and I think the onus should be on the manufacturer or the packer, and not on the merchant. There was a penalty imposed on merchants who sold impure maple sugar. I know of merchants who were fined for selling impure maple sugar although it was stamped "pure." They did not know that it was not pure, and simply sold it over the counter for what it purported to be. I think the Bill should be so amended as to penalize the manufacturer and not the merchant in the case of package goods.

Mr. McKENZIE: In penalizing it is always dangerous to go further than the common law, which has well considered what is criminal and what is not, and enters into the philosophy of the condition of mind of those who may be charged with crime. When we remove the safeguards provided by the common law and constitute a crime regardless of the state of mind of the individual, we are on very dangerous ground. We passed a law the other day whereby, if a lady put a pan of bread into the oven in too big a fire, and the bread should burn, she is liable to two years in the penitentiary. That is extraordinary, but it is the law to-day that if by negligence any person makes a fire which destroys property of any kind he is liable to be sent to the penitentiary. Now we are coming forward with another law by which, if a pound of tea is one-thousandth of an ounce short in weight a man may be fined $25, or, according to the amendment, $100 for a second offence. It is better to err on the side of mercy and fairness, and it is better that the responsibility should be thrown on the Crown to prove wilful intent, than to make it easy to punish people. We should not neglect the time-honoured principle of the common law that there must be criminal intent in order to render a person criminally liable, and I fully agree with the hon. member who insists that the word "wilful" should be inserted. If this word were added I would have no great fault to find. I do not think that the store-keeper could be criminally liable for a sale made by his clerk. He would be civilly liable in damages for the quality of the goods and for any shortage or inferiority. My view of the criminal law is that the master is not liable criminally unless there is criminal intent on his part. Of course, if he instructs his servant to do an illegal act he is responsible through his agent and is particeps criminis. I think the whole difficulty might be circumvented by adding the word "wilful." It is better that the department should experience some difficulty than that people should be fined and imprisoned who are not really criminally liable.

Mr. BALL: Will this apply to public scales, weighing coal, hay, cattle, etc., and to private scales that are for public use? This law should be very exact. It is the privilege of the owner of any scale to have it inspected, and I think that if all scales are properly inspected there will be adequate protection. I believe a great deal of fraud is perpetrated in the weighing of coal, cattle, etc. There is a great deal of trouble in my own town with scales that are not correct. The person who hires his scale for public use should see that it is absolutely correct. I think the public has suffered very much in this respect and should be amply protected.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not convinced that this is not good legislation. The public must be protected. If a man goes into a store to buy a definite quantity of anything, he should receive it, and it should be no defence that the proprietor has careless or dishonest employees. Of course, the law might be abused, but I assure the Committee it will not be by the officers of the department.

My hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Casselman) referred to package goods. That is covered by another statute, the Inspection and Sales Act. There is a toleration of error provided for in that Act up to five per cent of the original weight when sold to the con-

sumer, and it has never been the practice to initiate a prosecution against a person who sells goods in a container just as he himself received them. Prosecution for violation of the Inspection and Sales Act, if any, in that case would be against the manufacturer.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to have one further opportunity of impressing my views upon the minister, who is evidently not yet quite convinced. The member for Dundas (Mr. Casselman) said a few minutes ago, that owing to the fact that there might be habitual cases of carelessness on the part of merchants or their employees this clause, in his estimation, was all right. But I submit it is not the habitual offenders that will suffer and feel the consequent exposure most, but the casual offender. The person who has really committed an offence under this clause—not intentionally, not knowingly, not wilfully, but by mere accident; you may call it negligence, a term that the Acting Minister of Justice is very fond of—will be the one to suffer, although the offence may be an accident purely and simply, I think it is the feeling of those members of the Committee who have given the matter careful consideration that there should be some safeguard provided so as to protect a merchant against such imposition as has been referred to, viz: that a dissatisfied employee might, in order to get even with his employer, act in collusion with a friend who would institute a prosecution for short measure. There are a thousand and one ways in which a merchant might not only be penalized, but exposed to the odium which such proceedings involves, although that merchant is a conscientious person who gives the public the best of service and full measure and full weight in the sales which he makes. Like my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), I am willing and desirous that the public should be protected to the last degree in a matter of this kind, and that every safeguard should be attached to purchases by the public; but you can make the penalties resulting from proceedings under the Act so irksome, irritating, and annoying to the persons interested that it will be a continual source of worry to them. From week-end to week-end, and from year to year they will always be in terror of suffering seriously by reason of a slight deviation from the exact line of measure. As I said before, in my experience in mercantile affairs, covering a period of forty years, I have found that the measures going over a counter, either in yardage or weight, vary as often one way as the other. In a hasty operation of the scale or the yard measure an employee, even with the best of care, is liable to give over measure or short measure. Now the employee who has given in one case short measure even to the extent of a hair's breadth, is liable to a penalty under this Bill. I submit that the minister will be well advised if he listens to reason, reconsiders his decision, and inserts in this clause some qualifying provision.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I had intended, when last on my feet, to state that legislation similar to this has been enacted in other countries, particularly in the United States. The states of Massachusetts and Wisconsin have enacted a law of this kind, and I think that New South Wales has likewise passed legislation on similar lines. All this indicates that in the experience of other countries it was found impossible to secure convictions without these special enactments. My hon. friend (Mr. Pedlow) appears to be apprehensive that the merchants will be harrassed by the officers of the department in the enforcement of this law. I think I can safely assure him that there will never be any attempt to punish the casual violator of the Act, because there has always been what is known technically as " a toleration of error " allowed in any cases which come under the observation of the officers. For example, the toleration of error is applied to scales to insure protection to the man who owns and uses those scales. I think the Committee may feel quite sure that the department will not institute prosecutions for what would appear to be casual offences or mistakes, or some infinitesimal shortage in weight. The principle upon which this legislation is based is that a man is entitled to get the thing for which he pays, and if he does not, it is no justification that the employer has careless or dishonest officials. I can see the merit in my hon. friend's contention that there may be unintentional short weight delivered, and in some cases overweight. At the same time the delivery of short weight is becoming, or rather, it has become, quite common, and there ought to be some means of dealing with it and giving publicity to the fact, as against some of the offenders. After all, it is in the interest of the business man or dealer, who is scrupulously careful about giving the proper weight to his customers, that some other dealer, through carelessness on his part, or on the part of his employees, should not profit to his disadvantage.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am sorry the minister fails to appreciate the point which I have been making, and which is most reasonable and fair. I can understand the merchant who has no employees, but operates entirely on his own behalf, being subjected to this clause, but it is impossible for a business with hundreds of employees to obtain mathematical accuracy in his operations.

Mr. McKENZIE: He would not be penalized unless it were provided that he should be responsible for the acts of his servants.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am not a lawyer. I am looking at the interpretation of this clause from a common sense standpoint, and there is a difference sometimes between legal interpretations and common sense. Suppose I were to introduce a Bill and it were to become law—although there is not the slightest chance of that—penalizing a lawyer for advising a client that he has got a good case in court, whereas he has not a leg to stand on. It would be just as reasonable for me, if I were Minister of Justice, to press through a Bill of that kind as it is to pass legislation of the character contemplated here. What a storm there would be in the House if I were to attempt, as a legal adviser of the Government, to pass a Bill of that nature. It is all very well to say that the officers of the department will not be unduly exacting, but under this Bill, as I read it, it will be open to the individual purchaser to institute proceedings. It does not state that it is necessary for an official of the department to prosecute. Any Tom, Dick or Harry who goes into a store and buys a package of merchandise is able to take action before the magistrate, and we all know how human are magistrates in administering justice. It all depends on the state of their liver. If they have been out late the night before and are feeling the effects, we all know what kind of a deal they are likely to hand out. As a matter of fact, I have known many magistrates decide cases before they heard the evidence.

Mr. LOGGIE: If I understand the minister, this law applies only to bulk goods, the goods that are weighed out by the store keeper. For example, if a clerk weighs out a pound of tea and gives short weight, either he or his employer is guilty under the law; but if he hands out a pound of tea that has been put up by a wholesale firm, living a thousand miles away it may be, and the net contents are not quite one pound, he is not liable. The Massachusetts law that the hon. minister read refers I fancy only to bulk goods weighed or measured out by the retailer.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes. Another Act makes provision for goods in containers, and as a matter of fact this would largely relate to bulk goods.

Mr. LOGGIE: In view of that, I think the provision proposed would not cause undue hardship.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no possibility of any such construction. If a man sells a package of tea which he bought from his wholesaler as containing one pound, and that package is under weight he is guilty under this measure just as much as if he put up the package himself. There is no use having any misapprehension in the matter. The minister said that the prosecutions to be instituted under this new law will likely be initiated by the officers of the department, and he repeated that statement. If that is the intention, I would be satisfied by the insertion of a provision that no prosecutions are to be instituted except by leave of the minister of the department or his deputy. Then we would have some guarantee that frivolous and unreasonable prosecutions would not be instituted. I think that is the best safeguard we could have.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I could not consent to that. I meant to say that as a matter of fact and practice prosecutions, so far as I know, have never been commenced by private individuals, but invariably by officers of the department.

Mr. PEDLOW: But they are possible, are they not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, they are possible.

Mr. BALDWIN: Having been connected with mercantile business for some time, this subject interests me and brings to my recollection several incidents. In the case of impure food the revenue officer enters a store and buys the commodity suspected, and if he finds any impurity the retail merchant is punished, while the wholesaler, who sold the commodity to him, goes free. Who is to determine the weights of goods? Can a customer buy goods at a store, take them home, weigh them, and return them because he claims they are short weight? If that is possible, it is going to be a very serious matter, and I would like to have that question answered before I say anything further on this measure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is the most difficult thing in the world to establish violation of a law of this kind; in fact, it is almost impossible for a private prosecutor to do so. He has no means of testing the weight of the article which he has purchased, and the probabilities are that detections can only be made by officers of the department in their peregrinations through the country. They may have communications from individuals respecting short weights given by some particular dealer, and when visiting his store or inspecting his scales they might observe the weights of articles which were being sold, and in that way they would be able to establish any inaccuracy.

Mr.McCOIG: Will the officers work under a similar system to that of the Government officials under the Drug Stamp Act?

An hon. MEMBER: I hope not.

Mr. McCOIG: The Government officials in a number of cases caught innocent storekeepers who had small boys as clerks. In one city I have in mind an official prosecuted ten or fifteen storekeepers and they were fined $50 each, and that official got a "drag" of $25 apiece out of those fines. If the officials under this Act are going to work on the same basis, there is reason to use every precaution possible to protect the public before this Bill is passed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think the cases are quite comparable. Whether or not a stamp was affixed to a package of patent medicines is a fact easily established; if it was not affixed, technically the offender is guilty. I do not think there is the same opportunity for abuse in this case as there might be in the case to which my hon. friend refers. I believe I may safely repeat, that all prosecutions under this section must necessarily be initiated by the officers of the department, and I trust they will always exercise their duties with some discretion.

Mr. PEDLOW: From personal experience, I can state that that is not usually the case with officers of Government departments, and I am not now speaking of this particular department. The point raised by the hon. member for Kent is well taken, and I regret to state that officers in this connection are not always, like Caesar's wife, above reproach. I have had similar experiences to that indicated by him. I know a case where an officer of the department visited the town of Renfrew and tried his level best to induce junior employees to deliver to him packages without a stamp on them, and he knew they should have been stamped, but he endeavoured to induce the employees to commit an offence under the Stamp Act. I know that from personal experience. The same man operated in every store in that town on the same occasion along the same lines. I feel that no merchant would be any safer in the hands of an official of this department. This will be the last and final appeal from me in this regard. I have known cases where dishonest buyers tried to make believe that their measure was short. The merchant has no protection under this Bill in cases where customers take the goods home, remove a portion of them and come back to the store claiming that the weight or measure was short.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This indicates again how difficult it is to prosecute, even under this section. The Act will never be invoked unless an officer of the department knows that a certain man is habitually given to short deliveries. The evidence can only be secured after a great deal of trouble, probably by the officer of the department being in the store when the deliveries are being made.

Mr. PEDLOW: I do not see, then, why the word "knowingly" should not be inserted after the word "who" in the first line.

Mr. McCOIG: The word "knowingly" is used in section 69; why should it not be used in this?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Because a man would know whether or not his scales were being tampered with.

Mr. BALDWIN: Where will this weight be taken, or where will the account be made to ascertain whether the measure is correct—at the counter, or after the customer has taken the goods home? Some twenty years ago I had in my employ a gentleman of high standing. A customer had been annoying him with frequent complaints of short weight, and he asked me what to do. I said: Do you know that you have made no mistake? He said: Absolutely. I said: You weigh him out a pound more sugar than he asks for the next time he comes, and give him thirteen lemons or bananas instead of a dozen. He did so, and there was no complaint. I said to him then: You may go to that customer and tell him that you have proof that he is not honest, because he has not reported the

extra pound of sugar or the fact that he was given thirteen instead of a dozen lemons or bananas. A man may come to a store and buy certain commodities, take them home, remove a portion of them and then call in an officer and complain that the weight or measure was short. Retail merchants have troubles enough to burden them; yet by this law you are putting them in the very clutches of dishonest people. I am also a lumberman. If I send a thousand feet of lumber out ten miles, it should be measured at the wagon; the customer should not report to me two weeks later that he did not get a thousand feet of lumber. We might as well close up business if such a law as this is on the statute-book.

Mr. PEDLOW: The measurement or weight of the merchandise should be checked at the counter by the customer, before he leaves the store. In the banks you are asked to count your change before you leave the counter; otherwise .no claim will be recognized. Under the circumstances, I move the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. There is already an amendment before the Committee which will have to be disposed of before the hon. member may introduce another.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: With reference to what my hon. friend (Mr. Baldwin) has said, the fact would have to be determined as any other fact is determined. It would be very difficult to secure a conviction for selling short weight if the purchaser took the articles to his home and kept them there for some time.

Mr. BALDWIN: Fifteen minutes would be enough—or two minutes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Or two seconds, for that matter; it would be very difficult to secure a conviction in that case. There need be no apprehension, therefore, about anybody being injured by this law other than the person who has clearly laid himself open for prosecution.

Mr. McKENZIE: The section of the Code referred to in the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) reads:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to three years' imprisonment who, with intent to defraud by any false pretence, etc.

There the intent is mentioned, as it is in every section of the Criminal Code dealing with such matters. Are we going to depart from that and give to officers of the class described a moment ago an opportunity of making money by going round the country, getting a fee from a man for seeing that his yardstick is the proper length and that his scales are in proper order, and then discovering something against him and imposing a fine on him whether he is guilty or not? That is going entirely too far. The minister has taken into his head the notion that it is proper to make criminal laws for all matters of this kind, and if in any of the ordinary transactions of life, a man is to be held criminally liable, if he happens to make a slip, that is breaking every principle I have ever known of in this country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We wish, really and practically, to modify the criminal law which now states that if a man wilfully sells short weight goods, he is liable to imprisonment. The officials of the department state that in practice they cannot secure a conviction, and they want some legislation enabling them to punish men by the imposition of a fine for failure to furnish that which a man has paid for.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister will furnish to this committee any tangible proof of protest coming from the people of any city or town in Canada that they are being defrauded by their grocers, I would certainly seriously consider the matter; but if this is only because the officers who travel around the country in search of convictions, find it difficult to make them, I have no sympathy with the Bill. If any men or women in Canada who go to buy tea, pork, fish or anything else to be found in a grocery store, complain of short weight, I am very sympathetic and will respond very quickly to any remedy, but I am not satisfied that there is any such complaint, and I have heard none.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are every year complaints by the hundreds to the department that goods are sold short in weight. On the other hand, the officers of the department believe that short weight deliveries are due, in most cases, not to fraud and deliberate intent, but to carelessness, and they want to prevent this carelessness, and if possible, by this legislation, to compel dealers to give purchasers that which they bought and which they paid for. I hope this law will assist in making men more careful about the deliveries they make.

Amendment (Mr. Jacobs) agreed to.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am still sorry that the minister is obdurate, unconvinced. He says

that complaints are from time to time coming in to the department, and I have no doubt of that, but am sure, when the department investigates the basis of the complaints, it will find that in the majority of cases they are without foundation and fact, and that the actual cases of short weights and offences of that kind are infinitesimal. No business man could continue long in business if he habitually delivered short weights and measures. According to this legislation one would think that the mercantile people of this country were a crowd of thugs, robbers and criminals, and that a wall had to be built round the public for their protection, as if the public were not capable of protecting themselves. From my experience, I have no hesitation in saying that should customers be given short weights or measures they very quickly go back to the store and demand their pound of flesh, and I do not think the minister is well advised in acting the part of Shylock in asking that this section pass. It may be not only the pound of flesh, but some of the heart's blood along with it, and it was the latter to which Portia objected so well. I move:—

5 p.m.

That section 61A be amended by inserting the word "knowingly" after the word "who" in the first line.

The principle underlying this amendment is admitted by the minister; it covers the point of carelessness, which is all that this Committee should be concerned in. If a man deliberately, habitually, commits this offence, then he should be penalized, but as the section now reads, if the action is only casual, occurring once in a while, he is liable to a penalty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We have discussed that principle pretty thoroughly, and I hope my hon. friend does not want to press the amendment. The sense of the Committee is, I think, that the section would be absolutely of no use if the word "knowingly" were inserted.

Mr. JACOBS: If, as the hon. member suggests, we insert the word "knowingly," we come into conflict with section 405 of the Criminal Code, which states that if any person knowingly commits this offence, he is liable to three years' imprisonment, so that we shall have the curious situation that, while one section of the law says that if a man knowingly commits this offence, he is liable to three years' imprisonment, another section says that he is liable only to a fine of $25. That reduces the matter to an absurdity.

Mr. PEDLOW: This does not conflict with the section quoted by the hon. member, but is in entire harmony with it. The word "knowingly" was used in the Criminal Code, showing that the framers of it were wise in their day and generation, and we would not be well advised in departing from the phraseology of that section.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Let us give the Bill a fair chance.

Amendment (Mr. Pedlow) negatived.

Section, as amended by Mr. Jacobs, agreed to.

On section 8—penalty for using counterfeit weights, etc.

Mr. McCOIG: In case of a conviction, will the officer laying the complaint be entitled to any portion of the fine or any fee?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Section agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. McKENZIE: On a former occasion I asked the minister about the testing of meters for measuring electric currents. In out part of the country, complaint is made that those meters are not properly inspected. The minister could not, at that time, tell me under which department the matter came. If it comes under this department, I should like to know if proper steps are being taken for the inspection of electric meters.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I remember my hon. friend putting that question to me, I think, on the first reading of the Bill. The officer of the department who is now with me is not in the electrical branch, but I shall make a point, to-morrow, before the Orders of the Day are called, to give my hon. friend an answer, and I must apologize to him for having overlooked the matter.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT. SEXUAL OFFENCES.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Acting Minister of Justice) Bill No. 78, to amend the Criminal Code (sexual offences), was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—seducing female employees:

Mr. PROULX: I presume that sections 1 and 2 are the sections we passed last year, but which were objected to by the Senate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—unmarried man and woman registering as man and wife at hotel, etc.

Mr. NICKLE: Before that section is carried, I think the committee might well consider whether the contemplated legislation does not go very much further than was probably intended by those who drafted the Bill. With the exception of the province of New Brunswick, adultery, I believe, has not been a crime in Canada. It is not in Ontario, or Quebec to-day, for a man to live in an adulterous relationship with a woman. The result is that there are in this country a great number of men and women who are and have been for some time living openly together as man and wife, though unmarried. If this section should pass as it is, it would mean that if any one of those persons went to an hotel with a woman or man as the case may be, and registered as man and wife, not being legally married, an offence would be committed and the person would be liable to imprisonment. I quite appreciate the object of the Bill, to prevent hotels and lodging or boarding houses being used as houses of assignation, but I do think there is a class of public that is entitled to be protected, more particularly at the present time when there are many men returning to this country who have not gone through the form of marriage with the woman with whom they are living, and intend to live. I therefore suggest for the consideration of the minister that the section be amended by adding thereto the following clause:

No persons who have been openly living together as husband and wife shall be prosecuted for an offence under this section.

If I might press the matter somewhat further, I would direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that there are in this country cases where a man and woman are living together as man and wife where a divorce has been obtained in a foreign country, and it is very questionable if the divorce is of legal and binding force according to the laws of Canada. Are you going to say that these people who have lived together as man and wife shall be subject to criminal prosecution, not because the relationship is illegal but simply because, perchance, they registered at an hotel or boarding house? The general purport of this legislation is good, but I do think there is a class of the public that is entitled to protection along the lines I have mentioned.

[Mr. Proulx.]

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I might also mention the case where a married man represents to a woman that he is unmarried and then marries her, committing bigamy. The woman who might be perfectly innocent would be liable under this section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amendment suggested by the hon. member for Kingston and the suggestion of the hon. member for North Grey, have come to my attention only this afternoon. With regard to the latter suggestion, from the momentary consideration I have been able to give it, it might well be that innocent persons, man or woman, might be prosecuted if the innocent one was at the time under the belief that he or she was legally married. I think the suggestion is worthy of a few moments' consideration by the Committee. The latter remark applies also to the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Kingston. The amendment, however, would be more easily accessible to abuse for the reason that it suggests no time over which the open living together as man and wife must have continued before it shall constitute relief from the penalties imposed by the Act. I would like the members to express their views particularly on the amendment and on the suggestion of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Middlebro).

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: By putting at the end of the section the words " knowing the same to be untrue ", it would improve the section.

The CHAIRMAN: It will be necessary first to dispose of the amendment of the hon. member for Kingston.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have no sympathy with, and I do not care to afford any protection to any man and woman who are living together in open adultery in this country. It may be permitted, but certainly it is in violation of everything we regard as good citizenship and good morals. Although perhaps we have not provided any direct law to punish it, we undoubtedly should not throw any protection around it. If any man and woman coming to Canada have not yet been married, or have had no opportunity of being married, they can be married in Canada and should immediately comply with the law. I am not in sympathy with the amendment and do not think it should be accepted.

Mr. NICKLE: The matter is not as simple as the leader of the Opposition supposes. He says that people coming to Canada can be married. That is quite true, but people

may not be in a position to marry. I will mention an instance that came to my attention within the last month. A Canadian went overseas leaving in Canada a wife who went off with another man. The soldier foolishly paid attention to a girl in England, and she, believing him to be single, married him, not finding out that he was a married man until a child was about to be born. She came to Canada with him but the child was born prior to their arrival. That woman is in Canada living with the man in Kingston, wife number one not desiring to live with him. It is not a legal offence for these two people to live together, and you cannot prosecute the man for bigamy because the offence was committed in England. Will it be contended that it should be an offence for this man and woman to register in a hotel as man and wife, notwithstanding the fact that they may legally live together in a private house? That would be an anomaly. I can give half a dozen instances of the same kind if necessary. I have no desire to throw protection around people of this class but I certainly think that we owe it to them not to set traps for them. That is the principle on which I advocate the amendment I propose. The endeavour apparently is to prevent a man and woman from going to a hotel and using it as a place of assignation, but it should not be held that a couple casually visiting a hotel should be treated as criminals simply because they register or otherwise conduct themselves as man and wife when they are not such in fact. There are men and women living in this country as married people who are not legally divorced from their previous husbands or wives. How unreasonable it would be to say that they should live together in private residences unmolested, but that because perchance they come to Ottawa to see the leader of the Opposition or go to Toronto to attend the opening of the legislature they should be made criminals if they register at a hotel.

Mr. EDWARDS: I can only attempt to argue this matter from the standpoint of common sense. It seems to me that the member for Kingston fails in his argument when he assumes that it is all right for these people to live together as long as they do not go to a hotel and register. I take the view that they are committing a moral offence, at all events, when they live together after discovering that they are not legally married. If they continue to live together they are committing an offence even if they do not go to a hotel and register. The leader of the Opposition has expressed the case exactly when he says that the passing of this amendment will be equivalent to this House countenancing the living together of people who have no right to do so. To take the case mentioned by my hon. friend of the English girl marrying the soldier in good faith. What course should she take on ascertaining the facts? I think she should leave him at once, and the fact that she may decide to continue living with him does not excuse either of them if they go to a hotel and register. There ought to be a law on the statute-books, if there is not, making it a criminal offence for people to live together who are not married.

Mr. NICKLE: I do not want the hon. member for Frontenac to put words into my mouth. Not for a moment did I suggest that it was all right for such people to live together. I was not discussing morals but law, and it is in that respect that my friend no doubt misunderstood me. I said that adultery, at least in Ontario and Quebec, had never been recognized as a crime. The hon. member may be quite right in saying that it should be made a criminal offence, but if we are going to make it such let us do so in a direct way and not set traps for people. What I said was that so long as the law of Canada did not recognize adultery as a crime, I thought it was unreasonable that those who were living together openly as man and wife should be made criminals simply because they went to a hotel, lodging house, or boarding house and represented themselves as being married. I object to setting traps for people who are innocently—if I may use that word without giving offence to the hon. member for Frontenac—doing something they would have a right to do under the general law of the country but which becomes an offence when they register at a hotel or boarding house, or represent themselves as having a certain status which they have not.

Mr. JACOBS: Is not this the same Bill that was before the House last year, passed the House, and was thrown out by the Senate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the legislation in exactly the form in which it passed this House.

Mr. McMASTER: I have listened with a great deal of care to what the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) and the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) have said. I incline to the view expressed by the member

for Frontenac and also that expressed by the member for Cape Breton; I am very much afraid that if we amend this clause as the member for Kingston desires us to do it may be construed as giving the endorsement of this House to these irregular relations. Now, my hon. friend from Kingston seems to think that there is something unfair to the people living in these irregular relationships in this respect: That if they are living in a private house the law does not recognize their relationship as a crime, but if they go to an hotel or boarding-house and register there it is a crime. There is a distinction to be drawn. While these people are living in their own house they are not brought into contact with other persons so nearly and so intimately as they are if they register in an hotel or in a boarding-house.

Mr. JACOBS: Brought into the same contact?

Mr. McMASTER: Not into the same contact. Let us take the case of a summer boarding-house. Two people living in this irregular relationship go into this summer boarding-house. They register as man and wife, they are accepted as such, and they may become friendly with the people—many of whom will be young persons—in that boarding-house. I think the situation is different when these people are living in their own house from what it is when they are living in a summer boarding-house, or any such establishment. I quite grant that it may be a little hard on such persons to be subject to this penalty if they go to an hotel; but after all, however we may sympathize with individual cases, or however we may in our own hearts condone their offence, nevertheless they have by their action prejudicially attacked the very basis of our society, and therefore I would think that the amendment of the member for Kingston cannot be accepted. I do not think we can accept it because I am afraid it would give the country and the world in general an improper and false idea of the attitude of this House and of the people of Canada towards sexual relationships.

Mr. HALLIDAY: We have a moral law to observe in Canada as well as a criminal law. There may be sympathy coming to the man and woman who live as man and wife before they are married, but I have not heard any reason expressed for such sympathy. The most binding law which should be observed in the world to-day is a law not enacted by this Parliament. If there is no law on the Statute Book prohibiting one of the greatest crimes that is taking place in this Dominion to-day, I think it is about time such a law was enacted. For my part I cannot let the opportunity pass without voicing my disapproval of it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I would move that the following words be added at the end of the clause:

Knowing the same to be untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: We must first dispose of the other amendment. Shall the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kingston be adopted?

Mr. JACOBS: Might I ask that the amendment in question be read, as I was not in the Chamber when it was proposed?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Kingston moves to add at the end of clause 4, to form part thereof, the following words:

No persons who have been openly living together as husband and wife shall be prosecuted for an offence under this section.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My reason for moving the amendment which I am about to submit is simply this: I think the Committee will agree that in most cases of bigamy, one of the parties is usually innocent. Now under the clause as it stands to-day if, under those circumstances, a bigamous marriage was contracted, the innocent party would not only suffer from the results of that marriage, but would be liable as well to imprisonment. The operating words of the section are that either of the parties "represents or pretends" that the man is the husband or the woman is the wife. What I say is that this should not be an offence unless the person who thus represents or pretends, knows that the statement is not true. Therefore, I would move to add to the end of the section, the amendment referred to. Then in a case of that kind the innocent party to the marriage contract would be protected.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I would agree with the hon. gentleman if his amendment did not impose on the prosecution the onus of proving a want of knowledge; I think the hon. gentleman will see the distinction there. I am not saying that his amendment does that, he has probably given more thought to the matter than I have, but if the onus of proving the want of knowledge does not rest on the person accused then we should be careful to see that it does. As my hon. friend knows, the onus must be somewhere. We want the onus placed

upon the right person, because it is very hard to prove that the party accused had such knowledge in a great many cases.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I would think that before any party is held to be guilty the proof of guilt must be forthcoming.

Mr. McMASTER: I am quite in sympathy with the amendment proposed by the member for Grey, but I do not think it is necessary. In order that a person be convicted under this section, the guilty knowledge would have to be established; there would have to be mens rea, and that being so, although I am absolutely in sympathy with the object of protecting an innocent party to these irregular alliances, I cannot see the necessity for the amendment.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I will submit this illustration to my hon. friend: An innocent woman accompanies a man to the hotel and the clerk asks: "Are you married"? and she replies, "Yes, I am married to this man here." In giving that statement she fully believes that she is married to him, yet under the section she would be guilty of an offence.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think she would be liable, because she acted in good faith.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: But the clause does not say that.

Mr. McMASTER: I submit wrongful intention would have to be established before the woman could be properly convicted under this section.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I would not want to take a chance on it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I might present my own opinion, in a most humble way, it would be that the hon. member for Grey is right in his contention that that knowledge would not require to be brought home unless the Act specifically called for such to be done. All that needs to be done to constitute an offence under the clause as it stands now is—we will take a single case—that a man by registering, or otherwise, represents that a woman to whom he is not married is his wife.

Now, all that has to be done is to so represent that a woman to whom he is not married is his wife; that itself the statute declares to be an offence. Consequently in my judgment—which I do not put forward as final by any means—unless we add "knowing the same to be untrue," this knowledge does not require to be brought home to the accused person.

So far as the point raised by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle is concerned, I would certainly be of the opinion without reserve, that if the law were to be amended merely as asked for by the hon. member for Grey, then the guilty knowledge would require to be brought home to the accused by the prosecution. It occurs to me—although I would like more time over these matters before discussing them—that it would be better to state that the onus of proof of lack of knowledge should be on the accused. And if the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) would so amend his amendment, then, subect to further discussion, I would be disposed to accept it.

Mr. JACOBS: What is the law in England with respect to these offences, particularly the offence under review?

Mr. MEIGHEN: So far as I know this does not constitute an offence in England.

Mr. JACOBS: Then why should we want to make it an offence in this country?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We establish our own standard of morality—

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —on the footing of our own conscience, instead of on the standard set by Great Britain.

Mr. JACOBS: The sources of our law are from Great Britain; we follow her closely in the enactment of criminal law.

Mr. McMASTER: Not necessarily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The principles of our law, particularly of our constitutional law, we derive from Great Britain; but our standard of morality we derive from our own conscience.

Mr. JACOBS: I am of the view that this clause is liable to produce blackmail on an unprecedented scale. This legislation is hysterical. I think the Criminal Code already sufficiently safeguards morality without the introduction of legislation of this kind.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I will withdraw my amendment and substitute therefor the following:

> The onus of proof of the absence of knowledge shall be upon the person asserting the same.

Mr. DEVLIN: While you are perfecting the section, would it not be well to insert something in reference to cohabitation? The simple fact of a man passing off a lady as his wife in a hotel is not in itself a crime.

Mr. JACOBS: How are you going to prove cohabitation?

Mr. DEVLIN: By their occupying the same room. They do not generally do so except for an illicit purpose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid that if you put in the necessity of proving intention to cohabit you would only increase the difficulty of enforcing the law, and you would not absolve any deserving case.

Amendment carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the section as amended carry?

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Chairman, I move as an amendment that the clause be struck out of the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's amendment is merely a negative. If he is opposed to the section as amended he is at liberty to vote accordingly.

Mr. JACOBS: This Bill was before the House last year and was considered rather hastily I am afraid. In the Senate, where perhaps, if not wiser, there are older heads than in this House, they look at matters with that detached attitude which in questions of this kind is essential, they came to the conclusion that the entire Bill was useless, that it was provocative of blackmail and other offences of that nature, and consequently they failed to pass it. In view of that I do not consider it wise to send the Bill again to the Senate this year. This Bill was, as I understand, prepared and drafted by some association for the propagation of morality generally. It is not a request coming from any well recognized body, nor is public opinion, I venture to say, in favour of it. In view of all these circumstances I do not think it should form part of our law, particularly as we have, as I said before, a sufficient number of provisions of this kind in the Criminal Code to act as a drag-net for people desirous of committing offences against morality. As a matter of fact, I think we have too many of these measures already and they are not sufficiently carried out on account of that very reason perhaps. I am against the clause as amended and intend to so vote.

Section as amended carried.

Bill reported.

MIGRATORY BIRDS CONVENTION ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 88 (from the Senate) to amend the Migratory Birds Convention Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—one-half fine to go to private prosecutor:

Mr. McKENZIE: This provision is something that I am opposed to on general principles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A treaty was entered into between United States and Canada for the protection of migratory birds. That treaty was ratified by Act of Parliament, and its provisions were embodied in the Migratory Birds Convention Act. The provinces, of course, had their own game laws, and, in the main, were enforcing them; but those provincial laws did not go far enough to ensure the protection of migratory birds. The subject matter having been dealt with by international treaty, the Dominion acquires jurisdiction; but the Dominion thought—and the migratory birds legislation is based entirely upon this hypothesis—that provincial legislation would be enacted to bring the laws in each province into conformity with the several provisions of the treaty and to provide for their enforcement. That hope has, to a large extent, been realized. Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have brought their game laws into full conformity with the Migratory Birds Convention; British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec have brought their laws into substantial conformity—for all practical purposes, into full conformity —with the provisions of the convention and are in a reasonable manner carrying out those laws. But we have not been able to secure from the Maritime Provinces the legislation desired. New Brunswick, instead of bringing its legislation up to the requirements of the Migratory Birds Convention Act, has repealed its legislation altogether and throws the whole onus on the Dominion, very much to the disappointment of those who have at heart the enforcement of our migratory bird laws. Nova Scotia has not gone so far as that. Perhaps, in order to be accurate, I had better read just what has been done in this connection:

New Brunswick has not amended its game laws to comply with the treaty, but has repealed all its laws protecting migratory birds, on the ground that that is a duty now devolving on the Dominion.

Prince Edward Island has not amended its laws to comply with the treaty, and has no warden service.

Nova Scotia has amended its game laws, but it has omitted protection for wild beasts and ducks—except black, wood and eider—

and the open season for Wilson snipe and woodcock does not meet the conditions of the treaty. Moreover, Nova Scotia say they have not an adequate warden service to enforce the Act.

That being the condition of affairs in the Maritime Provinces, it becomes necessary for the Dominion, having regard to its obligations under the treaty, so to amend its Act as to enable it to enforce the law in those provinces. We must take power, therefore, to pass regulations covering minor matters of enforcement to enable us to carry out the law—it having been originally intended that these minor matters should be taken care of, as before, by the provincial authorities. That is the reason for paragraph (aa) in section 1, as to power of regulation under section 4 of the present Act. The same reasoning applies to the Bill throughout. Section 2 provides for penalties for violation and for the bringing of the goods seized to a justice of the peace who has power to order confiscation. The last clause, to which the leader of the Opposition advances his general objection, is also made necessary by the very same cause.

The laws of the various provinces which are now enforcing the Migratory Birds Convention Act, provide for the allocation of the fines. The provincial governments appoint wardens and game officers who are not under salary, but who are entitled, where they secure a conviction, to divide the fines, and in that way the enforcement of the law is secured. As, however, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island refuse to enforce the law—and this applies especially to Nova Scotia; the others refuse chiefly to pass laws—we must provide for some division of the fines as well, in order that a system of enforcement may be put into effect, without the necessity of our employing salaried officers for the purpose. That is the reason of this section. The hon. member will find that in his own province this very same law is in effect by provincial legislation. I read from section 108 of the Nova Scotia Game Act:

> Every fine imposed and collected under the authority of this Act, shall be paid in full to the Chief Game Commissioner, who shall, except as elsewhere in this section provided, pay over the same to the Provincial Treasurer to be paid and applied to him as provided by section 104 of this Act.
>
> (2) When a complaint is laid and the information therefor furnished by a person other than a warden, the Chief Game Commissioner may pay one-half of the fine so collected to the complainant.
>
> (3) When the complaint is laid by a warden under information therefor furnished by any other person, the Chief Game Commissioner may pay one-quarter of the fine so collected to such informant.

So that the principle of the Nova Scotia statute is merely being embodied in this Bill to enable us to carry out the enforcement which apparently the province of Nova Scotia declines to carry out.

Mr. FIELDING: Has the matter been one of negotiation with the members of the Nova Scotia Government? It is very undesirable to have any conflict, and I thought perhaps, that when some of the ministers were here lately, they might have had an opportunity of discussing the matter with the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not conducted negotiations personally, but the Parks Branch has for many years been under the charge of Mr. Harkin, and I know he has been conducting negotiations, although unsuccessfully, with those three provinces. I know Mr. Harken is very grievously disappointed that he is not able to secure that provincial conformity in the Maritime Provinces that has been secured in the others, and the consequent enforcement of the law.

Mr. FIELDING: Does this mean that the Nova Scotia Government would regard this as a hostile measure, and that there would be a conflict between their laws and this?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want to speak too certainly on the point, but I rather think their attitude is this, that it is something of a burden and, inasmuch as we have made a convention, we should wholly bear that burden. I think I am safe in saying that they are quite in accord with the Migratory Birds Convention itself.

Mr. McKENZIE: The situation in Nova Scotia is that the administration of the Game Laws is entrusted to an association called the Game Association, which comes, sometimes, to the legislature for amendments to the law. I do not know exactly what view they take, but I would be very much surprised if the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia and the other members of the Provincial Government would do anything that would not be in harmony with the general law, and whatever is done is, I suppose, the finding of this Game Association, which collects those moneys, out of which they pay the game wardens in the different parts of the province. I would suggest to the minister that it would be well to endeavour to have no conflict as to the close season for game, wild and migratory birds. The close season is now covered by the laws of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly, but we are bound in honour to live up to the terms of our convention, and as I stated to the hon. member, I am satisfied that the terms of that convention were satisfactory. Naturally inasmuch as the enforcement of them bears upon citizens of the province, I presume the provincial authorities are not anxious to assume any greater share of that than they should. That is the general attitude. I realize there is no objection to this Bill; but if it passes, and if, hereafter, by the efforts of the hon. gentlemen or otherwise, the legislatures of the provinces can be induced to bring their laws into conformity and to undertake the enforcement just as the other provinces are doing that will be much more satisfactory to the department and make a much better system all round.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not anticipate any trouble, unless it be on the matter of expense, concerning which all our Provincial Governments are sensitive. I know that this class of legislation has been regarded very favourably in Nova Scotia in days gone by, and I feel quite satisfied that if an effort is made the two Governments can be brought into harmony in the matter.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

WAR EXPENDITURES—$350,000,000 VOTE.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister), Bill No. 68, for granting to His Majesty aid for demobilization and other purposes, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—payment of three hundred and fifty million dollars may be made:

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not want to press the objection, but I think this Bill should not come before the House until after the minister had made his Budget Speech, because it involves the giving of a very full explanation of the expenditures of Canada, particularly the war expenditures, from the commencement of the war down to the present time. I think the Committee and the House and the country would like to know how the moneys derived from the different loans have been expended in connection with the war, and how we stand generally in respect of our war and other expenditures. Possibly the minister intends to give us that information now, but I rather thought he told us not very long ago that he did not intend to divide his Budget Speech into two sections. For that reason I really think the consideration of this Bill should not be taken up until after the Budget Speech has been delivered. If the minister intends to go on with the Bill now, I trust that he will give the Committee the fullest possible explanation of our expenditure, particularly in respect of the war, the proceeds of the different loans, and what he proposes to do with the moneys which he will obtain under this Bill. It is quite true the minister may have been giving an explanation of these matters from time to time, but we have been so intent on winning the war that, speaking for myself, and I suppose that in this I am like the average Canadian citizen, I do not remember the details. Now that the war is over, I think it would be well to have a thorough reckoning of our borrowings and expenditures in connection with the war.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will recall that when the Committee of the Whole House had under consideration the resolution which preceded this Bill, in accordance with a practice which has been followed by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) during the years of the war, I made a statement as comprehensive as was possible of the expenditure upon the war from the war appropriation during the past year, and also placed upon Hansard in such detail as was possible an estimate of the expenditure which the Government expects to be obliged to make during the present fiscal year in connection with demobilization and for purposes arising out of the war. My hon. friend will find that statement in Hansard of this session, unrevised edition, beginning at page 1404. I do not regard it as at all necessary that the consideration of this Bill should await the bringing down of the Budget. The Budget statement deals with the expenditures for the past year and estimates the expenditure for the coming year; shows the amount of revenue received during the past year and indicates the amount which it is expected will be received for the fiscal year in which it is delivered, together with the proposals of the Government for additional taxation to meet the requirements as disclosed. I informed the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) that

I would give him as accurate a statement as I could of the war debt incurred up to the end of the last fiscal year. I indicated then that I thought it inadvisable that I should make, so to speak, two Budget statements, and I think the House will concur in the propriety of that view. It is my intention when the Budget is brought down to make as comprehensive and accurate a statement as I can with respect to the cost of the war to Canada to the end of the last fiscal year, together with an estimate, as nearly as it can be made, of the remaining expenditures which we shall have to make under the authority of this Bill for demobilization, including war gratuities and other expenditures arising out of the war, so that the House may have before it on the occasion of the Budget, as accurate a statement as possible of the total cost of the war to Canada from the beginning to the time when our accounts are practically closed out, with regard to the principle of war expenditure. There will, of course, remain the annual burden necessitated by our war debt and pensions, but I can assure my hon. friend that in the Budget I shall amplify the statement to the fullest extent with the view of disclosing to the House all the information in the possession of the Government respecting the matters which I have mentioned. While I stated that to the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon, I also said that I would endeavour to give him the figures, so far as available, to the end of the last fiscal year in a very brief statement, which I shall now place upon Hansard:

War Expenditure.

Year.	
1914-15..	$ 60,750,476.01
1915-16..	166,197,755.47
1916-17..	306,488,814.63
1917-18..	343,836,801.98
1918-19..	450,000,000.00 (Estimated.)

Net Debt Statement.

Estimated Net Debt March 31, 1919..	$1,584,000,000.00
Net Debt March 31, 1914.. ..	335,996,850.14
Increase of Net Debt..	$1,248,003,149.86

The war loans issued and outstanding aggregate $1,536,276,922.53. I stated the other day that our account with the Imperial Government showed a difference of over two hundred million dollars to the credit of Canada. I think that statement is all that I can give, or should be called upon to give, at the present time, in view of my intention, as expressed to the Committee, with respect to the Budget. If my hon. friend will turn to page 1404 of unrevised Hansard he will find the details of expenditures for the past year. They are necessarily incomplete because many expenditures have not yet been brought into account. My hon. friend is aware that many services are not brought into account of the books for some time after the end of March, and especially is that so in connection with war expenditures. On page 1405 he will find all the different items of our estimated war expenditure for the coming year, with some notes which may be useful in their consideration. The Minister of Militia is here to-night because a great part of the estimated expenditure for the year belongs to his department here and overseas.

Mr. BALDWIN: Do I understand the Acting Prime Minister to say that the accounts standing between Canada and the Imperial Government show two hundred million dollars to Canada's credit?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: I object to the portion of the clause with reference to promoting trade and industry. I understand that something like $25,000,000 is to be loaned to Rumania. Rumania is at war with Austria-Hungary at present and her credit may not be too good. Peace has not yet been signed and it is doubtful what countries will sign the treaty. I am opposed to the principle of lending the money of the people of Canada to the manufacturers of this country, for that is practically what this amounts to. There is an offer to Rumania, an offer to Serbia and I think to other countries to lend from $25,000,000 upwards, and the question arises in the first place as to the advisability of Canada going into the business of loaning money to the factories of this country to promote trade where they are not able to go out and get trade themselves. It is a fallacy to suppose that you can promote the trade of the country by furnishing credits to other countries to buy our goods. The trade of the country is done with trade; it is a trade arrangement. We are not going to sell Rumania wheat, live stock, butter or eggs. We are not going to sell Rumania directly anything from the farm, but we are going to sell to that country manufactured goods; we are going to sell Serbia manufactured goods, and to any of the countries, apart from Great Britain, that get a loan from this Government will be sold manufactured goods. Great Britain can float a loan here at any time, and if Rumania wants a loan here she should be able to float one on whatever terms are possible.

But certainly she should not be able to come to the Government of Canada and float her debentures here at par and take in exchange manufactured goods from this country. Canada to-day is indebted to Great Britain and to the United States. There is a heavy balance of trade against us, and we are in debt to various countries. Yet in the face of that we are going out to borrow more money from the Canadian people, or the British or American people to loan to another country. In other words, we are giving credit to doubtful customers at the expense of the people to whom we owe money to-day, with the result that we are only sinking deeper all the time. The manufacturers tell us they must have protection in order to cope in Canada with outside competition. Then they come back and tell us that they are not able to compete in the outside markets unless we supply them money to buy the goods. It can easily be seen where we are going to end if we attempt to furnish capital to the manufacturers to buy goods to ship out to all the countries that are practically bankrupt in order to make trade for our factories. The argument was used, when the resolution upon which this Bill is based was before the House, that we must keep the factories going in order to create employment for labour. If the Government were to say: We will furnish this credit on the condition that all the profits that are made in these factories shall go to the employees and not to the manufacturers—then I would consider the proposal as being more sane and more justifiable. But to allow the owners of factories to fix their own prices for the goods, and their own price for labour, and then come to the Dominion Treasury for the money to carry that out, is, I think, a great mistake. If Rumania is not able to pay, what is the alternative? What are we going to do when this $25,000,000 becomes due? We must increase our taxation to pay the interest on that loan; and when our Western friends are asking for reductions in the tariff, or for the adoption of free trade, they will be met with the statement: Our responsibilities are so great that we cannot reduce or abandon the tariff. We are virtually bonusing these factories, causing a greater public debt, going out to incur what are practically certain losses that will entail increased taxation on our people. The Government is not only going to pay out this money to the manufacturers of Canada, but it is shovelling the money out to some foreign country; and the people of the Dominion will be called upon to pay. Should the loans not be liquidated, we will have to continue to pay the interest on these loans ourselves, and that will simply mean increasing the burden of taxation. I do not believe it is the duty of this Government to furnish any special industry or any special class of people with money to carry on business. If the Government has too much money on hand it would be better for it to purchase land from those who are keeping it out of use and sell it or give it to the returned soldiers, or to these factory employees, to build homes for themselves, rather than to hand it to some foreign country that in all probability will never be able to make repayment.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS: The argument of my hon. friend is a most extraordinary one to my mind. He states that we owe Great Britain, the United States, and other countries certain debts, and he deplores the fact. I wonder how in the name of common sense he expects this country is going to pay its indebtedness to Great Britain, or to any other country, except by the exportation of goods. Surely he must be aware that Rumania also owes Great Britain very large sums of money. if we send goods to Rumania and finance them in Canada we are simply going that far towards the liquidation of our debt to Great Britain. Being a man of very high intelligence the hon. gentleman must know that as a rule goods are not exactly paid for in cash to the country from which they are bought. It may be Spain, or Portugal, or France, or Great Britain, that is sending us goods; we also send goods to those countries; and the final outcome is a settlement by the process of exchange. He objects strongly to this Government establishing a credit for Rumania to buy manufactured goods in Canada. If he is sincere he must just as strongly object to the Canadian Government establishing a credit for Great Britain or any other country—

Mr. CAHILL: Not Great Britain.

Mr. STEVENS: —for the purchase of other classes of goods. Of course I understand that my hon. friend will say, for the sake of his farmer constituents, that he does not object to financing the exportation of farm products, but he does object to financing the exportation of manufactured goods. It is this everlasting baiting of the manufacturer, or other industrial person or company, that is causing sectional discord in Canada. This country is going to prosper, not merely by building up the agri-

cultural industry—which I am interested in and most anxious to see built up—but also by building up the manufacturing and the industrial interests. Canada does not possess merely agricultural resources; it has other immense resources—minerals, timber, oil, fish, and innumerable others; —and if we are going to liquidate the future debt of Canada it will be by the development of these resources and by encouraging the manufacturer. An ordinary business concern cannot ship goods to the centre of Europe with the expectation of securing an adjustment in the ordinary banking way. That is clearly impossible, and has been impossible for months and for years but through the agency of the British Government and through the medium of our own Government and the usual governmental channels and avenues, we are enabled to establish a credit for this country, and thus to send our goods out and secure payment to our manufacturers. This is not a bonus. My hon. friend is absolutely misleading and wrong when he tries to imply that we are giving a bonus to the manufacturers; we are simply establishing a credit to enable our trade to go on.

I think there is one principle that this House should get clearly into its mind, and get there just as quickly as possible, and it is this: If we are to meet in the next few years the enormous burden that Canada has incurred we must meet it through the process of foreign trade, through the exportation, not only of agricultural products, but of every class of goods manufactured from our natural resources. Unless we do seize upon that as an elementary principle in our economics, and bend every effort to direct the policy of Canada towards the development of our resources, I fear for the future of the country. I give the Acting Prime Minister and his colleagues the greatest credit for the courageous manner in which they are grappling with this problem, and providing for a medium of exchange, for a credit, for these foreign countries—especially for the enormous credits supplied by the Minister of Finance during the last four or five years for Great Britain, and for our Allies overseas, and I would say the more the Government can arrange these credits the better it will be for this country and the sooner we will certainly be able to liquidate our public debt, and relieve ourselves from some of the burdens which are bearing so heavily upon us.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It seems to me that the demand for such an enormous amount of money as will be raised under this legislation should not be submitted to the House at this particular juncture. In my opinion we are passing holus bolus a part of the Budget which is to be brought down some time during this month, if I mistake not, by the Minister of Finance.

We are anticipating and voting piecemeal what should be presented in bulk by the hon. gentlemen. If it were a small amount I would not object so much, because I understand there are pressing needs at times which require speedy and special legislation; but here my hon. friend demands that a sum not exceeding $350,000,000 be raised, and he is surprised perhaps that we offer some objection—not obstruction—to his large appetite for money. The preamble of the Bill does not in my judgment give a clear view of the situation. It seems to me an anomaly that on the very day the Peace Terms are announced to this House by the President of the Privy Council my hon. friend should preface his Bill with these words:

> Whereas notwithstanding the armistice of the eleventh day of November last, and the extension thereof which has been granted by His Majesty and His Allies, has suspended the actual operations of the war between His Majesty and the German Emperor, the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary, the Sultan of Turkey, and the King of the Bulgarians, it is necessary that measures should continue to be taken for the common defence and security;

Shall my hon. friend for any longer period after the present eventful one come before Parliament and, always under the pretext of winning the war, ask for the speedy voting of such large sums of money? I hope not.

My hon. friend enumerates in section 2 the purposes of this legislation. Among the purposes mentioned I find: "(a) the defence and security of Canada." I am inclined to believe that this language does not convey quite the whole truth. The defence and security of Canada has never been so well provided for as at present. We have a large standing army, and our defence and security does not require, it seems to me, any large expenditure, if we have reached the millennium that has been sought for during so many centuries—that of permanent peace. The hon. Minister of Finance does not specify the amounts that are to be voted for each of the purposes enumerated, and consequently he does not say what amount out of this $350,000,000 will be applied to the defence and security of Canada.

Canada has during this great war done wonderfully well. She has raised, equipped and sent 500,000 men overseas, an army well

worthy of any great nation. But this was for the specific purpose of winning the war against autocracy. The nightmare is now over, the German Emperor and his allies have been thoroughly defeated. The people of this country made enormous sacrifices to maintain the honour and reputation of Canada. But, eager as they were to do their duty fearlessly and without questioning the heavy expenditure which was necessary, they are not in a mood—and I say it without any equivocation—to spend in the future, one quarter of the amount that has been spent annually during the last fateful four years. There is a general cry throughout the country that we should cut out the frills in the Department of Militia and Defence, that we should reduce mercilessly its expenditure and come back to normal. I hope that my statement will not be considered as anti-Canadian or anti-preparedness. I am simply voicing the feeling of the people in this matter. Before voting the amount asked for by this legislation, out of regard for the people and for Parliament, my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence should give us an outline of his peace-time policy. Hitherto all appropriations have been voted liberally and willingly in view of war times; but now we have reached peace times, and in this connection the Minister of Militia, in whose integrity and honesty of purpose I have the fullest confidence, should give to the country at the earliest moment his policy with regard to the organization of the defence and security of Canada during normal times.

With the second purpose of the Bill, "the conduct of naval and military operations in or beyond Canada and the demobilization of the Canadian forces," I am partly in agreement. Any money which is needed for the demobilization of our Canadian forces I am ready to grant immediately. But here again I require some assistance from both the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Naval Affairs. In mentioning the question of the defence and security of Canada in peace times, I had in mind our military organization on land—our military forces. But here reference is made to naval operations. I do not wish to re-open the naval debate, but might I not say here that the success attending the naval operations of Canada during this war—and those operations were successful, because our coasts were well guarded—was due entirely to the wise policy propounded by the late lamented leader of the Liberal party? Sir, what happened in 1911? The Liberal Government had passed legislation with a view to creating a naval force for Canada. That policy was combatted from two different angles. It was combatted in my own native province, because, forsooth, the defence of Canada by Canadian ships manned by Canadian officers and Canadian bluejackets was nothing less than suicidal. Canada, in the words of the opponents of that policy, was entering into the vortex of European militarism. That campaign carried some weight in the province from which I come. In Ontario the policy of a Canadian navy was combatted because, forsooth, it was too much of a Canadian policy and not sufficiently a British policy. I shall not refute both arguments at this moment, but I will say this: The Government that preceded this one came to office pledged at the first opportunity to remove from the Statute Book the blemish which the naval policy of the Liberal party was supposed to have placed upon it. But nothing of the kind was done. In 1914, when war was declared, the then Government was only too ready to use the much decried "tin-pot navy" of the Laurier Government, and Canada owes the protection of our coasts—of the Atlantic coast, at least—chiefly to the much abused Niobe and Rainbow. Subsequently the Naval Department, which had been organized under that policy, was reinforced and developed according to the provisions of that Naval Bill. It is a matter of pride for me, after so many years —eight years have elapsed since that campaign of 1911—to proclaim that, after all, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was right when he propounded that policy—a policy which, we must not forget, had been approved by the Imperial Conference of 1911 and accepted by the British Admiralty.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. gentleman object if it was proposed to lend the Niobe and the Rainbow to the British fleet?

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is a French proverb which my hon. friend may translate for himself: "A sotte question, point de réponse." We shall not be called upon to lend the Rainbow or the Niobe to the British Admiralty, which has been made much richer since the abject surrender of the German navy. But I should not be ashamed to lend to the British Admiralty, in case of emergency, the Canadian bluejackets and the Canadian officers who defended the coasts of Canada. The flag would be safe in their hands. I need not say, Sir, that I subscribe willingly and gracefully to a reasonable expenditure to

make permanent the Laurier naval policy which was so bitterly opposed in 1911 by some of the hon. gentlemen whom I see before me, but which, after all, has been adopted and will remain the permanent naval policy of Canada. But we are entitled to know from our great Canadian admiral, the Minister of the Naval Service (Mr. Ballantyne) his policy for peace times, as we should know from the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn)—two good Liberals, by the way, lost on the other side—

Major-General MEWBURN: Lost, but not forgotten.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —his policy for our military forces on land during peace time. Am I asking too much from the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White)? Am I obstructing in asking that? I believe not. He is asking us, in anticipation of the Budget, to vote $350,000,000, are we not entitled to know the policy of Canada for normal times as regards our land and naval forces? Clause (c) reads:

Purposes—the promoting of trade and industry and transportation facilities therefor.

I agree with the statement just made by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill). I am not enamoured with this Rumanian venture, especially when I see that Rumanian bonds are being marketed from bucket shop to bucket shop and passing through the hands of Sir Clifford Sifton, who, by the way, has opened an office in the building rented by the Canadian Trade Mission in London. The Government, I think, should have prevented any such desecration of Rumanian bonds. If my hon. friend in asking us to vote money for the promoting of trade and industry and transportation facilities therefor is sincere and earnest, as he ought to be, I am in accord with him; but again I say if in those times of peace to which we are looking forward there is one Cabinet minister who ought to be in his seat, it is the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). During the last few years, we have been sadly missing the presence of a Minister of Trade and Commerce. Far be it from me to say one word against this right hon. gentleman (Sir George Foster), in whose ability I believe and for whose splendid eloquence I have the utmost admiration. He has, I believe, been one of the best public servants of Canada; he is one of the Nestors of this House; but I am repeating only what I read every day in the Unionist press when I say that as Minister of Trade and Commerce he has been a great failure. He has not taken to heart his position as Minister of Trade and Commerce, a department which has been sadly lacking in force, ability and foresight to develop the trade of Canada. Canadians are often called "the lion's cubs." That means, I suppose, that we are the true sons of John Bull, who is the master merchant of the world, who for centuries has been sailing and trading on the seven seas of the globe. Not to speak of our high tariff, which is a barrier

9 p.m. to our commerce, we have done nothing to even imitate from afar what has been done by John Bull and Uncle Sam. Long before the armistice was signed—and my authority is the London Economist and some financial reviews in England and the United States—England and the United States had their trade agents in all parts of the world. Any western member will tell us that in the far Canadian West, representatives of American firms have been trading with our Canadian farmers long before our own Canadian manufacturers. I have seen that stated in the press and I have heard it from the lips of my hon. friends who represent western constituencies. Therefore, anything which will tend to promote our trade and industry, I shall willingly grant to my hon. friend, but what does he intend to do? Has he given this Committee any explanations? Is he going to establish agencies and in what parts of the world? Is he going to create new avenues of trade and commerce? He does not say. What will our new tariff be?

We are at the present moment building a fleet of steamers. Some months ago I was present at the launching of the Canadian Voyageur in Montreal, in my own constituency, at Vickers, and on that occasion I heard speeches delivered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and some other prominent gentlemen from Montreal, and I read in the press that the Government had a very large programme of naval construction. But to my dismay, to my horror, I find that the ships we have been building in Canadian shipyards with Canadian material, are being used not for transportation facilities between Canadian and foreign ports, but by the wily Yankees between their ports and other foreign ports. This little item came to my hand the other day:

Barbados—Steamer Canadian Voyageur—Farr, J.—3,000 bags sugar.

That is the consignee.

St. Lawrence Sugar Refining Co.—11,500 bags sugar.
Armstray, L. W. and P.—8,000 bags sugar.

This was carried from Barbados to New York. Now it is strange that our ships should not find any business for Canadian ports—Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, St. John, Three Rivers or even Toronto—in the exporting of Canadian produce. Have we built those steamers to send them to United States ports, to take on cargoes there for other foreign ports?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This particular sugar shipment came from Cuba, I think, and was consigned to the St. Lawrence Sugar Refinery. At the time the shipment was made the Voyageur could not get up the St. Lawrence, I understand, because the river was frozen.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about Halifax, St. John, and Gaspe?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The railway rate would operate against those ports.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend must confess in all humility that the interests of Halifax were not well served.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend had been Minister of Trade and Commerce, instead of being minister of all trades in the present Government, he would have seen that the Voyageur sailed from a Canadian port to a foreign port. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, and I am in earnest, we have done practically nothing. I know, of course, that our export trade during the war has wonderfully increased, but this was due to our war industries, and there is an end to those industries. To-day we must revert to peace trade and peace activities, and long before peace was declared an army of commercial agents from England and the United States were marching through many countries in order to capture as much as possible of their trade. I am told that Mr. Hoover himself, although his mission was to feed the Central Empires, has captured the blue ribbon for the United States, having secured enormous orders for American concerns. But Canada has done nothing at all.

Mr. BURNHAM: How did he do it? By advancing them money?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance either to secure a good sinecure for the present incumbent of the Department of Trade and Commerce —I want the best for Sir George Foster, because he deserves it—or to promote him to some other department and appoint in his stead some "live wire" so that Canada shall secure some of the world's trade in the coming peace times.

I said a moment ago that this legislation is a camouflaged Budget, and it is. In connection with this third purpose "the promoting of trade and industry, and transportation facilities therefor" the Minister of Finance owes the country an outline of the fiscal policy of the Government. Does he believe that trade and commerce and industry can be promoted if the country is kept in ignorance of the tariff changes that are to be made? Surely not. My hon. friend must know the sentiment of his followers. To use a somewhat vulgar expression, which is nevertheless in common parlance, he is between the devil and the deep sea—between the high protectionists on the one hand and the free traders of his party on the other—and he is simply marking time, awaiting the return of the Prime Minister or some heavenly inspiration. I am afraid, however, that his inspiration will come from the opposite direction.

The fourth purpose is this: "The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the war." Mr. Chairman, I am afraid of that purpose. I am not timid; I have some courage left in my bones, but I must confess I am really in dread of that fourth purpose. What are those measures that are deemed necessary? What are those vague measures that are deemed advisable? Should not those measures be made known to Parliament, and not left to the sweet will of the Governor in Council? Already the practice of governing by Order in Council has been too much abused, and I am really in dread of what may happen when my hon. friend is granted the powers he is seeking under this fourth purpose.

The fifth purpose is this: "Payments made on expenditure incurred during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and nineteen, for the purposes mentioned in the War Appropriation Act, 1918, and in excess of the amount authorized by the said Act." It is true that my hon. friend gave the House the other day row after row of figures running into the millions—indeed into the hundreds of millions of dollars. We must face the situation; the millions are there. As Mr. Thiers, the liberator of the French territory, once said, referring in the House of Representatives in France to the inevi-

table expenditure of several millions: "Saluez, Messieurs, vous ne les reverrez plus." After having seen my hon. friend marshalling his long array of millions the other day I also am inclined to repeat with Thiers, "Hats off, gentlemen; you shall never see those millions again." To be serious, I think my hon. friend should take us into his confidence a little more. Assuredly, I am not asking him to give us the inner secrets of his soul; I am not asking him to unbosom before this House, because it would be a terrible confession and I am afraid there would be no absolution for the many crimes he is guilty of. But at least he should pay the taxpayers of Canada the compliment of telling them why this enormous sum of money is needed, and to what specific purposes it is to be applied. I am afraid of being accused by my hon. friend of obstruction. I will say no more, but I again appeal to him to be a little clearer as to numbers 3 and 4, and to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and also the Minister of Naval Affairs I would suggest that we might have an outline for the benefit of the country of their respective policies.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have listened with considerable interest to the hon. gentleman's eloquence, but I am at a loss to understand several of the statements he has made. If he will turn to Hansard of April 29th, when I had my main estimates for the Militia Department before the Committee, he will see that he was very complimentary to me on that occasion when I attempted to give a brief résumé of the future policy of the militia forces of Canada. The portion of the Bill now before the Committee does not include one item for the upkeep of the military forces of Canada after demobilization. My hon. friend will see that on page 1404 of unrevised Hansard, April 10, the Acting Prime Minister gave complete details of expenditure, particularly of the militia forces of Canada in connection with this Bill. I am sure my hon. friend is as anxious now, as he always has been, to assist in every way the prosecution of the war by paying for our soldiers overseas. I do not believe for a moment that he means now to leave those soldiers alone and not consider the complete demobilization of the troops. Every dollar of this expenditure is simply to pay the allowances of soldiers on active service to-day, including war service gratuity; deferred pay, which amounts to some $36,000,000, which is money belonging to the troops, held back in the wisdom of the Government, and now being paid them on discharge, plus interest; also assigned pay some $11,000,000; separation allowance to dependents of the troops; and subsequent items including transportation and feeding of troops until complete demobilization. Therefore, no portion of the money included in this Bill is to be utilized for the upkeep of military forces beyond the period of complete demobilization, which I am just as anxious as any one else to see carried out as early as possible.

Regarding the future policy as far as the militia is concerned. I regret that my colleague the Admiral of the Fleet (Mr. Ballantyne) is not here to give an account of the Navy, but I explained the other night as to the future policy of the military forces, that, after very careful consideration, we appointed an inter-departmental committee to consider ways and means for reorganization. The Chairman of the Committee is General Otter, who has had a very large experience in the militia of Canada; and it is also proposed to have an officer who has had distinguished service at the front, one from the permanent force, one from the active militia, and one who has never been associated with the militia until this war. The Committee are to visit the various military districts, to consider ways and means and probably at another session of the House to bring in some concrete proposal as to how far the militia should go. The duty of the committee is to consider and report how best to give effect to the proposal that with a view to preserving their traditions and identities, the several units of the C. E. F. which have served at the front should be incorporated in the Canadian Militia—this without avoidable increase of establishments, without prejudice to the divisional system of organization, and with due regard to the services which at various times, both before and during the war, the militia itself has rendered. That is practically the substance of the duties of the committee. The present idea is to endeavour to rehabilitate the militia units as well as possible. The permanent corps had a strength prior to the war of 3,000, kept up during the war for service overseas by reinforcements. Those men who come back are entitled to discharge or to go on pension. It is proposed to increase that permanent force as a temporary measure to 5,000 men throughout Canada. That will be practically all the force in Canada, and will be held in aid of the civil power if necessary. At the present time it is not proposed to train the militia which is in a disorganized state. Possibly it may

be considered necessary to train a portion of the militia next fall, but no definite policy has been arrived at and I think it would be premature for us to lay down a concrete military policy just at present.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend must have in mind the very large reduction in the expenditure of the Militia Department for peace time. Can he state what he thinks approximately will be required in the future for the appropriations of the Militia Department? What amount does he expect to apply as appropriations for the Department of Militia and Defence in the future?

Major-General MEWBURN: I should say approximately from four to seven million dollars.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wanted to know what was in my hon. friend's mind for the future in peace time. It is a relief to hear that he intends to live up to $4,000,000, but he will have to cut many frills.

Major-General MEWBURN: At present the problem of demobilization, not only bringing troops back, but clearing up all records, documents, etc., is an enormous one.

For instance, at the present time some one hundred and seventy thousand ledger sheets have been returned from overseas within the last few weeks—that is, ledger sheets of the individual troops that are coming over as the men are demobilized. The work of checking and dealing with every individual man's account is enormous. In addition, there are some five hundred tons of files being gradually returned from overseas to the Militia Department here. That includes all the records and documents that have been moved from General Headquarters in France back to England, and the records and documents from the various Record Offices in England. It takes an enormous amount of labour and some staff to complete and get all these documents into shape. Furthermore, there is the file containing documents of every individual man with the Canadian Expeditionary Force, amounting in all to over six hundred thousand files. These documents, containing the medical history of every man, it is most essential should be carefully kept so as to protect this country in the matter of claims for pensions in the future. The Pension Department requires these files, also the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment—when the men are discharged, which work has nothing to do with the Militia Department—and the Land Settlement Board in connection with soldiers' settlement. Then there is the large problem of hospitalization. We are taking care of the returned soldiers—officers, non-commissioned officers, and men—in the various hospitals throughout Canada, and we estimate that by next February we should be through with the military hospitalization, but that is only an estimate. In November, 1918, the casualties of Canadian corps were something like 45,000. The difficult problem was to estimate the number of casualties or invalids coming back to Canada. We estimated, as well as we could, on information from the medical service, that somewhere about May there would be approximately 18,000 invalids still coming back from overseas. I am glad to say that we were generous on our estimate; that the patients in the military hospitals in England are being evacuated a little quicker than we expected and becoming convalescent cases. The last figures from France, I think, showed that there were about seventeen hundred still to be evacuated from that country. The total number of patients in England and France up to a week ago was slightly under 14,000, but many of these—

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many are there in Canada?

Major-General MEWBURN: In the various hospitals in Canada close on to 14,000. A very large number of those men, if they do not require any further treatment in the military medical hospitals, will be discharged, and will come under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment for vocational training, and so on. Referring to the amount that is required out of this particular vote, it is purely and simply to complete the pay and allowances, and deferred pay and war gratuity for the troops that are on active service. We estimate that if we have no setbacks, our troops will be brought back from overseas by August. There may be some hospital staffs and other details remain for a further period, but by the end of this year, I have every expectation, the whole of these staffs will be cut down to the very lowest minimum, and nobody will be retained except to carry out the problems of cleaning up. I believe we shall enter upon next year with a very small staff both at Headquarters and in the military districts. I am quite satisfied of that. I think if my hon. friend would look at these items on the page referred to, he will see that they have nothing

to do with the future upkeep of the militia and are not intended for military purposes in Canada beyond actual necessary cleaning-up purposes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: So the expression used here, "Defence and security of Canada", has reference only to the war situation?

Major-General MEWBURN: Only to that.

Mr. MORPHY: While we are upon this subject, I would like to draw the minister's attention to a phase of military life which has been brought out in a letter received by me to-day from a soldier's father. Speaking in regard to his son, the writer says:

> He enlisted at London, Ontario, in December 1915, went to England in January 1916, and to France in June 1916, and has been there on active service ever since, while his wife and child are with us. The Canadian Authorities in Division One, London, Ont., took the initiative in the signing up of the boys conducting their medical examination, etc. They advised them to enlist in the Imperial Mechanical Transport, as the C.E.F. at that time did not need any more recruits. They took their advice. Had my son signed up with the C.E.F., he on discharge would have been entitled to $100 per month for six months, a total of $600. Instead of that the B.E.F. will only grant $75 all told, a difference of $525.

Now since this Bill, as it is worded, refers purely to the demobilization of Canadian soldiers, I thought it would be an opportune time to ask the minister whether he intends in the expenditure of these moneys to provide to the extent of $525 for the war gratuity of a young Canadian soldier who is married and has a wife and child? If the minister intends to do nothing in that direction, will he make representations, if such may be proper, to the Imperial authorities to influence them to act equitably to this young man who was misled, according to my information, by the officers of the minister's department at London. On inquiry, I find that there are overseas many hundreds of Canadian young men who have gone to the front in some capacity or other, having either transferred to, or enlisted directly in this country in, the Imperial Forces. If the Imperial Government are doing nothing for these young men, I want the minister to tell me whether he intends to do anything for them, and whether this fund will be available for that purpose? If the minister replies in the negative, I would say that I would be rather ashamed to live in the country if such inequity should be passed out to these young men who fought for their King and country as Canadians in the Imperial Army. I take this opportunity of asking the minister whether he has considered the matter, and if he has not done so, to state, if he can, that he will consider it and that he will look favourably upon the application which I am making on behalf of these men.

Major-General MEWBURN: The subject which the hon. member has raised has certainly been given a good deal of consideration, particularly of late. The war gratuity does not apply to such a man as the hon. gentleman has referred to, but I may say that some little time ago suggestions and claims came from different soldiers regarding the war gratuity. A few of the class are Imperial army reservists, who, when the war began, left Canada and rejoined their units. The claim has been made that those men should participate in this war gratuity, or be paid the difference between what they received from the Imperial Government and what Canada is giving. There were also pensioners resident in Canada who returned to England and re-enlisted—I am speaking of British pensioners, on whose behalf application was made; likewise, men who especially enlisted in Canada in the British Army Service Corps and the Royal Engineers; men who enlisted in Canada and the United States (British subjects), and Canadians who enlisted while overseas in the Imperial Forces.

I may say for the information of my hon. friend that a committee has been working on this for the last week, and while it is not a Committee of the House, I understand, unofficially, that several hon. members who have had those matters brought before them have been meeting and are drafting a memorandum, which I believe they are giving to the Government, and I know it includes such items as those. Whether the Government can see their way to concede those or some other items, I am not prepared to say. But there are a great many hardships. A great many Canadians I know joined the Imperials, and a large number of university graduates went over to England and took commissions. I understand the Imperial Government are giving very much larger gratuities to officers than the Canadian Government, but not anything like what we are giving to the rank and file. But that matter is having our most serious consideration.

Mr. KEEFER: Will the Northwest Mounted Police who were reservists be included? I happened to travel on the same

train when they were going overseas, and among them was Michael O'Leary, who later won the V.C. They were very anxious to return to Canada after the war, and hoped to have a stake in the country when they came back.

Major-General MEWBURN: That particular man, I think, is in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Mr. KEEFER: No.

Major-General MEWBURN: They are included in the same lot.

Mr. DUFF: I am very pleased indeed with the explanation given by the Minister of Militia as to what he intends to do regarding militia matters, and it is interesting to know that he has already appointed a committee of eminent soldiers who during the next twelve months will visit the different militia districts and get information to enable him to lay a concrete proposition before the House next session. I understood from his remarks that these three gentlemen are military men. I have no objection to their appointment, but I would suggest for his consideration that he also appoint to that committee at least one business man. It seems to me that the matter should not be left entirely in the hands of men who have served in the army or who are officers of the Militia Department.

Dealing with section 2 of this Bill, I see that a part of the $350,000,000 to be borrowed is to be spent (a) for the defence and security of Canada; and (b) for the conduct of naval and military operations in or beyond Canada and the demobilization of the Canadian forces. I do not think it is necessary to spend much time in discussing subsection (a), because the Minister of Militia, when his Estimates were being discussed recently, convinced me that it is not his intention to spend any money in the defence and security of Canada except what is absolutely necessary to continue the staff at headquarters and to provide for the upkeep of other pre-war military organizations in different parts of the country.

With regard to subsection (b), I am in hearty agreement with that portion which states that this money is to be spent for "the demobilization of the Canadian forces." I think we all agree that every effort should be made to have our Canadian boys returned from France and England at the earliest possible moment, so they may be discharged and take their place again in civil life. But with the first part of this subsection "for the conduct of naval and military operations in or beyond Canada," I am not in agreement. I do not think it is necessary to provide that one dollar should be expended in military operations during the year 1919, except as outlined by the Minister of Militia. Instead of spending money on military operations, we should strain every nerve to cut our expenditures down to the very lowest possible minimum. Let us see what we have spent for this purpose in the last four years. In 1914-15, the first year of the war, we spent $53,176,613.55; in 1915-16, $160,433,416.42; 1916-17, $298,291,030.66; 1917-18, $316,669,871.95, and in 1918-19 to March 31, $289,229,119.38, making a total expenditure of $1,117,791,051.96 to equip and send our boys overseas and maintain them there. In addition there was spent on account of military hospitals about $12,800,000, and with our other expenditures in connection with the war we spent up to March 31 of this year a total sum of $1,225,114,112.36. A great deal of criticism has been directed against the extravagant expenditure of part of this money, but so far as the Department of Militia and Defence is concerned, we have the satisfaction of knowing that while they have spent an enormous amount of money, and in some cases have spent it not as wisely as we would like to have it spent, yet they despatched at least 500,000 men overseas to fight for the Empire, and Canada to-day realizes that the splendid valour shown by our soldiers on the battlefields of Flanders and Belgium fully justifies the action of the Department of Militia and Defence. Consequently, while as I said before there may be some criticism of the manner in which portions of this large amount of money were spent, yet Canadians everywhere feel that they have received value in return for what has been disbursed.

What about the Naval Department? My good friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) thinks that the naval defence of Canada is a great deal better than it really is. Perhaps the reason for that is that "distance lends enchantment to the view," and my hon. friend, living as he does in Ottawa, does not know a great deal about naval defence on either the Atlantic or the Pacific coast. Since 1914 the enormous sum of $30,982,683.22 has been spent by the Naval Department on what is termed "strictly war expenditure;" and in addition millions of dollars have been expended in keeping up the dockyards and naval colleges at Halifax and Esquimalt and in paying the salaries of officials

at Ottawa, Halifax and other places. Speaking for the moment of what is termed "strictly war expenditure," in 1914-15, $3,096,125.35 was expended; in 1915-16, $3,274,019.94; in 1916-17, $3,806,329.19; in 1917-18, $9,666,229.14; and in 1918-19 to March 31, $11,139,979.60; making, as I said before, a grand total of $30,982,683.22

I am going to show, Mr. Chairman, that this $31,000,000 was practically all wasted, that it was not spent in the interest of the taxpayers of Canada; that it was entirely unnecessary, and did not in any particular, or in any way help to defend Canada or to protect the property of her citizens.

Before trying to show the Committee exactly what has happened during the war, I think it would be well for a few moments to give the history of naval matters in Canada. In giving this short résumé of naval history, I do not intend to deal with the matter from a political standpoint.

In 1909 Sir George Foster introduced into the House of Commons a resolution, the substance of which was that Canada should proceed with the building of a Canadian navy for the protection of our own coasts. This resolution, with a slight amendment made by the leader of the Government, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was adopted by the whole House, the members being unanimous in their decision that this was the proper course to pursue. In 1911 the Government called for tenders for the construction of cruisers of the Bristol type, and at the time they went out of power in 1911 tenders had been received from a firm in Canada which was willing to build these ships. No action was taken on these tenders by the incoming Government, and the whole matter was dropped for a year or two until Sir Robert Borden introduced a resolution to pay to Britain $35,000,000 to purchase three dreadnoughts, and, in a speech delivered by him, abandoned the Canadian navy. Some of the arguments which were used by Sir Robert Borden were that it would take fifty years for Canadian workmen to learn how to build these ships, and that we could not supply riveters. In view of the fact that for the last few years Canadian workmen have been turning out steel ships in different shipyards in Canada, the argument is refuted that we could neither build the ships nor provide the riveters. Most of the work which has been done in the last few years by Canadian workmen is second to none and will pass inspection by either Lloyds or the American Bureau of Shipping.

At the same time it will be remembered that Mr. Winston Churchill informed us that there was no land in Canada suitable for building these ships, a statement which at the time was laughed to scorn by every person but those who wished to damn the idea of a Canadian navy.

The Senate of Canada refused to sustain the vote of the House of Commons, and consequently the $35,000,000 never reached England, and the whole matter of a Canadian navy or of a contribution to the British navy died a natural death.

It is true that at this time we had at Halifax the Niobe and at Esquimalt the Rainbow, two cruisers which had been purchased by the Liberal Government. Up to 1911 the crews of these ships had been kept at full strength and had been used for training purposes so that young Canadians could take courses in naval instruction. Shortly after Hon. J. D. Hazen assumed the position of Minister of Naval Affairs the crews of these ships were disbanded, the boys sent home and only a few men kept on board to act as caretakers. It is just as well—perhaps, though it is not as well—that the gentleman who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here to-night to answer what I have to say. I may add that I do not lay any blame at the door of the hon. gentleman who to-day has charge of the Department of Naval Affairs (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne), because at the time he took charge, matters were in such a condition that it was impossible to remedy them. It is well, perhaps, that the gentleman who was in charge of naval affairs at that time now has a good, soft position in New Brunswick. A black eye was given the Canadian navy when the action of the then Minister of Naval Affairs showed that he was not in sympathy with any Canadian naval movement. Consequently, when the war broke out, the Niobe was not in fit condition to help protect the coast of Nova Scotia. Although immediately upon war being declared, orders were sent to Halifax to prepare the Niobe for sea and a part crew was sent from Esquimalt to man her, it was found that her boilers were in such condition that it would take several months to put her in a seaworthy condition. I make the statement here that if the Niobe had been ready to proceed to sea the morning that war was declared she would have succeeded in capturing prizes which would have paid the Canadian expenditure for war purposes during the first year of the war.

It was certainly humiliating for Canadians at Halifax to see this ship tied to her dock, grounded on her beef bones, weeks and weeks after hostilities had commenced

and also to know that the German-Hamburg liner Willehad, with a rich cargo on board, worth millions of dollars, steamed down the gulf of St. Lawrence, proceeded along the Nova Scotia coast and sought refuge at Portland, while the Niobe was tied up with a chain at her port bow, a chain at her starboard bow, and two chains over her quarter deck so that she could not put to sea. It was also humiliating for Nova Scotians to know that the North-German-Lloyd steamer Princess Cecelia left Boston a day or two after war commenced with the most valuable cargo ever shipped from that port and with a million dollars of gold in her strong box, and that no effort could be made by the Niobe or by any Canadian cruiser to go out and capture that ship, although fishermen off Cape Sable reported seeing her steam down the Nova Scotia coast and leisurely turn back and make for Portland, Maine.

The Government awoke at last to the fact that something had to be done. They realized that the British Government required all their battleships, cruisers and destroyers to protect their own interests in the North sea and to keep the lanes of commerce open; consequently they realized that they could not purchase or arrange with Britain for any of her ships. It became necessary for them, therefore, to endeavour to provide ways and means to protect some of the ports on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and they proceeded to waste money in the purchase of a lot of small boats which were utterly useless for defensive purposes. Orders were given to shipbuilding firms all over the country, and boats of the drifter and trawler class were contracted for and feverishly rushed to completion. A number of retired English officers were sent to this country to help organize a Canadian naval service. Naval recruits were asked for, captains and first mates were taken from the merchant marine service and held around Halifax for months drawing pay and doing nothing, for the simple reason that there was nothing for them to do. The story is a disgraceful one and should bring the blush of shame to every Canadian.

In the meantime there were being gathered at Halifax a motley collection of broken-down tug-boats, gentlemens' yachts, second-hand trawlers and drifters and the new boats which were being launched. A few of these boats were used for gate purposes at Halifax and proved more of a nuisance to the shipping interests of the country than anything else. When it was found that Halifax was full of these boats, a base was established at Sydney, and when the war came to a close some seventy-five boats of all kinds were tied up to the wharves in Sydney harbour. I have no hesitation in saying that the large expenditure of money for naval purposes at Sydney harbour was absolutely wasted; that no good resulted from having these boats in that harbour. Owing to their condition they were constantly undergoing repairs, most of them were unseaworthy and were not fit to go outside the headlands. It is true that in this way they were given something to do. Some of these little gasoline patrol boats were sent out to Low Point and held up all Canadian fishing boats or schooners that came to Sydney harbour, instead of allowing them to pass without delay on their way in and out.

One of these boats known as the T. R. 30 was ordered to sea one morning, and on account of the condition of the boat's deck, seven of the seamen refused to proceed to sea unless the deck was caulked. Water had been pouring down the decks into the bunks of these seamen for several days. They reported the matter to their officer, and he reported it to the officer in command at Sydney, who refused to have anything done. These men were court-martialed and sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment, and the mayor of Halifax protested against the sentence. I purpose putting on record the correspondence between the mayor and Mr. Desbarats, Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs. This item first appeared in the Halifax Herald:

> Major Hawkins says there were seventy-one prisoners at Rockhead on Sunday.

Rockhead is the Halifax jail or penitentiary, where these boys were incarcerated:

> He told this at the Board of Control meeting yesterday, and said further that there were there since August last a number of boys, some of them from good families and environment, who say that they complained at Sydney of unseaworthiness of a trawler on which they were serving, were tried there by court martial, brought here in irons and put in the city prison for eighteen months. The mayor said he had written the minister, Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, in reference to the matter. "Shipping laws are severe", said His Worship, "but it strikes me these boys got a raw deal from the Naval Department. They say no naval rules or regulations were read to them." His Worship was informed that the boys had refused to go to sea in the trawlers. If they had deserted, they might have got but ninety days. They were ignorant of what they were doing, he said.

This item must have come to the attention of Mr. Desbarats, Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs, and he wrote Mayor Haw-

kins at Halifax the following letter on January 29, 1919:

Dear Sir:

In the absence of the minister I am answering your letter of the 21st regarding seven seamen from T.R. 30 who were court-martialed and sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment for "wilful disobedience of lawful command."

I do not think there is much justification for the statement that these men were not fairly treated at their trial or were given a raw deal. The men were part of the crew of one of the trawlers doing convoy work at Sydney in protecting the vessels sailing out of that port. These men refused to take the ship out when she was ordered for duty with the convoy and the mercantile vessels sailed without the protection of this trawler. The offence was a very serious one and if the convoy had been attacked the absence of this trawler in the line might have allowed of the sinking of one or more of the convoyed ships.

That is the most ridiculous statement I ever saw put on paper by a responsible officer, and I say without hesitation there was not in Sydney a patrol boat, not to speak of the T.R. 30, which could convoy any vessel or protect any merchant or other ship. The letter continues:

There was no question as to the seaworthiness of T.R. 30. She is one of a number of similar ships which have proved to be thoroughly seaworthy and staunch. The complaint made by the men was that water leaked from the deck into their quarters and rendered them uncomfortable and insanitary. An inspection was made at the time by the Warrant Shipwright, who reported slight leaks but nothing of a serious kind.

So it is admitted there was some ground for the boys' complaint. The letter continues:

Even supposing that there had been serious leaks and that a good deal of water leaked into the men's quarters, this would have been no reason for refusing duty and for preventing the ship to take her place in the line and do her share in protecting the convoy.

The men stated that they were quite aware of the seriousness of refusing duty but notwithstanding this they took the action related above. If men on active service were allowed to refuse duty on account of uncomfortable surroundings there would be no need of any defensive or offensive warfare. The offence committed by the men was quite serious, they took the action with full knowledge of its gravity, they pleaded guilty to the charge of disobedience, they were tried in an open court and given every opportunity to present any defence which they might have, and there is no justification for a charge of unfair treatment on the part of the authorities.

These men can hardly be classed as boys, as their ages vary from eighteen to twenty-eight, with an average of twenty-three, and they are therefore quite old enough to realize their responsibilities.

It is to be regretted that it should have been necessary to sentence these men to punishment but it does not seem possible to maintain discipline in a fleet if men are to be allowed to refuse their duty on the grounds of personal discomfort especially as in this case the discomfort would hardly seem to have been of a serious nature.

I trust these explanations will show that there was good ground for punishing these men and that there was no injustice in the sentence which they received.

Yours truly,
(Signed) G. J. Desbarats,
Deputy Minister.

My understanding of the matter is that these boys were poor boys from the country who knew nothing about military or naval regulations, and if, as Mr. Desbarats says, they pleaded guilty, what else could they do when they were before the court-martial? I suppose they thought the best thing they could do was to say whatever the court wanted them to say. This letter of Mr. Desbarats did not satisfy Mayor Hawkins, and on February 1, 1919, he replied as follows to Mr. Desbarats:

10 p.m.

Dear Sir,—In answer to your letter of the 29th ultimo, it is my desire that my letter of the 21st ultimo regarding the seven seamen from the T.R. 30, who were court-martialed and sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment for "willful disobedience of lawful command," be placed before a responsible minister in the absence of the minister of your department.

There has been a good deal of feeling aroused in this community on account of the way in which these seamen were treated; the sentence imposed is looked upon as very much out of proportion, compared with other sentences of officers who have been court martialed.

The story of a certain Lieutenant Legatt, late commanding Officer of the H.M.C.S. Hochelaga, who was court martialed and honourably discharged from service for cowardice, has been mentioned in the public press. It would be interesting to know, as the court martial was held on these boys on the Hochelaga, if this officer had anything to do in passing sentence upon the offenders from the T.R. 30.

There are other instances where it would seem to show that there is a law for officers and another for seamen.

Yours trply,
(Signed) A. C. Hawkins,
Mayor.

In view of these facts, if these boys have not already been released, the acting Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. A. K. Maclean) should draw the matter to the attention of the minister and have these boys released from jail immediately, and make proper restitution. An hon. member asked the Department of Naval Affairs for some information in regard to this trawler upon which these boys served, and it was necessary for him to ask the question several times before he could get very much in-

formation. Some of the questions asked by this member were as follows:

Was trawler No. 30 in the service of the Canadian Navy Department during the summer of 1918?

The answer was "yes."

If so, were any refits necessary to this boat during the summer of 1918?

The answer was "no." This is the summer the boys were sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment.

On what date was this boat laid up for refits?

The answer was:

Answered by No. 2.

There were no refits, said the department.

Where was trawler No. 30 on August 9, 1918?

The answer was:

At Sydney, under routine lay-up.

If there was nothing wrong with this boat, why was it lying at Sydney under routine lay-up unless that was the excuse for having all the boats tied up at the wharves at Sydney? But I have absolute information that these answers are not correct, and I say that on August 14, 1918, the Sydney Foundry Company completed the work of caulking and pitching the deck of this trawler, the amount of the account being $284. This was the boat from which these seven poor seamen were court martialed and sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment, and yet within a fortnight after they were sentenced, this boat was laid up for refits and the deck caulked and pitched by the Sydney Foundry Company at a cost to this country of $284. Let us go a little further in this matter. Who were the gentlemen who court martialed these seven poor seamen from a fishing hamlet on the Atlantic coast? There was a steamer on naval duty called the Hochelaga, which was commanded by a certain gentleman and which was sent to sea on patrol duty. The look-out on this naval patrol boat one morning sighted a submarine; he reported the matter to the captain, and the captain, who was in charge of eight or ten small boats in addition to his own, at once put up signals to return to port, and instead of stopping and endeavouring to get that submarine or be sunk in the attempt, the captain of the Hochelaga deliberately turned tail and proceeded back to port. This captain is one of the three men who sentenced those seven poor Nova Scotia fishermen to eighteen months in the penitentiary. It is true that after the Hochelaga returned to port and the naval authorities came into possession of the fact that the captain had acted in a cowardly manner they discharged him. But why in the name of common sense was he allowed to go with an honourable discharge, while these seven poor Nova Scotian fishermen were sentenced to eighteen months at Rockhead? Is that fair play? Is that in keeping with the traditions of the British navy? No; and I say action should be taken to release these boys from Rockhead and make whatever restitution is possible.

We have endeavoured to get information from the Department of Naval Service this session with regard to some of the steamers it employs, but in nearly every case the answer has been unsatisfactory or contradictory. I think the truth of the matter is that the Government are ashamed of the whole sorry mess of bungling extravagance and mismanagement of the naval affairs of this country since the war started.

To show the uselessness of the steamers composing this so-called navy, let me give one or two illustrations. On a fine summer day in 1918 the oil-tanker Lux Blanca, having discharged her cargo at the Imperial Oil works at Dartmouth, got up steam for sea. She was an American boat manned by American sailors and captained by an American ship-master. She proceeded out of the harbour and headed westward. When thirty-five miles west of Sambro island, the lookout sighted the periscope of a submarine. Let me say at this point that previous to this date the naval authorities at Halifax and Ottawa knew there was a submarine on the Nova Scotia coast, yet nothing was done. There were no patrol boats outside the headlands of Halifax harbour. When the lookout sighted the periscope of the submarine what did the captain of this oil-tanker do? Did he turn tail as the captain of the Hochelaga did? No. He had a gun forward and another gun aft, and he had these guns manned and trained on the periscope of the submarine. He gave instructions to the wireless operator to send a message to the Halifax station that he was attacked by a submarine and to send help. He turned his ship towards Halifax harbour and fought that submarine for three hours. The message was sent to Halifax about two in the afternoon, but, Mr. Chairman, not a boat left Halifax to go to that ship's assistance, and the result was that some of the crew of that oil tanker were killed, some were wounded, the ship was sunk, and the rest of the crew had to

take to the boats. I admit that there were no ships in our naval fleet that could have sunk the submarine, but they could have done this: When that S.O.S. call came the naval authorities should have sent those boats to sea. I do not blame the captains or crews of those boats or drifters; I lay the blame on the men in charge of the naval base at Halifax, most of whom do not belong to this country, but were sent over from England after their period of usefulness there had finished. Every man who knows anything about the business says that when that S.O.S. call came the naval authorities should have sent those boats out to sea because, whilst they may not have been able to sink the submarine, the minute the submarine sighted their smoke on the horizon, the good black smoke from Sydney coal, she would have disappeared and the oil tanker would have been saved. While this vessel was being sunk the naval officials at Halifax were trifling at pink teas and playing bridge whist. That is the way we were protected on the Nova Scotia coast.

Let me give another instance—I have five hundred pages here, and it will be impossible for me to give it all. The Lady Evelyn was one of the best boats in the patrol service. She had first class equipment; in fact, naval officers tell me that she was the only vessel in the fleet that could have engaged a submarine. While this submarine was off the Nova Scotia coast, the Lady Evelyn, the best equipped vessel in the fleet, was sent to the Magdalen islands to deliver six lead pencils to the wireless operator there. There were at this time some American destroyers also on our coast, and about the same day the Lady Evelyn went to the Magdalen islands to deliver the lead pencils, an American destroyer was off Cape Canso. This was twenty-four hours before the fishing vessels were sunk in those waters. This American destroyer received a call to return to Halifax. When the commander of the destroyer received the call he wired back that he had information a submarine was in his zone. Nevertheless, he was ordered back to Halifax on some paltry excuse, and when he got there he was sent out on convoy with the ship that was to take Prince Arthur of Connaught to England. Whilst the fishermen were left to row a hundred and forty miles, this American destroyer was sailing out with Prince Arthur. Is that the way to treat the people of this country? That is what actually happened.

Let me go a little further. Two German submarines came across the water last May. They operated first on the American coast. The Naval Department here knew all about them, and I might say that I sent several telegrams about the matter myself to Mr. Desbarats. These submarines sunk a number of American ships off the American coast, and gradually worked down the Bay of Fundy sinking vessels belonging to merchants of St. John, New Brunswick, some of them new vessels with valuable cargoes.

The submarines next appeared off Cape Sable, then off Shelburne and proceeded down the Nova Scotia coast. In the town of Liverpool, at the time, three large vessels were preparing for sea. There were four or five in my home town, and several in the Lahave river preparing for sea, and to proceed to foreign ports

These captains, notwithstanding the fact that they knew that the submarine was coming down the Nova Scotia coast, proceeded to sea on their voyage. They did not fear the submarine; they did not fear the Germans. No; it was the patrol boats and those others who were the ones that were making all the trouble. This submarine after destroying the Lux Blanca, proceeded down the coast off Canso. You will probably remember, Mr. Chairman, that the first ship she sank was a trawler belonging to parties in the constituency of the hon. Acting Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. A. K. Maclean). While the American destroyer that was sent down by the United States to protect our coast was sent to Halifax to convoy a ship on which was Prince Arthur of Connaught, the submarine sank five or six Nova Scotia vessels and one American vessel, and the fishermen were ordered into their dories. Hon. members may not all know what a dory is. It is a small boat about fifteen feet long capable of containing only two men. These fishermen were given five minutes to leave the ship and take to their dories and then had to row for two days and two nights before reaching Canso. And this was the kind of protection we were receiving from the naval service of this country. The submarine proceeded down the St. Pierre banks and this is the time the Hochelaga turned tail, when the submarine was about 50 miles off Sydney harbour. As I say, she proceeded down the St. Pierre banks and several more fishing vessels anchored there were sunk. The crews had to row about 45 miles to St. Pierre and arriving there—I think there were about 110 men altogether—the Governor of St. Pierre realized that provisions were short and that it was advis-

able to despatch these men as quickly as possible, and cabled, I presume, to the Ottawa authorities, because shortly afterwards instructions were forwarded to Sydney to despatch one of the patrol boats to St. Pierre to bring the Lunenburg county fishermen to that port. My information is, and I believe it is correct, that on that occasion, because the boat was unseaworthy, the whole crew refused to go to sea and the captain had to get an entire new crew, except himself and the wireless operator. I do not know where he got them from, but I am informed that on the way back from St. Pierre to North Sydney, although it was not very rough, every man jack aboard the trawler was sick, except the captain and the wireless operator, and the fishing crew had to do the crew's work and help bring the patrol from St. Pierre to North Sydney. That is the kind of naval service we get in Canada.

Then they tell a story, and it is a true one, that when one of the fishing vessels was coming up in the fog off Halifax harbour the man on the lookout did not see the patrol boats, but he said he smelled ham and eggs, and shortly after the fog lifted there were about ten of these patrol boats in the shelter of Sambro Light. They did not come alongside the ship and tell them that there was a submarine in the vicinity, but allowed that vessel with twenty valuable lives to proceed on her way without notifying the captain of the danger. It seems to me that the least they might have done was to apprise him of the presence of the submarine so that the captain could put into Halifax harbour. Another method that was practiced was to get men for these ships by robbing the merchant marine. Every vessel that came to Halifax from a foreign voyage with crews that had been facing the submarine in the submarine zone in Spanish waters, in the Mediterranean and nearly every place else where the submarine was most in evidence, these men having faced these grave dangers for six, nine and twelve months, on arriving at Halifax they were arrested by the military police and put in jail. I know of one case—and I can mention more—in which the mate of a ship called the Win the War was arrested and put in jail by the military police. The mate of a vessel that arrived in Halifax one Saturday morning was arrested and put in the lockup over Sunday, taken to Aldershot and kept in custody for a week until the owners of his vessel got him out. We are supposed to emulate the example of Great Britain, and yet this condition of affairs existed in spite of the fact that Great Britain gave every encouragement to the members of the British marine. I have in my hand what is known as a notice to mariners for 1918 in which appears the following:

Maintenance of British Shipping.

Officers and Seamen of the Mercantile Marine (except Stewards on Passenger Vessels) are included in the list of certified occupations issued under the Military Service Act, 1916, as persons who are engaged in work of national importance and are entitled to exemption from Military Service. If Officers or Seamen receive notices to present themselves for military service they should return the notices to the military authorities claiming exemption.

The efficient maintenance of the Mercantile Marine is of vital national importance, and Masters, Officers and Seamen should remain with their ships, and should not leave the merchant service to join the Army.

Why was that not done in this country? Was it not necessary that we should have our merchant marine available to carry our products? I think the Government would have been well advised had they followed this clause in the British Merchant Marine Act, and not arrested our boys who were returning to see their parents for a week or two after long sea voyages. I have in mind a case in my county of a young fisherman who came home last September and who was arrested by the military police, although he says that at a public meeting held in 1917, at which an official of the Militia Department spoke and made the announcement that the fishermen and farmers would not be taken, as conscription was intended only for the province of Quebec. This man was arrested, and the reason he gave for not having obeyed the regulations of the Military Service Act was the statement that this official of the department had made that he would not be conscripted. The boy, of course, was guilty under the Military Service Act; there is no question about that. He was taken to Halifax and before a court-martial of military officers, this poor fisherman, who did not know the law and for whom there was some excuse, was sentenced to two years' hard labour in the penitentiary,—a splendid man who had supported his mother from the time he was twelve years of age. He had engaged in fishing on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and off the coast of Nova Scotia from the age of twelve, and had kept a widowed mother and two sisters. He certainly did not know anything about the law, and yet a court-martial consisting of three supposedly intelligent officers, deliberately sentenced him to two years' imprisonment. However, the boy had a few frieds and they certioraried

his case to Judge Drysdale. I have not Judge Drysdale's decision before me at this moment, but I may say that the judge decided that the boy should be released. After his release he went to the barracks and told the officers that he wanted his clothes, which consisted of a pair of long rubber boots, stable overalls and an old cap, in which he had been arrested, handcuffed and taken to Halifax. But he demanded his clothes from the militia authorities, and putting them on he walked the streets of Halifax for three days, and to every man he met he said he would not go home until the Militia Department sent him home. He went every morning to the barracks and insisted on being sent home, and at last they were so ashamed that the officers paid his fare home.

Speaking of the purchases of ships for the so-called Canadian navy, I would like to know why the officers of the Naval Department did not adopt the suggestion of Mr. J. K. L. Ross. When the war broke out, Mr. Ross, in conversation with a certain naval officer, thought that something should be done for the defence of Canada. He went to one of the shipyards in the province of Quebec—I think it was Vickers, but I am not quite sure—and said to the manager, "How long will it take you to build five cruisers of the Bristol type?" The manager gave Mr. Ross the information, and at his own expense, he hired a special train, journeyed to Ottawa, and laid the matter before the naval authorities. He offered to pay for one of these cruisers if the Government would build the other four, but his offer was turned down and he went home in disgust. When matters were in a serious condition on the Nova Scotia coast, and we could not get any protection for our shipping from the Canadian Government, I am very pleased, indeed, to say that after an earnest telegram was sent to the Department of Naval Affairs—and I want to convey to the member for Halifax the credit for what was done after strong representations were made to him by two business men at Halifax—the Naval Department realized that they would again have to go with their hat in hand to the American naval authorities for protection, and very shortly afterwards one or more American naval destroyers were sent to the Nova Scotia coast to protect Canadian shipping. Now, whilst I am very pleased, indeed, that we had the protection of American naval vessels—we owe a debt of gratitude to the American people and the American Government for what they did for us; there is no question about it, their destroyers saved a lot of our ships because one of them went as far as the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and notified the fishing vessels to get into port—I say it is a shame that we should have had to depend upon the American navy to protect our coasts, our fishermen, and our shipping. Let me tell the Committee something else. This is a personal matter, but my reason for telling it now is that I have never been able to discover the name of the captain of the destroyer who did the good work. One Saturday night I received a telephone message from Liverpool, and the gentleman on the wire informed me that he was the captain of an American destroyer. He said that a Lunenburg vessel, a foreign-going ship, was drifting five miles off Gull Rock with a disabled rudder. He said, "I left my sister ship out there to protect her, while I came in to give you the news. The captain asked me to request you to send out a tugboat to tow him either to Liverpool or Halifax." I told him to wait for an hour until I ascertained if I could get a tugboat at Yarmouth or Halifax. I kept the telephone busy but failed to secure a tugboat. I then telephoned the captain of the American destroyer that I could not get any assistance, whereupon he said: "I will return to my ship and both of our destroyers will stand by the disabled vessel until you can send out assistance." I managed to get a towboat from Halifax the next afternoon, but by the time she arrived the American commander had commandeered an American fishing vessel, attached it to the stern of the Lunenburg ship, and fastening hawsers to their destroyers had towed the disabled vessel into Liverpool. I have never been able to find out who the captain of this destroyer was. The American Government so far have rendered no bill for the services rendered; doubtless if they intended to do so they would have done it long ago. Now I want to express my gratification to the American commanders of these destroyers for the splendid assistance which they rendered. Undoubtedly these destroyers rendered splendid aid in keeping submarines away and protecting Canadian shipping, a duty which properly devolved upon the Government of this country, which should have had proper ships in Nova Scotia waters for that purpose.

Did the Americans perform any other service for us? They certainly did. They established airplane, or seaplane, bases at Halifax and North Sydney, and were about

to establish another at Shelburne when hostilities ceased. But a base was established at Halifax and on the first flight of one of the squadrons, in order to show what the seaplanes could do, the route followed was via the towns from Halifax to Yarmouth; and I had the honour, Mr. Chairman, as mayor of the town of Lunenburg, to receive the first letter, written by the Premier of Nova Scotia to me, which was ever delivered at that town by seaplane. These seaplanes went from Lunenburg to Liverpool, Lockeport, Shelburne and Yarmouth, and the people of the different towns along the coast turned out in full force to do honour to the brave American airmen who were protecting our coast and stopping the depredations of German submarines, which duty we should have performed ourselves. What a humiliating position for Canada to be placed in, to be dependent for protection on the sea and in the air to American destroyers and American airplanes.

In addition to the expenditure of $31,000,000 for naval war purposes, the Auditor General's Report sets forth that in 1918 the sum of $209,296 was spent on the dockyard and naval college at Halifax, principally for frills, furbelows, and pink teas. At Esquimalt, $244,554 was paid for gold braid and brass buttons. When I read the Auditor General's Report and saw what this amount was for I was shocked and disgusted. For clerks, stenographers, telephones and telephone operators the sum of $168,000 was spent last year at the Halifax dockyard and naval establishment. Nine thousand, seven hundred and twelve pairs of boots were purchased from Ames Holden and the Amherst Boot and Shoe Company; 5,097 silk handkerchiefs were purchased at about one dollar each. There were purchased 57,605 pounds of ordinary soap, and 3,403 pounds of Castile soap, presumably for the lime-juicers. These are some of the items appearing in the Report. It is impossible for me to give the full details of the expenditure for these purposes, but the Auditor General's Report is worth the serious perusal of every member of the Committee. Another item which appears in the Report is $665 allowance for clergy. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that this amount was paid to Presbyterian clergymen as well as clergymen of every other denomination, and I am ashamed that Presbyterian clergymen should have taken this money. These very Presbyterian clergymen in 1917, when I was a candidate for Parliament, said that I, and others like me, were pro-German, were disloyal and traitors to the country. These were the clergymen who were going to save the country. I understand there are about forty clergymen in the city of Halifax and they are not overworked. These men who were so extremely loyal in the 1917 election should have gone out on board the Niobe and given their services free—that is the least they might have done. It seems a shame and a disgrace to me that ministers who endeavour to teach us to be patriotic should take the country's money for going on the Niobe and giving religious services to the sailors.

Then to show some of the acts of gross carelessness on the part of the Naval Department at Halifax I want to refer for a minute to the Halifax explosion. On December 6, 1917, the whole country from Halifax to Vancouver was shocked when it heard that Halifax had been blown up by an explosion and that some two thousand people had lost their lives and between twenty and thirty thousand injured. It is almost impossible to believe that so many people were injured, but it is a fact that between twenty and thirty thousand of the population of that city were more or less injured by the explosion. What happened?

The steamer Mont Blanc arrived at Halifax one fine December morning. A steamer named the Imo had received instructions the night before to proceed to sea. Orders were given to the Mont Blanc to proceed up the harbour and as the Imo was coming through the narrow channel between Dartmouth and Halifax, a collision occurred, and the high explosives on the Mont Blanc created the tremendous devastation with which we are all familiar. An investigation followed, but nothing came of it—at any rate, whatever information the Government secured it never published it. There were plenty of rumours current, one being to the effect that the collision was due to neglect on the part of one of the naval officers in charge—and it is a fact that a naval officer was discharged from the service, he having given conflicting orders. I contend that there was absolutely no necessity for the Mont Blanc to come up to the harbour, and the naval authorities had no right to allow her to come up, there being plenty of space in the eastern passage to lay, whilst awaiting orders to proceed. Not only that ship but other ships containing high explosives were allowed to come up to the middle of the city both before and after this disaster and if there had been a German spy on board he could have blown up the whole city.

What do we find about this matter? I will not give my own version, but I will

quote from what a good Unionist newspaper says. This is something that happened after the explosion and after the naval authorities should have been on their job, if they were not when that disastrous collision occurred. The Halifax Herald of March 12, 1917, contained the following:

Further investigation by The Halifax Herald in shipping and pilotage circles yesterday has brought additional and conclusive evidence that there must be a shake-up of no meagre dimensions at Ottawa. The pilots' story that a steamer laden with high explosives was allowed to lay in the fairway of the harbour one day last week for seven hours, was fully confirmed, and in getting the confirmation other details of a most startling nature were disclosed.

The Halifax Herald is scrupulously careful to abide by the rules of the censorship and anything calculated to furnish information to the enemy is gladly withheld from publication. There is not a man familiar with marine affairs at this port, not a Nova Scotia captain who has gladly given his services to the work of naval patrol, not a master mariner who regularly brings in and takes out his steamer, but what has a story to tell of stupidity, of pigheadedness, of bungling in connection with the affairs of the port, and, following up these stories, the trail leads directly to Ottawa and reveals a heterogeneous bunch of incompetents who may know the ways of society, who may be able to judge aright the merits of various blends of wine, but who certainly do not know the ways of ships and are not able to judge the competence of those whom they place in charge.

In times of peace we should not have such men at the head of affairs of a maritime nature. To have them in such position in these awful days of war is evidence of a laxity on the part of our people, a laxity which has already led to fatal consequences and which should, perchance, a break be made through the British fleet, lead to awful disaster. God forbid that a change at Ottawa be withheld until such a time comes.

It took one of the greatest disasters the world has ever known, to partially arouse those in authority, but those who were in supreme authority then are still in authority.

I repeat, that is from the Halifax Herald, a paper edited by no other than one William Dennis, a member of the honourable Senate of Canada.

As far as I am personally concerned, I have watched this matter for the last four or five years, and I want to say that I do not hold the present Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne) responsible in any great degree. I believe he took charge of this thing when it was in such a mess that he realized that nothing could be done by him. I do not wish to imply that all the naval officers were incompetent. There were a number of bright, young Canadian officers scattered through the fleet, and a large number of marines and bluejackets, who, if they had been given a chance, would have distinguished themselves and brought honour to Canada, but these men were not given an opportunity so to do.

The naval conditions on the Atlantic coast were of such a disgraceful nature that it was in the mouths of everybody, and I have gathered a large amount of information which it would take up too much time to place before this Committee. The matter is of such a serious nature that I consider an investigation should be held, and I here and now ask for a parliamentary committee to be appointed, and I have the proof to place before any investigating body that may be appointed. I had an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of discussing this matter with a naval officer and a number of sailors, and I got the former to give me his opinion why the naval affairs of this country were in such a disgraceful condition. He gave me a statement, which I will now read:—

I, the undersigned Charles Otis Julian, of the city of Vancouver, in the province of British Columbia, Lieutenant Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, hereby solemnly declare:

That the Borden Government knowing the imminent possibilities of the outbreak of war showed culpable neglect in not having the Canadian naval dockyards in Halifax and Esquimalt in a proper state of efficiency.

That the dockyards were in a deplorable state of decay and neglect, the wharves and jetties being in need of repair, the buildings and store houses being old and unsuitable, the stores depleted and the general equipment inadequate and in no way suited to carry on effective war-time operations.

That the Borden Government showed further culpable neglect before the outbreak of war in allowing the Niobe and Rainbow to remain out of commission without proper equipment in view of the threatening situation in Europe. The Niobe at the outbreak of war was moored at Halifax and would have remained an ineffectual fighting ship had she not obtained crews from the Imperial ships, Algerine and Shearwater; the Rainbow would have been in the same predicament had she not obtained sufficient ratings to man her from the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserves then in process of formation and a nucleus crew from the Atlantic station.

That the Fishery Protection Service vessels of Canada as equipped and manned were totally inadequate to offer any effective protection to our cities on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

That the Borden Government showed culpable neglect in not encouraging and ordering the formation of an effective Royal Navy Canadian Volunteer Reserve and that as far back as three years prior to the outbreak of war many representations had been made to the Government without result for the recognition and proper equipment of the force then struggling in process of formation; and that after this force had come into being with scarce government aid, the Director of Naval Service, acting on instructions from his Government proceeded to disband the Naval Volunteers of Canada, and that a majority of men who had joined this force with a pure volunteer spirit were encouraged to leave the force and join the

C.E.F. That in the city of Quebec, directly after the outbreak of hostilities, on instructions from the department more than one hundred naval ratings were recruited carried on drill and such duties as were allotted to them by the S.N.O. at that port. These men were without equipment of any kind. Thirty-three days after its formation this force was disbanded and discharged. That no provision was made anywhere in Canada towards naval recruiting. In Toronto private efforts succeeded in recruiting a considerable number of naval ratings who were despatched to Imperial and R.C.N. establishments. Although in the British Isles directly after the outbreak of hostilities recruiting for ratings for naval brigades was carried on, no provision was made in Canada for recruiting for the navy although repeated appeals were made to the Government to do so.

That the Borden Government showed culpable neglect at the very outbreak of hostilities when unarmed enemy merchantmen were in close proximity to our coast in not endeavouring to capture or destroy these ships. The Government were repeatedly advised of the presence of these ships but made no effort to capture them although they had suitable ships available for this purpose.

That the Borden Government showed unfair discrimination from the outbreak of hostilities to the signing of the armistice against native born Canadians in all senior appointments both ashore and afloat in the Canadian Naval Service. That in the larger ships of the Canadian Patrol Fleet only one native born Canadian has been in command. In almost every instance these ships carried in the position of Navigator or First Lieutenant eprfectly capable Canadian officers. That the records of the shore establishment show that these bases were elaborately overmanned by retired and in many cases incapable R.N. or R.N.R. English officers. The same condition prevailed at the naval headquarters at Ottawa. That the graduates of the Royal Naval College of Canada of sufficient seniority and entirely capable of taking command of Canadian patrol ships who were on loan to the R.N. were not recalled and given the opportunity to serve in the defence of their own country.

That the Borden Government's actions have occasioned a general spirit of discontent and resentment among the officers and men in the Canadian Naval Service. That promotions have been unfairly allotted and positions of trust have been given to men of unknown and questionable ability. That seniority and previous experience have been most shamefully overlooked in numerous instances and throughout the rank and file of the service a feeling of discontent, contempt and distrust has always been entertained against the authorities at Ottawa. That the department has repeatedly broken faith most shamefully with officers and men, the notable instances being in the case of the treatment of mates. In the beginning these officers were promised by the department that they would rank with, but after a sub-lieutenant R.N.C.V.R. in accordance with clause 13 relative to rank as found in the K. R. & O. After they had served some considerable period, however, and without any cause they were reduced by Order in Council two grades lower and ranked with bandmasters, masters-at-arms, boatswains, etc. That in the case of chief skippers R.C.N., these men all holding coastwise and foreign seagoing tickets were induced to join the service with the promise of a rate of pay of $3.50 per day. After serving some considerable time an order was issued reducing their pay to $3.00 per day. That in the case of W.T. operators, these officers were, without any apparent reason, unjustly denied any separation allowance. A considerable number were in the service before the Order in Council to this effect was passed, and these men were discriminated against in a most shameful manner. The pay for this branch of the service was ridiculously small considering that these officers had to bear a great part of their own expenses in the matter of messing and clothing. On the larger ships it was necessary for operators to live with wardroom officers and pay their mess bills out of their small pay. Until 1918 no proper school was established for their training, consequently many were unable to qualify as fourth class operators and were forced to remain "Learners" for an unreasonable length of time. The pay of a "Learner" was $22.50 per month.

(1) In the beginning the rate of pay in the R.N.C.V.R. was fixed much lower than that given to men in the C.E.F., and no separation allowance was granted, enlistments to the Navy were therefore reduced to a minimum and great dissatisfaction prevailed among the men in the service.

(2) That the Naval Service repeatedly made promises to men on enlistment in connection with rank, promotions, rate of pay and conditions of service which they later failed to fulfil.

(3) For more than a year and a half after the outbreak of the war men wearing the Canadian Naval uniform were not allowed reduced fares or any special privileges by the transportation companies in Canada, while at the same time such were enjoyed by the men in the C.E.F.

(4) That it would appear that the Borden Government in the manner of the treatment of the men in the Canadian Navy were pursuing a policy of deliberately creating a feeling of dissatisfaction in order to justify their pre-war contention that Canada could not man and maintain a navy of her own. The result of this policy is very apparent as such a feeling still exists.

That the Borden Government showed culpable lack of foresight since the beginning of the war in the method it pursued in chartering vessels, exorbitant rentals being paid for inferior craft, so much so that in many instances the charter money as time went on amounted to much more than the actual value of some of the crafts in question. That these crafts were supplied with coal and water, besides being kept in ship-shape condition at the expense of the Government, gun-crews and signal ratings being placed on board and utilized by the owners of the craft. And with exception of a few large harbour tugs the boats proved inadequate for the duties assigned to them.

As regards small craft, the Borden Government expended large sums of money in a ridiculous and wasteful manner in chartering or purchasing at exorbitant rates, numerous motor boats and other small craft which were to be found at the bases at Halifax and Sydney and Esquimalt. These boats were continuously out of repair, their up-keep amounting annually to large sums. These boats being used principally for the convenience of senior officers ashore and their wives and families.

Over seventy per cent of these boats could have been dispensed with had this branch of the service been conducted in an efficient manner.

The Borden Government did not pursue the policy of other Overseas Dominions in despatching naval ratings for duty overseas—until obliged to do so by pressure in the House —and then only in a half-hearted manner. Then the Deputy Minister, the Director of Naval Service and the Admiral Superintendent at Esquimalt expressed personally their displeasure and disapproval of the policy of sending any such naval ratings overseas.

That throughout the entire war no policy appears to have existed in regard to the vitally important work of patrolling and convoying off the coasts of Canada. As a result of their lack of policy and unpreparedness when the coasts of Canada were seriously menaced by submarines an appeal had to be made to the United States for the despatch of craft capable of protecting our coasts. That our large patrol vessels with one exception proved to be old, out of date vessels deficient in speed and gun power and were all out of order. In convoy work the Canadian fleet could not venture far from their bases and it is on record that not one flotilla ever despatched successfully carried out the orders assigned them.

That the Borden Government showed culpable neglect in regard to the gunnery of the patrol fleet, many of the boats being fitted for a considerable period with obsolete guns and no provision being made for the proper training of gun crews under experienced officers and it was not until the fall of 1917 that this most important branch of the service was taken in hand and a gunnery commander appointed. This officer experienced great difficulty in carrying out his work owing to reluctance of the Department to supply them with proper ordinance and gear.

That although the traffic regulations of the Port of Halifax were under the sole supervision of the Naval authorities proper orders were never promulgated and such regulations as were in effect were carried out with laxity.

That although the calamity that overtook the Port of Halifax on December 6th, 1917, was accidental nevertheless there can be no doubt that the actual cause can be traced to the inefficient and careless officers in charge of the Canadian Naval base at Halifax.

That many acts of heroism performed by Canadian Naval ratings received no recognition although officers and men from vessels of the Royal Navy then lying in the harbour performing similar acts received prompt recognition and declaration from their Government.

C. O. JULIEN,
Lieut. R.N.C.V.R.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that under the circumstances, and having regard to what I have said, there should be a full and complete investigation into naval affairs in Canada during the last four years. Furthermore, I have no hesitation in saying that owing to the black eye which has been administered to the navy, it is too late now to endeavour to do anything to put naval affairs in Canada on a satisfactory basis. At the time of the Soudanese war, when the question of sending help to Britain was discussed in this Parliament, Sir John A. Macdonald used the expression: "Not a dollar, not a man." I repeat that statement now without any hesitation. I say in all seriousness that Canada should not spend one dollar on naval matters for the next few years at least. One reason is that our financial condition will not warrant it, and even if we wished to do so we could not vote sufficient money to build or to purchase naval boats which would be of any service in time of trouble.

Because of its inefficiency, the Naval Department at Ottawa should be closed up, the officers in charge of it should be paid off and the offices closed. Canada has nothing to lose by doing this, and a large amount of money would be saved the taxpayers.

In my opinion Parliament can do only one of two things: Appropriate $100,000,000 at least, to build and equip an efficient navy, or else not spend one dollar. I do not think that in our present financial condition we can afford to spend the large amount which I have mentioned; consequently I say that not one dollar should be spent and not one man engaged at the present time under the excuse and pretence that we are doing something for naval affairs in this country. Sell off the useless trawlers, drifters and patrol boats, clear up the mess and make the best of a bad job.

It might be said, of course, that we have the naval bases at Halifax and Esquimalt, and that they should be kept up. My answer to that is this: If the British Government require Halifax and Esquimalt for naval bases and for coaling purposes, they should take them over and operate them at their own expense. We certainly cannot do it, and I have no hesitation in asking that the whole idea be abandoned.

Mr. McKENZIE: The statements made by the hon. member (Mr. Duff) with regard to expenditures in connection with naval affairs in Canada are of such a serious character that we should at least have some explanation from the minister before this clause is adopted.

We have the statement made here by the hon. member, not as his own, but as a declared statement by an officer who was one of the men in charge at Esquimalt at the time, I believe, and who professes to make a declaration, equal to a statement on oath, as to what has been taking place in connection with the handling of the navy, not only on the coast of British Columbia, but at Halifax, Sydney and other

places. We have not, so far, had a word of explanation from the Government. There may be some minister or other hon. member who can give us some explanation about this matter, but we have not had a word of explanation, and we are asked to vote $350,000,000, a large part of which is going to be paid out in connection with work of this class. While we are all anxious to get along as fast as we can with the business of this session, including the voting of money, this Committee and the House and the country are entitled to some explanation as to the charges put forward in respect to the management of this very important department of Government. It is well known, in the part of the country from which I come, which is in the same province as the constituency represented by the hon. member (Mr. Duff), that moneys were simply squandered right and left; that every sort of a boat that would float at all was either purchased or hired, and that it was the sheerest mockery the piles of ships that were in each others' way in the harbour of Sydney during the last year or two doing nothing in the world except paying out money to men who were friendly to the Government and who had craft of this kind to sell or hire. Without some departmental head here able to answer these questions, it would be useless to make any further charges than those already put before the Committee by the hon. member for Lunenburg, and I do not wish to take up time of re-stating what has been so well said by him. But it is the duty of the Government, and particularly of the minister in charge of this Bill, if he cannot give this explanation himself, to let this matter stand until the minister who is capable of giving the explanation is here and can tell us how many vessels were purchased or hired; from whom vessels were purchased or hired; what was the necessity of hiring vessels; how many vessels we still own; and what are they worth; and what the Government intends doing with them? I suggested to the Minister of Naval Affairs that such of the vessels as are equal to the kind of work, should, if possible, be converted into fishing craft. The Canadian people would get more value and better results from those vessels in that way than in any other. I do not know that this is the occasion to discuss that, but I am mentioning it in the presence of so many ministers, that they may have at least one constructive idea in connection with the handling of those boats. I am told that many of the boats can be sold to advantage to fishermen who, perhaps, may not be able to pay the whole of the money at once, but a scheme could be arranged by which the Government would be sure of obtaining its money and a fishing fleet of fine proportions, well equipped, would be established on both the Atlantic and the Pacific. If this matter is inquired into at all, we shall be able to get some information from the minister on that score.

11 p.m.

At an early stage in the evening, the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) made some statements in connection with the furnishing of money for trade purposes. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) thought that he was making a very clever answer when he told us that we were perfectly justified in voting $25,000,000 of the people's money to Rumania, because Rumania was in debt to Great Britain and that we were in debt to Great Britain and the United States, and in order to square our bills with Great Britain and the United States, we should allow Rumania to become indebted to us. If that is a business proposition by which there shall be accorded any satisfaction in the payment of debts between Rumania and Great Britain, Great Britain and ourselves and ourselves and the United States, it is a system that I never heard of before and that I do not understand. The hon. member sat down absolutely satisfied with himself as having solved the whole problem and having justified the borrowing by Canada of $25,000,000 somewhere and passing that over to Rumania in order that Rumania might become indebted to us. If that is business, I shall be glad to have it more fully explained by the minister if he shall deem it proper to make any further observations in connection with this Bill.

There are different ways of promoting trade. When we were in power in this country we promoted trade in the usual way. We wanted to have trade with people who were willing to pay either in kind or in cash for our goods. In 1911, the situation in this country was excellent, but we wanted to make it better and we launched upon a comprehensive trade arrangement with the people of the United States and other countries where we could get proper trade and where we would have exchange of our goods for theirs or get their money for our goods. That was not good enough for the statesmen who are to-day in charge of affairs, and they turned it down. What have they given to us instead of it? They have given us an

absolutely new idea in trade, namely, that we are to furnish our own money and that we are to buy our own goods, and after we have bought our goods from ourselves, we are to pass them over without any security whatever to a foreign country. Will the minister explain how it is that we are going to get wealthy in that way? Supposing a man furnishes a customer with $5 to buy a pair of boots, the man comes in to his store and buys the boots and he passes over to the merchant his own $5. The merchant has his $5 back in his till, but the boots are gone and he has nothing for them. I see many hard-headed business men sitting in front of me, and I should like them to explain how we are going to grow wealthy and expand and develop the country by such a system of trade.

The idea of a man lifting himself by his boot straps has always seemed the most ridiculous thing we could imagine, but I think such a feat is just as easily possible as the making of this country wealthy and prosperous upon the system of trade, and business generally, that is followed by this Government, and which is applauded by its supporters as a new device which will overcome all the trade ills that the state is heir to. As a matter of fact, we have not got the money to give, but we are undertaking to find it in some way, and pass it off in the manner I have mentioned. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that whether or not this will be a bribe to the manufacturers of this country, to the big combines, the big friends who own the Government according to the Government's own friends, it is capable of being a bribe. What is happening? The Manufacturers' Association and the men engaged in big business come to the Government and say: "We want more trade. We want more money put in circulation. What are you going to do about it?" The Government says: "If you can get anybody to buy your goods we will pay for them." That is a magnificent proposition. The manufacturer is not asked what his price is, where he will deliver the goods, or anything of that kind; he is simply told by the Government: "We care not what you produce, so long as it is a manufactured article of any kind. If you will pile it on the shore at Montreal, Halifax, St. John, or Vancouver, and get a certified account from somebody whom we will appoint at these places, we will put you in the way of getting a cheque for your goods." Is not that a magnificent layout for the manufacturers? They do not send travelling agents abroad; they are free from that expense. They do not bother about insuring their goods and sending them across the Atlantic; they do not worry about transportation or freight or anything else. All they have to do is produce the goods, and then this paternal fraternity known as the Government will furnish the cash and take full responsibility for everything. If that is not a scheme by which men who have goods to sell are capable of being bribed, I do not know what scheme you could devise that would be more capable of being used for bribery. I am not saying that that is what the scheme is for, but it is an old saying that the sight of means to do ill deeds, has ill deeds done. It would be better to let the men on this side of the Atlantic who have goods to sell do business direct with the men on the continent of Europe who want to buy their goods, instead of the Government engineering the thing so that the manufacturers can sell their goods for what they like without the purchaser having anything to say about it. When this matter was up about two weeks ago, the complaint was made that there was no proper distribution of these orders. Some person said there was no such thing at all as orders of this kind, but the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) who, I believe, is a manufacturer or interested in manufacturing, told us all about it. He said that the orders were distributed in the best possible way, that there was no discrimination, that everybody got a share. Nevertheless, the distribution of the orders is made by a combination of manufacturers who come together and fix their own price; they divide the orders up just as they like, and then the Government undertakes all the hard work of getting the money to pay for the goods. That is not a proper or healthy way of doing business, and the sooner we get away from it the better.

I submit that we have not been given the necessary information about this money which we are going to give to foreign countries for the purpose of stimulating trade in Canada. We do not know how much we are going to give—at least I do not; we do not know how it is to be handled; we do not know how the goods are to be bought; we do not know how they are to be conveyed from this country to their destination. When we are furnishing money in this way to help out foreigners, I submit, we should know something about it. There is all the more reason for this information because of conditions to-day, when the price

not only of foodstuffs but of manufactured articles is such that if the price were reduced to normal the sales of the manufacturers could be doubled and trebled and our men kept at work without sending goods out of the country at all. I think that before we accept the proposition of the manufacturers, there should be the closest possible inquiry into the conditions; and the method which evidently has been adopted by the Government should only be resorted to in the last extremity when nothing else could be done to carry on trade and keep our men employed.

The information we particularly desire is in connection with the expenditure on naval affairs. We also require a little further explanation about the money we are going to borrow and pass over to foreign countries. It might be somewhat difficult for the minister to give this information to-night, but as we are entitled to it, if no other hon. member wishes to speak, I would suggest that at this late hour the minister should let the Bill stand in Committee.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think I can give my hon. friend the information that he desires to-night as to the necessity of the constitution of credits for foreign export business for Canada, and as to the manner in which that business is placed. Before doing so, however, I think I should refer to the speech of the hon. member for Lunenburg.

He covered a very wide field. I had no notice that he would bring forward the matters he dealt with to-night. It would seem to me that they would ordinarily be brought forward when the Minister of Naval Affairs had his estimates before the Committee, but the hon. member was quite in order, because we were discussing the naval estimates for the coming year as embodied in this vote. This Bill which is now before the Committee is analogous to the Bills of last year and the previous year, only that the amount is smaller and its purpose is, as hon. members know, to provide for what we might call the remainder of our war expenditure, and particularly, as the war is in reality although not officially, over, for our demobilization expenditure and other outlays arising out of the war. The Minister of Militia has explained that so far as his portion of the vote is concerned, it is solely for demobilization purposes. I would suggest to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that as the Minister of Naval Affairs will be having his estimates before the House to-morrow or the next day, he might deal with the statements made by the hon. member for Lunenburg on that occasion. I would submit that delay in answering the hon. member, because the minister had no notice that these matters would be brought up to-night, is not a sufficient reason for our not passing the section of the Bill referred to.

With regard to the general question of credits, let me make a rather comprehensive statement. I should like to say, first, that there is no man in the Dominion who would rather see a return to the former and normal modes of business than I. The furnishing of credits by the Dominion of Canada for the purchase of our agricultural and manufactured products is absolutely forced upon us by the exigencies of the financial situation due to the war. Take the question of our grain; I shall come to the manufactured products later. This year I had expected to have to provide a sum not exceeding $100,000,000, for the purchase of our exportable surplus of wheat and flour, but on account of the exchange situation between Great Britain and this continent by which it is impossible for Great Britain to purchase wheat in the United States and Canada except from funds provided on this side of the Atlantic, and because no funds are available except such as we can provide in Canada, the Dominion Government has paid out up to date a sum in excess of $80,000,000, which has been loaned to the Imperial Government for the purchase of our wheat, and it has undertaken to furnish a further $90,000,000 which will be required for the purchase of the balance of the wheat and flour products of this last year's crop. My hon. friend, I am sure, would not describe that as a bribe to the farmers. If the Dominion Government did not furnish that credit of $170,000,000—I hope it may be somewhat less, because it is a very heavy burden—then it would mean that the exportable surplus of the wheat of Canada and our exportable surplus of flour could not be bought. Under the old conditions, my hon. friend knows that the Government would not have to intervene at all, and I should be perfectly delighted if the old conditions prevailed, so that the sellers of wheat and flour would simply send forward bills of exchange with the documents attached and get their money in New York exchange. If they were able to do that there would not be to-day a 3 per cent rate of exchange against Canada as between us and the United States. So much for wheat and flour. My hon. friend would not say that we were bribing the

farmers and that we were doing. anything a government should not do at a time like this, in furnishing money which alone makes it possible for the Canadian farmer and the Canadian miller to sell their wheat and flour, and for the rest of the people of Canada to get the benefit that comes to them from the sale of those commodities.

Then as to manufactured goods. I am sure my hon. friend will not object if I ask the Committee to consider the situation with which we were confronted immediately upon the conclusion of the armistice in November last. It has often been said that preventive ability is never appreciated. People see results, but they are not aware of the cause. I have no hesitation in saying that if the Dominion Government had not faced with financial courage the situation which confronted us in November last, we should have a very grave and serious situation in Canada to-day. I believe there would have been thousands if not tens of thousands of people out of work, and I would not like to state what might have happened in Canada in consequence. If my hon. friend will go back to November last, he will realize that the entire community was greatly excited over what would happen once the war came to an end and all our war industries ceased. Directly and indirectly there were 200,000 people, men and women, engaged in munitions work and in the supply of other war material, and in other enterprises connected with those industries and in industries basic to them. That was the situation with which the Government was confronted. We had to find not only the credits with which our wheat and flour, our cheese and meat products were to be purchased, but we also had to face that very acute industrial situation which caused the utmost anxiety to the labouring population in Canada and to business generally, and to all the people interested in the welfare of the country and in the preservation of order in the community. Faced with that situation, and knowing the international financial conditions to which I have referred, the Government, at the instance of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), appointed an Overseas War Mission headed by Mr. Lloyd Harris, who did such successful work as head of the British War Mission at Washington in obtaining orders for Canada, and whose work was referred to by the President of the Privy Council in connection with his estimates the other evening. The Prime Minister went overseas himself, and accompanying him were Mr. Lloyd Harris, Mr. Frank Jones, Dr. Robertson, formerly of the Department of Agriculture, and Mr. Draper. The three important national interests, mercantile, labour, and agriculture, were represented.

Those men have been working over there most assiduously since November last, and I am surprised now to hear the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), although he paid the absent Minister of Trade and Commerce a compliment on the personal side, find fault with the minister whose work, to my knowledge, and on the reports which I have received from men who have been over there, has been of the most efficient kind for the benefit of Canada. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has really done admirable work in connection with the important question of finding markets for Canada's grain and meat products and other supplies, and the representatives of the Western Grain Growers and the Western Grain Exchange, who went overseas last fall, paid the highest tribute to the work done by him in connection with the important matters in which they were interested.

The Prime Minister has given the closest attention to the subject of the promotion of Canada's trade overseas. I have been in constant cable communication with him, and hundreds of cables have passed relating to matters of shipping, and to the general trade of Canada and its extension to Europe at this time. The purpose of the Prime Minister in constituting that commission to London was to obtain business for Canada, and to take up the slack of the factory production which was interrupted by the cessation of the war. Hon. gentlemen can picture to themselves what effect the closing of these munition plants, on the scale that we had them in Canada, and of the allied industries immediately affected, would have, and what the result would be, unless we could replace that business by an equal, or at all events a large, volume of export trade. Remember we were manufacturing what we needed for ourselves and our productive capacity for munitions and war supplies bore relation to our export trade. Therefore, unless we could substitute export trade for what we had here, only one result could ensue, and that was that our industries could only run on partial capacity, and that tens of thousands of men would be out of work all over Canada. Mr. Lloyd Harris, as head of the Canadian Mission in London, has not only been doing his utmost to obtain trade for Canada, but has from the very first urged and insisted that Canadian industries

should send their own representatives over there in order that they might not only assist him, and have the benefit of the co-operation of himself and his office, but at the same time push to the utmost for business themselves; and I understand that some two hundred representatives of practically all the industries of Canada are in London to-day on the summons of Mr. Lloyd Harris, and working in co-operation with him for the benefit of our export trade. I think it is a mistake to say that that export trade is for the benefit of a few manufacturers; it seems to me that it is not a fair statement of the situation. We often play politics in this House, but is it a fair statement to say that the promotion of the export trade of Canada is for the benefit of a few manufacturers? There are hundreds of millions of dollars—

Mr. McKENZIE: I saw the agreement that was made for Rumania, and it seems to me it is all for the manufacturers, except one-fifth.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to that in a moment. I make no objection to my hon. friend raising the question, because I am the last one to deny information on public affairs. This is an important Bill, and I desire to satisfy my hon. friend by making a very full statement: There are hundreds of millions of dollars invested in important manufacturing establishments in this country. They employ hundreds of thousands of men whose families are maintained by their wages, and they in turn by the expenditure of their money promote the business of the country. So that the getting of export trade for Canada for our manufactured goods, as well as for our grain and natural products, is not for the benefit of a few manufacturers, but for the welfare of the people of Canada as a whole. If, as I said before, we did not push for that trade, and if we did not get trade of that character for Canada, we should have a very grave situation on our hands to-day.

Now we come to the question of the credits which we shall extend. In the first place—and hon. gentlemen opposite I take it assent to that—we shall have to continue to make extensive loans to Great Britain for the purchase of our foodstuffs and the timber and other products which Great Britain will want from this country. In case some hon. gentlemen may not understand the situation, let me say that the burden on us this year is going to be very heavy because we are demobilizing in Canada, and consequently we have a higher expenditure in respect of our men coming upon the Treasury here than we would have if those men were overseas, and we were borrowing money from Great Britain for their maintenance in the Old Country and in France, and setting off that expenditure against the advances which we make to Great Britain here. I have explained that with respect to last year's wheat crop, we have found, or undertaken to find, no less a sum than $170,000,000, and I have no doubt that with regard to foodstuffs we shall have to make further advances to Great Britain, although I am glad to say that free markets are being established as quickly as possible with respect to all our commodities. Now we have the wheat crop of this year coming on, which we hope will be a large crop, and I do not know to what extent Europe will have to rely on us for credits for the purchase of that. But no matter what we have, we certainly must, and will, ensure the financing of the exportable surplus of the wheat crop of Canada for this year. My own view is that that should be the first demand to be satisfied, it is of such great importance to the entire country. Now we come to these other credits. There was common talk here in November of last year that Canada should strongly push for a portion of the re-construction business in Belgium, France and other devastated countries of Europe. Europe must be restored. Not only will food be required to maintain the population, but raw material and partly manufactured, and manufactured goods of various kinds, in which Canada can compete I think with any other nation, will be required on a vast scale. Now I submit that if the Government had not taken the step which it did in establishing the War Mission and providing credits, hon. gentlemen opposite, headed by my good friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) would to-night be most severely censuring the Government for not having done precisely what the Government has done. They would have very much better reason for censure in that case, because the conditions in this country, if we had not done what we did, would have been so serious that Opposition criticism would have counted very much more than it does now. Now I beg my friend the leader of the Opposition to take my word for it that we are not doing anything on the other side in the way of financing that we can avoid doing if we are to get the business.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To what other country is credit being extended besides Rumania, Belgium, and France?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Greece.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the amount of credit provided by the Canadian Government to date for France and Belgium?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will make a complete statement as to that, and I desire to say to the leader of the Opposition, and to hon. gentlemen to your left, Mr. Chairman, that I find no fault whatever with the question being raised, because an important Bill deserves serious consideration in Committee, and it is not my custom to withhold information if I can furnish it.

I desire to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that we are in good company in what we are doing. The United States has loaned, during the war, and is loaning now, billions of dollars to the nations of Europe to enable them during the war to conduct military operations, and since to buy the products of the United States. The United States must continue to do that through her Government and her financial institutions if she is to get trade. To put it another way, if Europe is to be supplied with foodstuffs and manufactured products from this continent Europe cannot pay for them, and this continent cannot sell them unless the money is found on this side of the Atlantic. There is no business man on this side of the House who does not know that that is so. The United States has been pushing very strongly for business, as my hon. friend says, but she has been in the powerful position of being able to offer credits. Her wheat, her meats and all her other foodstuffs of every kind she can sell to Europe, but Europe cannot sell European exchange against New York exchange to pay for them; Europe has to borrow from the United States. That borrowing will be done partly from the American Government and partly by the ordinary operations between banks, and by the sale in the United States of securities of European countries.

Great Britain for many years had the greatest money market in the world in London, and foreign governments came there and sold their securities, which were taken up by British investors, and in that way the money was furnished in London for the purchases which were made in Great Britain. Now you have this situation on the North American continent. Our people and the people of the United States are not accustomed to buying the securities of foreign governments. The United States is very slowly becoming an international money centre because her people, until this war, had not been accustomed—as were the British people—to purchasing the securities of foreign governments. Whether they will become so accustomed to doing that as to constitute New York a great international financial centre like London, in which the securities of foreign governments will be dealt in, I do not pretend to say. It will take probably a long time before that is accomplished. But the United States Government has been furnishing immense sums of money to the European countries, as I have said, in order that they might purchase foodstuffs and the goods required from the United States. I think the amount loaned to Great Britain alone is between four and five billion dollars for commodities so purchased. That was not loaned in gold and shipped overseas; it was a credit given at Washington, and Great Britain by means of that credit purchased in the United States the goods she required. She wanted the goods, and she could not buy them unless she got that credit.

With regard to Rumania, I would ask hon. gentlemen to bear in mind that she could have kept out of the war. She came into it at a very critical period and made great sacrifices for the common cause. I am not prepared to say that many thousands of Canadian lives have not been saved by the intervention of Rumania. If hon. gentlemen will look at the map of Europe they will see that Rumania is a great salient projecting into Austria-Hungary, exposed to attack on both front and flank—Bulgaria to the south, Austria-Hungary to the north and west. Rumania risked her all in coming into this war, and she lost for the time being, but she made the sacrifice. Sentimentally, therefore, I do not think we should be quick to reflect too much upon the credit of Rumania, devastated as she has been by the war, prosecuted by her in common cause with the Allies. Rumania is not so strong financially, of course, as Belgium and France, but she must be restored. Her fields have been devastated, her cattle carried off; and her people need food and clothing and agricultural implements. How are they going to get them? If they do not get food they will starve; if they do not get clothing the consequences will be serious from exposure; if they do not get agricultural implements their tillage cannot be restored. Rumania is a very rich country, rich in her fertile plains, her splendid forests and her great oil resources, and she will get upon her

feet rapidly once she gets a chance. Now, who is going to supply to Rumania the wheat to feed her population, the clothing to protect them from the elements, and the agricultural implements and railway equipment required for the restoration of their tillage and their transportation facilities? There is an opportunity there for some nation. The United States have seized that opportunity. Since the armistice, to say nothing of before, the United States have loaned Rumania $25,000,000—I ascertained that from Washington—and all that money is being spent in the United States.

Now, our Trade Commission in London approached Belgium, France and the other nations of Europe requiring supplies of various kinds of food and for the restoration of their countries, and ascertained that there was a splendid opening for business in the Balkans, the business that I have mentioned, good for the time being to keep our factories going and afford employment to our artisans and work people, and good in its promise for the future. Rumania, as I have said, could not purchase supplies in Canada unless a credit were established; neither could France, nor Belgium; and I pointed out that even England could not purchase unless we gave her credit. We gave a credit of $25,000,000 to Rumania; we gave a credit of $25,000,000 to Greece, whose future is of the brightest; we gave a credit of $25,000,000 to Belgium, and I believe she will speedily recover from the effects of the war. Belgium is a very rich country, and is now assured of protection by the League of Nations and by the interest which Great Britain and France notably have in the preservation of its integrity.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And France?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With regard to France, I may repeat to my hon. friend what I said the other night. The first country that we approached, long before the armistice and immediately after, in relation to reconstruction business was France. The matter was taken up with the French representative at Washington, and it was taken up overseas directly with the French Government by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and Mr. Lloyd Harris, and also, I may say, by the Prime Minister; and we offered her a credit of—well, we put no limit to it. What I had in mind was a credit of from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000. No question arises of France's future. We offered her such a credit as she might require for purchases in Canada. But I think the position of France is this, she has her own situation in regard to industries and employment, and very naturally she desires, to the extent of her ability, to do her own restoration through her own manufacturers and to give her own people employment. Consequently up to date she has not felt it necessary to avail herself of the offer of credit which I can again assure my hon. friend and this House it would have been a pleasure to us to extend to her for making purchases in this country. I have indicated all the credits that have been extended, with the exception of those which we have been giving to Great Britain and which we shall have to give. I assure the leader of the Opposition that no one will be more relieved than I shall when free markets are restored for wheat, flour, and all other commodities, so that men will carry on their business in the way they did in 1911. The hon. gentleman seemed to indicate that he thought we were blameable because we do not do business now as we did in 1911. But he has overlooked one very important consideration—something for which William Hohenzollern is responsible, not myself— and that is, the war. The reason why we have to do business in this way is that since 1911 we have had the war and we have not yet been able, as a country, to get back to the normal manner of doing business as my hon. friend described it. My own view is that as soon as industrial conditions permit, as soon as business can be done through the ordinary channels, the Dominion Government should not make any loans for the purpose of facilitating the sale of our products. The natural way is to have them taken care of through ordinary commercial and financial channels. What the Government has done it has done for two reasons: In the first place, to provide employment for those in Canada who would otherwise be out of work and to keep our factories going; and, in the second place, to extend the export trade of the country.

With regard to the placing of orders, a point was raised the other night about commissions. I made careful inquiry of Mr. Lloyd Harris over there; he knows nothing of any commission paid in respect of the business. I also served notice upon the Trade Commission here that it was not necessary that commissions of any kind should be paid, and that no orders should be placed with firms that were paying commissions or remunerations to any outside of their own employees or organization. This business is obtained in London. The

agents of, say, the Rumanian Government know what they want. They deal there through the Canadian Trade Mission, and with the representatives of the various branches of Canadian manufacture. They bargain as to the prices to be paid, and they see the samples—our men are in competition with others who are competing for the same business—and then the order is placed through the Trade Commission here, which is officered by very capable and honourable men. It seems to me that we could not devise any better means of getting business for all the manufacturers of Canada than we have devised by the establishment of this Mission in London and of its complement, the Canadian Trade Mission here. It is easy to criticise, and it is hard to construct and create. But this organization which we have built up and which at the time of its inception had the commendation of the people of Canada—it was a very live question here—is to-day keeping thousands of people at work, is promoting the industry and the commerce of the country, and, I submit, should be commended by hon. gentlemen opposite when they get to understand it fully. At the head of our Trade Commission here is Sir Charles Gordon, a very able and honourable man, as the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) said the other night. In London we have Mr. Lloyd Harris, who is well known, I think, to most members of this House. So far as I am aware, the Government's action is such as the Government should take at a time like this. Let us look forward to a period—I do not know how far distant; I hope not far distant—when the Dominion Government will not have to provide credits; then we shall have the benefit of all this connection that has been established with foreign countries. Our goods will get to be known, and an impetus will be given to all the industry of the country.

As to indebtedness on the part of one Government to another, that is usually a very honourable obligation of Governments and I have no doubt whatever that the advances which are being made by the Dominion Government, substantial sums as they are, will be repaid in due course, as soon as peace conditions permit these nations again to get upon their feet, and as soon as international exchange is restored.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the rate of interest charged?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We could have charged six, six and-a-half or seven per cent, but we are dealing with Governments and we did not think that it was dignified to charge an extortionate rate of interest. We charge them just the rate it costs to raise the money here—five and one-half per cent.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Most of these European countries are protective countries. Will the goods be subject to customs duties when they reach these countries?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot say as to that; but these goods are being purchased by Governments, and Governments could no doubt arrange to have them go in free of duty. Our relationship is not with individuals in these countries, but with Governments. For example, we give the Belgium Government a credit of $25,000,000, and Belgium is going to send a mission out here to purchase. The Belgian Government, having borrowed the money from us, and being, as I believe, entirely responsible, will use its credit in this country to purchase to the best advantage. I think the Hudson's Bay Company has been doing some buying for the Belgian Government. I believe that Greece also will send a mission here to purchase. Of the Rumanian credit, $5,000,000 is in wheat, another $5,000,000 is in raw material—that has not yet been purchased—and the balance is in manufactured products, such as clothing, woollens, textiles, agricultural implements, and, I hope, some railway equipment; in other words, what they need in order to restore their country.

Hon. gentlemen may say that Canada is taking some risk in this matter. Well, let us assume that we are. Having regard to the situation in which the country found itself in November last, facing this collapse in its industries, Canada is abundantly justified in doing what the United States has been doing on an immense scale, and what Great Britain is doing. This war has caused so profound a dislocation in the world, in finance, commerce and industry, that if during this year, which, in a sense, is a war year, because we have the consequences of the war with us, we failed in courage or in resource, the situation would be different in Canada from what it is to-day. I do not believe hon. gentlemen, no matter how well informed they may be, quite appreciate what the Government's financing has done and is doing for this country to-day. If you take the gratuity which we gave the soldiers; if you take the payments to the soldiers that the Minister of Militia has referred

to; if you take our shipbuilding programme; if you take the immense expenditures we are obliged to make for the financing of our grain purchases and our manufactured products that I have mentioned—hundreds of dollars—and then imagine the situation if the Government on November 11 had said: "Now we quit right here; the war is at an end; no more credits for wheat or meats or manufactured products; let private enterprise carry on the business itself. Well, I would be taking a ticket out of the country, because I would not desire to face the situation which would have resulted. Imagine the activities of this country, stimulated as they were during the war, keyed up to a height that none of us believed they could attain, and then everything suddenly stop. If the Government had not come to the rescue as they did, with courage and resource, and provide the credits we did, there would have been a very serious situation in Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the minister include transportation charges in the credit?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Of the $25,000,000 mentioned, there is a sum of $1,000,000, I think, for transportation. If my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) desires that this Bill should be taken up again to-morrow afternoon or evening, I have so much respect for his request that I will agree to it, and I do not think it will take very long to finish with the Bill. As regards the observations of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who was Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, may make a brief statement, but I will direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) to them in order that he may take them up when his Estimates are under consideration. This is a general Bill; it follows the lines of the previous Bills, both as to drafting and otherwise, and it is for demobilization as the others were for war; and it seems that the matters referred to to-night, especially those referred to by the hon. member for Lunenburg, might very well be taken up on the Estimates.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no doubt the matters discussed by the hon. member for Lunenburg could be discussed on the Estimates; but I think when the Acting Prime Minister considers that he has himself admitted that the hon. member is quite in order in bringing them up on this Bill, it is on this Bill that the answer should be made, because when the minister comes along with his Estimates, it will then be necessary for the hon. member to make his speech over again and put those facts before the minister in connection with another matter. We want to avoid that and to save time.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is going into Estimates to-morrow afternoon and intends to make a statement on shipbuilding and to take up items on his Estimates. The minister will then be able to deal with the observations of the hon. member for Lunenburg and the passing of this Bill need not be delayed because of the observations of the hon. member. On Supply or on any money Bill, it is proper for grievances of any kind to be brought forward; it is not necessary that they should be answered unless they seem to be relevant in some way to the vote, but I am quite sure the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be glad to speak to the observations of the hon. member for Lunenburg, and in the meantime, while I should like to get this Bill through, it can stand until to-morrow afternoon when we can take it up, and, I have no doubt, finish it quickly.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister was kind enough to direct his observations very largely to myself. He has not in any way cleared his Government from the responsibility of starting this new venture of opening credits in a foreign country with which we never did any business before. We have done our share in connection with the war nobly and well, particularly as an ally of our Mother Country, and nobody is finding very much fault with any moneys that have been expended in that direction. But I say to the Acting Prime Minister that we are under no obligation to build up Rumania or any other country that might have of its own free will gone into the war and received some damage by reason of that fact. It is going too far to ask the Canadian people, who have not the money to spend, who have to borrow money for their own purposes, who cannot, by reason of the high cost of living and other matters, get all the money they require for their own purposes, to furnish this money; and the Acting Prime Minister is going too far in looking for sympathy and applause from his supporters to-night by saying that we are doing this in the generosity of our hearts and extreme loyalty in order to build up the finances of Rumania, because that country got into trouble with its neighbours and not because of any loyalty to us.

I have no fault to find with advancing credits to Great Britain, France, Italy or Belgium because, if the Acting Prime Minister had the securities of those countries in his vault, he could easily raise money on them from any bank in this country or in the United States. But the trade that we went after, by and through our Trade Mission, was the trade of a country whose securities are evidently not very good in this country, upon which securities the Acting Prime Minister cannot raise any money and which, as the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) stated, are being peddled about from bucket shop to bucket shop in London at much below par. What we should have done is to deal with Great Britain and France, and if Great Britain and France want to advance goods to those smaller powers who are under their control and who must pay for them or get into trouble, that would be good business. We could very well say to the British Government: We will give you all the credit you want; we will arrange that we send the goods to you, and you can deal with the smaller countries. We never had any dealings with those countries in the most prosperous days of Canada, and why should we now pass over the heads of France, Italy and Great Britain and seek trade with countries with which we have never dealt with before? That is the particular fault I have to find. It is stated that our Trade Mission and our Trade Ministers were so clumsy and slow and incompetent in securing trade that everything that was worth having was gone and they were glad enough at last to fall back on such trade as they could make with Rumania by offering Rumania the money. That is where the difficulty is. If our manufacturers were properly represented on the other side by live business men, they would have secured the orders that the United States manufacturers got, but we did not get them, and our representatives, in order to do something to justify their existence on the other side, had to make this masterful stroke of saying to Rumania: We will give you money if you will be kind enough to buy our goods. That is all they did for which they claim so much credit, and I do not think they have shown any great foresight or capacity because they have done that.

12 p.m

I want to be absolutely fair to the manufacturers. We have manufacturers in the part of the country from which I come, manufacturing rails and all kinds of structural steel. They got no help from the Government.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Will the hon. member say what means were taken to provide the Steel Company at Sydney with orders so that they could continue manufacturing steel rails?

Mr. McKENZIE: The Minister of Railways found it proper, with a view to building three or four, or ten, thousand miles of railway next summer, to secure contracts for rails at a price below war prices. That is all that was done, and I am quite satisfied that any such a contract should be made with any manufacturer in the country. The Nova Scotia Steel had to send out their own agent to London and do the best they could to make contracts for themselves. Colonel Cantley went to London representing the Nova Scotia Steel. The company got no help from any body. Some of their men had to be laid off for a couple of months because there was not enough work to keep things going; but they had good times during the war and they had to put up with the difficulties that came their way, without any help from the Government. If the Nova Scotia Steel and other concerns in the part of Canada from which I come have to forage for themselves and find a market for their product as best they can, I cannot understand why other concerns should not do the same thing.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is the hon. gentleman aware that Colonel Cantley was unable to get any contracts in England because of the difficulty of financing over there?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not aware of any such difficulty. I am aware that while the men were idle for a while, they have now gone back to work and everything is going on first-class. The company did not get a cent of assistance from this Government or anybody else.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Colonel Cantley was not able to get any contracts overseas.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not saying whether he was or not. I know he went over there to try and get contracts. I know that the steel works are now working on their own initiative without a dollar of assistance from this Government, and what they have done other concerns should be able to do. But no one will exert himself if the Minister of Finance is going to take the whole responsibility on himself and relieve him of all his difficulties. I am sure the Nova

Scotia Steel and the Dominion Iron & Coal and other concerns in Nova Scotia would be delighted to jump at such an opportunity as that, but they had to get along by themselves, and they got along fairly well, and I think that is a more healthy way of doing business in any country. I would suggest that at this late hour the Bill should stand.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We will take it up to-morrow.

Mr. DUFF: When the resolution on which this Bill is founded was before the House I asked the Minister of Finance when the Order in Council had been passed with reference to the Rumanian loan, and he promised to give me the information. I already knew that an Order in Council had been passed, but the Prime Minister promised to get that information. A fortnight or three weeks have passed and the information has not yet been brought down as to when that Order in Council was passed granting a credit to Rumania. I understand it was passed only four or five days before the resolution was discussed in the House, but I should like to know the exact date.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I paid so much attention to the request of my hon. friend that I laid the Order in Council on the Table the next day. The Order in Council was passed as soon as the agreement signed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Prime Minister of Rumania came to hand. It could not be passed before that agreement had come to hand. I would not like my hon. friend to think I was guilty of any discourtesy.

Mr. DUFF: The minister must have laid it on the Table sotto voce. It is strange that the Government should pass an Order in Council granting a credit to Rumania when the people's representatives were assembled here in Parliament, and I wish to protest against any such action of the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The assistant clerk calls my attention to the fact that on the 11th of April, as I stated, I laid the Order in Council on the Table.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: Hon. gentlemen laugh with great glee because the Order in Council was laid on the Table without the knowledge of a private member. I wish to say with reference to laying Orders in Council on the Table, that that is no proper means of communicating information to this House. I have complained about it dozens of times. Whenever an important Order in Council or any important document is to be laid on the Table, a copy of it should be put in the box of every hon. member. We cannot hear a word in this House; I can hardly hear a word myself, and it is much worse for hon. gentlemen sitting behind. An Order in Council can be laid on the Table without any one being the wiser. We cannot always be standing over the clerk to see what is being laid on the Table. I repeat, when any information is laid on the Table of which hon. members should be made aware, a copy should be placed in every member's box, just as is done with the Estimates.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Thursday.

Thursday, May 8, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON DEBATES.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield), presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates, as follows:

The Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates beg leave to present the following as their Second Report.

The attention of your committee having been directed to the present system which necessitated delaying the binding of the Revised Edition of the Debates until the final completion of the index of the session's Debates thereby preventing the distribution thereof within a reasonable time after the prorogation of Parliament.

Your Committee therefore, with a view to expediting the distribution of the bound volumes in question, recommend that each volume be bound with the index for that volume, the last volume to contain a complete index.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

R. L. Richardson,
Chairman.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report relating to Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions for fiscal year ending March 31, 1918, with traffic returns, etc., to December 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

DISQUALIFICATION OF MILITARY DEFAULTERS.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill

No. 91 respecting disqualification of military defaulters.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The class covered by this Bill are known generally as military defaulters. They are comprised of those who failed in their military obligations under the Military Service Act. The subclasses are specifically defined. As to those, the Bill provides that they shall be disqualified in the following respects for a period of fifteen years: from holding any office under the Crown, from being members of Parliament or members of the Senate, and from voting at any Dominion election. The Bill provides that any of that class who have satisfied any conviction properly obtained and punishment imposed by such conviction shall not be included therein, nor shall any who came in under the amnesty proclamation of August last, nor shall any one who having been apprehended actually served in the military forces after apprehension, and, any who subsequently satisfied the terms of any legal conviction thereby become relieved of the disqualification provided by the Act.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does this include all the defaulters under both the Department of Justice and the Militia Department? There are six classes, as the minister outlined the other day. Does this include the whole six?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SENATE BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 87, respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

LEASES FOR OIL LANDS.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Have any leases for oil lands, in the western provinces, been issued since 1st January, 1917?
2. If so, under what regulations and to whom?
3. Has any application been made, lately, for special privileges on, or reservation of, oil lands in the western provinces, by any company?
4. If such privileges and reservations have been made or are to be made, under what terms and to whom?
5. Is it the intention of the Government, before granting such privileges and reservations to consult Parliament?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes. 2,168 such leases issued since 1st January, 1917.
2. Under the petroleum and natural gas regulations, a printed copy of which is attached. The preparation of a list of the names of the lessees would involve several days' work.
3. A great many applications have been made for such privileges on or reservation of oil lands in the western provinces.
4. No such special privileges have been granted.
5. The Government will consult Parliament in all cases except where it acts on authority already granted by Parliament.

MILITIA ACCOUNTS.

Mr. ROBB:

1. Has the Government passed an Order in Council under the War Measures Act, providing for the audit of the Militia accounts in Canada by an official of that department?
2. Has the Auditor General been asked to accept the audit by the official of the Militia Department without receiving the usual accounts and evidence of payment required by the Statutes?
3. Has the Government power under the War Measures Act to compel the Auditor General to accept an audit performed by an official over whom he has no control?
4. Who is the official appointed by the said Order in Council? How long has he been in the employ of the Militia Department, what is his salary and what was his occupation or profession prior to his being employed by the Militia?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. P.C. 316, dated February 8, 1918, provides for the appointment of a general auditor for the Militia Department, responsible to the deputy minister. Previous to this date, the audit was carried out as a part of the work of the branch of the Accountant and Paymaster General.

2. Under P.C. 1136, dated May 22, 1918, the General Auditor of the Militia Department was removed from the jurisdiction of that department and "made responsible to and under the control of the Auditor General." This step was taken after consultation with the late Auditor General, who has initialled the original Report to Privy Council. This was done in view of the tremendous expenditure of the Department of Militia and Defence under War Appropriation, and the provisions of the said Order in Council have been accepted by the present Auditor General as a temporary measure, until such time as the Militia Department comes back to its ordinary level. Under the provisions of P.C. 1136, all accounts are audited before payment by the representa-

tive of the Auditor General, thus safeguarding public funds to the greatest extent possible. The Auditor General still receives the usual accounts and evidence of payment. Previous to the passing of P.C. 1136, these accounts were paid by the Department of Militia and Defence and post-audit carried out by the Auditor General. Under the provisions of P.C. 1136, all accounts are audited before payment by the representative of the Auditor General.

3. Yes—Answered by Nos. 1 and 2. The Auditor General was a party to the arrangement, and not compelled, as implied.

4. Lieut.-Colonel D. F. Pidgeon joined the C.E.F. on August 10, 1914, as a lieutenant; was promoted to the rank of captain and served overseas 12 months, 9 months of which in France—Salary, $4,182.50, same as General Auditor Overseas—Paid as an officer, Canadian Expeditionary Force—Previous occupation, financial and real estate broker.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other papers regarding supplies purchased for the Yukon Telegraph Lines, during the fiscal year 1918-19, including copy of all tenders, the names of the tenderers and the amounts of each tender.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions and other documents, exchanged between the Post Office Department and any person in Inverness county during 1918 and 1919, in any way referring to the mail contract for carrying the mails from Inverness Railway station to Margaree harbour, N.S.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a return showing the amounts paid for advertising, printing, etc., by the various departments of the Government during the fiscal years 1916, 1917, 1918 to the following newspapers:—The Brandford Expositor, The Woodstock Sentinel Review, The Stratford Beacon, The Kingston Whig, The Hamilton Times, The Toronto Globe, The Toronto Star, The Guelph Mercury, The Niagara Falls Review, The St. Catharines Journal, The Ingersoll Chronicle, The Orillia Times, The Belleville Ontario, The Simcoe Reformer, The Richmond Hill Liberal, The Acton Free Press, The Mitchell Recorder and the Owen Sound Sun.

THE PEACE TREATY.

QUESTION AS TO ITS RATIFICATION BY PARLIAMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) what procedure the Government purpose adopting for the consideration, and if necessary, for the ratification of the Peace Treaty the terms of which were brought to the attention of the House yesterday.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The signature of the Peace Treaty is an executive Act. After signature by the parties to the Treaty, it will be submitted to Parliament for consideration and for legislative sanction. I understand that the Treaty provides for the deposit of the ratifications in Paris and that the Treaty becomes binding upon the powers as and from the date of the deposit of the ratification.

Mr. McKENZIE: In reference to the question raised by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) do I understand the Acting Prime Minister to say that this Parliament will have nothing to do with the ratification of the Treaty?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I said the precise opposite. I stated that the signing of the Treaty was an executive Act but that after the Treaty had been signed by the parties to it, it would be submitted to this Parliament, as to other Parliaments of the Powers concerned, for consideration and ratification of the executive act of signing. I stated further that there was a provision made in the Treaty for the deposit of the ratification at Paris and that each Power would be deemed to be bound by the treaty as and from the date of such deposit of the ratification.

Mr. JACOBS: May I ask what would happen should this Parliament refuse to ratify the treaty?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Considering that it would be signed by the Prime Minister and by the accredited representatives of the Government, acting as plenipotentiaries I could not conceive that Parliament would refuse to ratify it. If it did, the usual constitutional consequences would follow—but that I do not at all apprehend. The ratification by this Parliament will be in the same manner as the ratification by the Imperial Parliament of the signature of its plenipotentiaries, by the Congress of the United States, and by the other legislative bodies concerned.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: Is the hon. gentleman correct in using the word "ratification"? Ratification is a part of the machinery without which a Treaty is not completed. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this treaty will be com-

pleted without any ratification here. I suppose that he means that it will be submitted to this Parliament for approval or disapproval, if we so wish, but that whether it is approved or disapproved it is effective, and no ratification here is needed.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am afraid I cannot agree with my hon. friend. Let me give a case in point. An agreement was entered into by the late Government of Canada with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and it was signed on behalf of the Government. It was afterwards submitted for the ratification to Parliament. It did not become binding upon Canada until it was ratified by Parliament. Similarly, my hon. friend negotiated a treaty at Washington in 1911. I understand that was signed by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) and his colleagues, but it had not legislative effect until considered and approved, and it was not in that case approved by Parliament. I do not understand that the present case is different.

Mr. W. S. FIELDING: My hon. friend, I submit, is mistaken. There was no treaty signed at Washington; but there was an agreement made which was subject to Parliamentary approval—not ratification; exchange of ratifications is a part of the machinery without which a treaty does not become effective.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. We are wandering into a discussion on the Orders of the Day.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I ask a question of the Acting Prime Minister. If this Parliament does not ratify the treaty does the war begin again?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is in good fettle; he might be able to start a new war.

PRICE OF OLEOMARGARINE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. B. McCOIG: Mr. Speaker, there is a matter of extraordinary importance to the consuming public that I wish to draw to the attention of the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Maclean). A report appears in yesterday's Toronto Globe in reference to the high cost of butter. An investigation was made by Dr. Hastings, medical health officer of the city of Toronto, who states that:

> The demand for export butter at 80 cents per pound governs the price to the local consumer, and this demand has recently increased particularly in the English and United States markets. On the other hand, Dr. Hastings can find no justification for the "enormously high price of oleomargarine."

In another part of the paper it states:

> Margarine, which has been selling in Great Britain at 25 cents a pound, is now 16 cents. Here the manufacturer's price is about 33 cents, with the dealers in some cases getting almost 50 cents.

And it wants to know why there should be this difference. We allow margarine to come into this country free of duty and if the manufacturers are extracting an unfair profit from the consumer an injustice is being inflicted upon the public and the matter is one that should receive the attention of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is hardly taking the proper course on the Orders of the Day. I assumed that he was going to ask a question of the Government. This would be the proper subject of a question to be placed upon the Order Paper.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): I will endeavour to give my hon. friend (Mr. McCoig) a complete answer to-morrow. I am not in a position to give him what he might deem a satisfactory answer this afternoon. I wish to repeat a statement that he has himself made, namely, that oleomargarine is on the free list.

CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I notice in this morning's paper that the question of the representation of Canada at Washington was raised yesterday in the Imperial Parliament. The following question was asked by Mr. Arthur Murray:

> Has any communication yet been received from the Canadian Government in regard to the announcement made in the Dominion House of Commons recently by the president of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) that a permanent Canadian representative at Washington is shortly to be appointed?
>
> Col. Amery, Under-Secretary for the Colonies replied, "No."
>
> Mr. Murray: Is the House to understand that this proposed change has been arranged without consultation between the two governments?
>
> Col. Amery: I do not think the House should understand that. Undoubtedly when the matter is advanced to a further stage the Government will be consulted.

As the representative in Washington will have no ambassadorial powers but will act simply as the Canadian agent, as our agent in Paris or in London acts, may I ask the

Government if it intends to submit to the Imperial authorities the name of the proposed agent and will they consult with them as regards the right of Canada to appoint such a representative?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: The Canadian representative at Washington will be very much more than the Canadian agent. His status will be very different from the status of the Canadian representative in Paris or London. Therefore, there is consultation with the Imperial Government with reference to the appointment. I stated the other evening that confidential communications had been held between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Imperial Government in reference to this matter but that these were not yet concluded and that when they were the House would be advised of the whole purport of them.

HIGHWAY BETWEEN MONK STATION AND ST. PERPETUE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. J. FERNAND FAFARD (L'Islet) (Translation): I would like to inquire from the hon. minister of Railways whether, he proposes building a carriage road between Monk Station and the main road to St. Perpetue.

Several times I applied to the hon. gentleman for the building of that road, the last time on January 4, 1919, and I have here his answer dated February 20th, in the following terms:

(Text.)

Dear Sir,—With reference to correspondence in connection with improvements at l'Islet, I beg to advise that it is the intention of the railway officials to have this work performed during the coming session, providing satisfactory arrangements can be made.

Yours faithfully,

G. A. Bell.

J. F. Fafard, Esq.,
L'Islet, P.Q.

(Translation) It is to the knowledge of the hon. gentleman that such roads connecting stations with a main road have been built at the expense of the Government.

It is also to the knowledge of the hon. gentleman that the land adjoining the stations of the Transcontinental railway is the property of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER (Text): Order. The hon. gentleman, as I understand, is putting a question of a purely local character. He has the machinery for placing his question upon the Order Paper, or when the Estimates of the minister come up for consideration.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): It is also to the knowledge. . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

SUPPLY.

GOVERNMENT SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME —STATEMENT BY HON. MR. BALLANTYNE MINISTER OF MARINE.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Public Works—Marine Department—Government Shipbuilding Programme:—Amount required for the construction of vessels in accordance with Government's programme—$30,000,000.

Hon. CHARLES C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): Mr. Chairman, before we take up this item in a general way, I think it would be fitting for me to give to this House all the details that I possess in regard to the Government shipbuilding programme. A year ago I had the honour of introducing the Government's merchant marine shipbuilding policy. A great many changes have taken place since the armistice has been signed, and it seems to me to be an opportune time to furnish to this House all the information that I have on the subject for which the vote is now asked.

I think it would be well for us to look for a moment at the shipping conditions of the world, and particularly as they existed in Canada when the Government deemed it wise to embark on its shipbuilding policy. Up to about February or March, 1918, the Imperial Munitions Board were occupying all the vacant steel shipyards in Canada building ships for England. I believe that the Government of Great Britain is to be congratulated for its energy and foresight in not only having ships built to the fullest capacity of the immense shipyards of the United Kingdom, but also for utilizing all the available yards in Canada.

But, Sir, when I became Minister of Marine I could not see what particular value the steel ships that were being built in Canada for England could be to our own country, and after considering the matter from every point of view I thought the time had come when Canada should have her own merchant marine. Therefore I had the honour and privilege of recommending to my colleagues in the Government that we should utilize our own yards to build up a national merchant marine, and, much as we admire the old country and desire at all times to render her every assistance possible, more particularly when she is engaged in war, I con-

sider that we were doing not only our full duty to Canada, but also to the Empire when we took that course.

It will be remembered that there was an immense total loss of shipping at that time, about 15,000,000 gross tons, the war being at a very serious and critical stage, and the success of Great Britain and her Allies depending very largely on the extent of their merchant marine. So pressing was the need for tonnage that all Canadian ships under Canadian register and all ships plying in Canadian waters under British register were commandeered by the British Ministry of Shipping, a fact which left Canada devoid of a merchant marine.

At that time, Mr. Chairman, all of our Allies, with the exception of our neighbour to the south, were coming to me constantly to know if I would allow them to build ships in our yards—I refer particularly to France and to Italy, and also to Norway, one of the neutral powers. I had to reply to the overtures made to me that the policy of the Canadian Government was to utilize to the fullest extent our own steel shipyards, and that therefore we could not look with favour upon building ships for them. It was not so much a matter of price. Many of our Allies were willing to pay from $20 to $25 per ton more than this Government was paying for the ships it was having built under contract.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Per ton?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, sir, The policy of the Imperial Munitions Board was to build wooden as well as steel cargo vessels. The Canadian Government did not think it good policy to have wooden ships built. Not that either I or the Government had anything to say against wooden ships, but we thought it was a sounder policy, having in view that some time peace would come, to confine our efforts to the building of steel ships only, which accounts for our not having built any wooden ships. I should add that the money for the ships that were being built by the Imperial Munitions Board for Great Britain was being loaned by the Canadian Government. As these ships were being built with Canadian money, it seemed to me to be a wise and sound policy that they should be Canadian ships, for the use of the Canadian people.

There were three reasons why the Government adopted the policy of building up a mercantile marine. The first for reasons arising out of the conditions brought about by the war, and to which I have already alluded. The second was the desirability of building up our export trade. At no time in our history have the prospects been so favourable as at present for the building up, the extending, and the expanding of our export trade. The third reason was that Canada has a vast railway system, and it was proper that the Government, in order to complete the chain of transportation and to place our railways on as favourable a footing as possible, should supply those railways with the necessary steamship service. Parliament and the people generally will, I am sure, agree as to the wisdom of the policy of having these splendid cargo-ships work in co-operation with our railways and carrying on a service somewhat similar to that operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We hope to see our ships on the Atlantic and on the Pacific oceans plying to England, to Australia, to New Zealand, to South Africa, to South America and to all the ports with which Canada can carry on a foreign trade.

At present we have under contract forty-five steel ships, orders for which have been placed in yards from Prince Rupert to Halifax. The orders are placed as follows:

Name of Firm.	No. and Size of Vessel.	Total tonnage.
British American Shipbuilding Co., Welland, Ont.	2—4,350 tons.	8,700
Canadian Vickers, Ltd., Montreal, P.Q.	2—4,300 "	57,200
	6—8,100 "	
Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., Collingwood, Ont.	4—3,750	15,000
J. Coughlan & Son, Vancouver, B.C.	4—8,100 "	32,400
Davie Ship bldg. & Repairing Co., Ltd., Lauzon, Levis	2—5,100 "	10,200
Halifax Shipyards, Ltd., Halifax, N.S.	2—8,100 "	
	2—10,500 "	37,200
Kingston Shipbuilding Co., Kingston, Ont.	1—3,750 "	3,750
Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., Sydney, N.S.	2—2,800 "	5,600
Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co., Port Arthur, Ont.	4—3,400 "	
	2—4,300 "	22,200
Prince Rupert Drydock & Engineering Co., Prince Rupert, B.C.	2—8,100 "	16,200
Tidewater Shipbuilders, Ltd., Three Rivers, Que	4—5,100 "	20,400
Victoria Machinery Depot, Victoria, B.C.	2—8,100 "	16,400
Wallace Shipyards, Ltd., Vancouver, B.C.	2—4,300 "	
	2—5,100 "	18,800
	45	264,050

The total tonnage of these forty-five ships is 264,050 net tons. We have at the present time ready to go into service the Canadian Ranger and the Canadian Pioneer, both of 8,100 tons deadweight; we have the Canadian Voyageur, 4,350 tons, which has been doing splendid service for some months; and we have the Canadian Warrior, 3,760 tons. Two more will be ready in May, five in June, three in July, two in September, four in October, seven in November, and two in December, making twenty-five ships that we expect to put into commission during the present year.

Sir Sam HUGHES: Are they fitted with cold storage?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not yet, that matter is under consideration.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not hear the minister mention the Midland Shipbuilding Company.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No orders has been placed with the Midland Shipbuilding Company—I will deal with that a little later. The value of the contracts which have been placed is, in round figures, about $52,000,000. and up to the end of the present fiscal year $20,000,000 of that will have been paid. The item that we are asking the Committee to pass is for $30,000,000, which with the $20,000,000, constitutes, in round figures, the total amount of all the contracts, $52,691,450.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is for the twenty-five ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, for the forty-five ships; all that are under contract.

I stated in the House a year ago that it was the policy of the Government to utilize only existing steel shipyards. But there existed at Prince Rupert a large ship-repairing plant and floating dry dock, and considerable pressure was brought to bear upon the Government, especially as the war was proceeding at that time in a way that did not look favourable to us, and tonnage was very badly needed, to place some orders out there. I took the ground that the Government were not investing money in shipyards, but that if any firm would come along with the necessary capital the Government would be willing to give them a share of their business. That accounts for the placing of orders for two ships of 8,100 tons at Prince Rupert

Victoria, B.C., likewise did not have a modern shipyard. The Victoria Machinery Depot had a small place there, and our Victoria friends, especially the late Premier Brewster, were very anxious that we should give the city of Victoria part of the Government business. We therefore placed an order with the Victoria Machinery Depot for two ships of 8,100 tons each

Enterprising capitalists of Halifax, Captain Norcross and R. M. Wolvin, said that they were prepared to put $5,000,000 into a modern shipyard there if the Government would give them some business. I shall not weary the Committee with an account of all the interviews that I had and of the requests that these gentlemen made and which the Government could not see their way clear to grant. They wanted us to allow them to bring in free of duty what plant they required; I told them we could not agree to do that. They also wanted a very large order for ships, as their capital expenditure was great; but I told them that all we could do would be to give them an order for four ships, which we have done. When that yard is fully completed—and it will be completed shortly, because the keels of two vessels have already been laid there—it will be one of the finest and best equipped shipyards in the country.

Mr. MURPHY: What will be the cost of these four ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Two are 8,100 tons and two 10,500 tons. The price is $195 a ton.

Mr. DUFF: Deadweight capacity, or registered ton?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Deadweight. I will explain why we deviated from the policy announced a year ago that we were only going to keep existing yards going.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the speed of those ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The speed of the 8,100-ton ships is ten knots sea speed; that of some of the smaller ships is eight knots and of others nine, and that of the 10,500-ton three-deck ships to be built at Halifax, will be thirteen knots. As regards the type of ships, after consultation with the technical officers of my department, we decided it was wise not to build too expensive a freight ship, but at the same time to make our ships as efficient as possible. And I am proud to state to the committee that in no other country in the world, not even in the Old Country, are any ships being built better than those which our Canadian shipyards have so far turned out for the Dominion Government.

I now wish to refer to the matter of price which ranges all the way from $180 to $215

per ton dead weight, and I hope hon. members will fully realize that when the Government commenced their shipbuilding programme a year ago, everything was at its height; labour was very high, the rate of wages was constantly increasing, as was the cost of boilers, engines, and all the auxiliary equipment that goes into a ship. I am pleased to state that the forty-five ships that we have under contract for the Dominion Government are being built at a considerably lower cost than the ships on the vast programme of shipbuilding which the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation are carrying out. Their ships have cost considerably more than ours, notwithstanding the fact that they have turned out so far 555 steel ships.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is approximately the difference per ton?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not like to say anything but what would be pleasant about our neighbours who are our allies and who have helped us in every way possible, but according to the information I have received, their price, taking all the ships they have ordered from the various shipyards, would be at least $25 per ton higher than the forty-five contracts we have entered into in Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Where do we get the steel plates?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: From the United States. The other night the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) made a statement in this House, and he never makes a statement unless he is reasonably sure of the facts. While I give him credit for sincerely believing that the statement he made was correct, if I read Hansard aright —I was not in the House at the time—he stated that the Canadian Government ships under contract cost 400 per cent more than they had any right to cost, the comparison made by the hon. gentleman being between the pre-war price in England of $50 per ton and the prices the Canadian Government have made with the various shipyards throughout the country. The correction I wish to make is that the hon. member overlooked stating that his price was a pre-war price. The most reliable information I can get from England, Ireland and Scotland is that all of their yards are busy; that they are building ships rapidly for themselves, and that they are also building a certain number of ships for their Allies in Europe. Consequently, no one can get a firm price for ships over there. If any one in Canada wanted to build a ship of any size and approached any of the Old Country yards, he would be told that they would enter into a contract with him on a cost plus basis, but that they could not give him a firm price per ton. He would also be told that they could not make deliveries before at least the spring of 1920. In this connection, I might quote a well known shipbuilder, Sir G. B. Hunter, of the firm of Swan, Hunter, a firm distinguished for its shipbuilding. Sir G. B. Hunter, in an interview which was reported in the Newcastle Journal on April 6, 1919, stated that ships cost at present three times as much to build in England and Scotland as they did before the war. Therefore, if we take the hon. member's figure of $50 per ton, and if we take the well known and reliable authority which I have quoted, namely Sir G. B. Hunter, ships built in the United Kingdom at the present time would cost $150 per ton.

Mr. McKENZIE: What I had in mind was that the Government which preceded the one of which the minister is a member, were so slow in taking up a policy of shipbuilding that prices had gone up so much to the disadvantage of Canada.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member surely does not think that at any time since war began, ships could be built for $50 per ton, either in the Old Country or Canada, and that is the point I am trying to clear up.

When the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) was making an able address in this House about shipbuilding, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) made a statement similar to that made by the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie). He said that Canadian Government ships were costing four times as much as they ought to cost. Therefore I want to make it clear to this Committee and to the country that those hon. gentlemen were referring to pre-war prices in making those comparisons.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The Financial Post was my authority for making the statement that ships are being built on the Clyde for $55 per ton. The contract price in Halifax is $200 per ton dead weight, which is approximately four times as much.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member can give me the name of any firm on the Clyde that will build ships for $55 per ton the Canadian Government will be glad to give it a large contract. I do not know of any firm in the Old Country that would undertake to build ships at any such price,

although I give the hon. member credit for making a statement which he believed was accurate at the time. I merely want to clear this point up, because I do not want the public to think that, in order to build ships in Canada, we are compelled to pay $180 to $215 per ton when they could be built in the Old Country for $50 per ton.

Mr. DUFF: Has the minister made enquiries of large shipbuilding firms, and if so what prices has he received?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have. I sent cablegrams to four different firms in order that the information which I am now giving might be accurate and up to date. It will interest hon. members to know that one of our great allies is having thirty wooden ships built in Canada at the present time at a price of $200 per ton dead weight, so that if $200 per ton is being paid for a wooden ship I do not think the Government have paid too high a price when it pays from $180 to $215 for steel ships.

Mr. DUFF: Where are those wooden ships being built?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At Victoria.

Mr. DUFF: We are building wooden ships in Nova Scotia for about $75 a ton dead weight.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The type of ship built at Victoria for $200 per ton would, I imagine, be entirely different from that of the ships being built in the Maritime Provinces for $75 per ton.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The ships are being built at Victoria, B.C., for the French Government?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. I wish to explain why the Government found it necessary to pay British Columbia shipbuilders $10 per ton more than eastern shipbuilders. First of all, I endeavoured to place contracts with British Columbia shipbuilders at the eastern prices, but they pointed out that the labour cost was $7 per ton more in British Columbia than in the East, and that freight rates were very much higher. After a great many interviews, extending over some months, the Government agreed to pay the British Columbia shipbuilders $10 per ton more than the eastern price for a similar type of ship. For instance, if an 8,100-ton ship was being built by Vickers of Montreal for $180 per ton, the price for a similar ship in the British Columbia yards would be $190 per ton.

There has been some criticism of myself, especially by the British Columbia shipbuilders, because I would not allow them to take foreign contracts. When the war was on, France, Norway, and Italy were urging us to allow ships to be built here for them. I would gladly have consented had we been able to get sufficient ship plates, marine engines, boilers, and the other necessary equipment for our own needs, and at the same time have a surplus for ships to be built on foreign accounts; but unfortunately, notwithstanding the fact that we had an agreement with the United States for 80,000 tons of plate, up to the time of the signing of the armistice we had only been able to get some 6,000 tons. So I could do nothing else than say to these gentlemen that Canada could not afford to delay her own shipbuilding programme by building ships on foreign account.

With regard to the slowness of the construction of some of our ships, I admit that the yards have taken very much longer than I anticipated, but the delay has been unavoidable owing to the shortage of skilled and unskilled labour, and the great difficulty in getting shipbuilding plate from the United States, as well as engines, boilers, and other equipment. The ships are coming along more rapidly now than when the war was on. Before I leave the subject, I might say that quite recently there has been a great demand for space. Our ships are going to be operated by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited, and naturally manufacturers and firms who have large orders for shipment abroad have been coming to the Marine Department to know whether or not they can get the tonnage. I have been approached, for instance, by the Dominion Coal Company, who told me that all their ships had been requisitioned by the British Minister of Shipping, and they wanted tonnage to send 1,000,000 tons of coal to Montreal. They said that unless the Canadian Government could provide the tonnage they might have to close down their mines, which would be almost a catastrophe. The steel men, the pulp men, the sugar men and the general produce merchants all want to know what tonnage the Canadian Government can provide. The British ships that are plying from Canadian ports at the present time have seventy per cent of their available cargo space reserved for the British Minister of Shipping, which leaves only thirty per cent for the Canadian export trade.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are the Dominion Coal Company's ships on the British register?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Some of them are, and some are on the Canadian register.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the minister been able to meet the requirements of the Dominion Coal Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I did everything I could in that respect while I was in England last year. I have since sent many cables to the British Minister of Shipping. The Canadian High Commissioner, Sir George Foster, and Mr. Lloyd Harris have all done their very best, but I am sorry to say they have been unable to get the tonnage. To illustrate the great necessity of our having ships at the present time let me read a cable received by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association from Mr. R. J. Young of the Canadian Mission in London, under date of March 1, and which was handed to me only yesterday:

Our work here practically futile unless additional ocean space can be secured. Commercial shipments Canada to Great Britain now three times quantity space available, and rate of freight on many lines practically prohibitive, amounting in many instances to seventy-five per cent invoice value. Steamship companies in many instances charging double published rate.

He goes on to ask what assistance I can give, and concludes, addressing the Canadian Manufacturers' Association:

You may make statement that unless the matter of shipping is immediately attended to Canadian tr `e will suffer tremendous loss.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If some of the Dominion Coal Company's ships are on Canadian register, by what right can the British Admiralty requisition them?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Before a Canadian registered ship can be so requisitioned, application has to be made to the Canadian Government through the Minister of Marine. When the war was on and tonnage was required to transport munitions and foodstuffs and soldiers across the seas, the Canadian Government could not refuse to release the ships on Canadian register.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not get them back now?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Of course, we have no authority over the ships on the British register.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Did I understand the minister to say that we are importing all our steel plate from the United States?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: All the plate we have used on our ships to date has been imported from the United States. The plate mill at Sydney is not yet ready.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I asked the question because I was under the impression that, pursuant to the Order in Council passed in March, 1918, the Canadian Government had entered into a contract with the Dominion Steel Corporation for steel plates.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall come to that in a moment. I think it will interest the House to know what Australia is doing in the matter of shipbuilding. She is not only building her own merchant marine, but war ships too, so their Minister of the Naval Service, Sir Joseph Cook, informed me when I was in London. Australia has erected during the war a plate mill. Besides the ships Australia is now building, she bought ten ships in 1915 or 1916 and these have proved to be very profitable. They are now building twenty ships more. The Acting Minister of the Australian navy, Mr. Poynton, announced on April 10th that the Australian Government would remain in the shipping business and would continue its shipbuilding programme. He said that their present programme contemplated the building of twenty steel ships.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And war ships as well?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. I now come to the policy of the Government for the future. I have already stated that we have forty-five ships under contract. There are at the present time certain yards in Canada that require business. Berths are becoming vacant, and many more will become vacant in the very near future. The Government has not finally decided how many additional ships they will order but I will bring down in my Supplementary Estimates the amount that the Government will think it wise to ask approval for. The sum of $30,000,000 that I am dealing with now is to complete the contracts that we have already let, but in view of the fact that there is a great demand for ships and also that we could sell some of our ships under contract at the present time if the Government deemed it wise to do so, we are not going to discontinue shipbuilding for the moment. We realize that there are 30,000 men engaged in the shipyards throughout Canada, from Prince Rupert to Halifax, and there are fully 10,000 more engaged in the industry of making engines, boilers, etc., and to cause 40,000 men to be out of employment at this time would be rather a dangerous thing to do. It is therefore not the intention of the Government to cease their shipbuilding programme now. We are going to order additional ships, at least to keep the yards that are requiring

work busy throughout the balance of 1919, and probably for a few months in 1920.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What class of men are these shipbuilders? Are they British or Canadian people, or are they the foreign element that have been cursing us?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member must realize that I have no way of knowing the nationality of these 30,000 men, but I should imagine that a very large majority of them are Canadians or British subjects. I was told this morning by one shipbuilder, from the Halifax shipyards, who employs a thousand men, and will shortly be employing two thousand, that 29 per cent of his total staff are returned soldiers.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is such a scarcity of work that it would not be wise on the part of the Government to discontinue at once their shipbuilding programme.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As regards Vickers in Montreal, I may say that 95 per cent, if not 99 per cent, are full fledged Canadian or British subjects.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not want this House or the shipbuilders to think that the Government can go on forever ordering ships, because there must be a limit to the number of ships that the Canadian Government can use, and we are getting very near to that point. So that when I say that it is the intention of the Government, subject to the approval of Parliament, to order more ships, the shipbuilders must not expect that there will be many more orders to follow, and they must therefore look for orders for their shipyards in the same way as any other industry in the country would.

There is no protection whatever given to the shipbuilders in the way of duty and bonus, and when the yards of the United Kingdom are free a year and a half hence to take orders, it will be most difficult for the Canadian shipbuilder to compete unless some form of assistance is given by the Government. What that form of assistance will be has not yet been determined, but between now and the next session of the House we hope to have a policy ready to present to Parliament.

Mr. MURPHY: Will that mean more bonuses?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I said a moment ago that the Government had not decided what form of aid should be given to the shipbuilders. The matter has not been considered by the Government, but naturally when the shipyards complete the building of the ships that are ordered by the Government now, and a few more that will be ordered, it will be a problem that the Government will have to deal with, as to whether they will let these shipyards go out of existence altogether or give them a fair amount of protection the same as other Canadian industries are enjoying and have been enjoying for some years. That is all I wish to say on the shipbuilding policy and programme of the Government.

But I want to say something in reference to ship plate contracts. Over a year ago the Government entered into a contract for 250,000 tons of ship plates at $4.15 per hundred pounds based on the price of steel billets at $25.50, and as the price of steel billets would go down, so would the price of ship plates. From time to time the Government will place their auditors in the steel company's plant in order to check up their costs. The total amount of plate tonnage that we contracted for was 250,000 tons. What caused the Government to give this contract was the scarcity and the impossibility of getting ship plates from our neighbours to the south in order to carry on our shipbuilding programme. No one at that time could foresee the end of the war. It might be a year or more before the conclusion of hostilities, and when a country is at war, as Canada was, it is necessary to prepare for an indefinite continuance of war conditions. The shipyards at that time were paying for plate all the way from 4 cents a pound up to 10 cents. The ruling price in the United States, outside of the plates required for the Government ships, was from 4 to 5½ cents. I called into competition the great United States steel companies, besides inviting all the steel companies in Canada to tender, and the best price I could get was $4.15, the United States steel price being 4¼ cents per lb. Since the letting of this contract the armistice has been signed, and the price of steel plates has dropped to 2¾ cents in the United States and may possibly go lower. I therefore recently interviewed the officials of the steel company and pointed out to them that this was a war contract that we had entered into with them, and that in view of the price of steel plates having declined so much in the United States, and for other reasons, I wanted to negotiate with them for a modification of the existing contract. I met the President and the Vice-president of the Dominion Steel Corporation, who could not have met me in a

more broad and patriotic spirit than they did; and while they said that they were sorry to lose such a contract if they had to, they were prepared to make any modifications that I, as a responsible minister would care to propose with the approval of the Government. These negotiations are being carried on at present, and the contract will either be modified or be entirely cancelled. The Government have not yet got the necessary information before them to decide what action they will take, but I am free to state now that we can modify the contract or, if we prefer, as they have met us in a very broad spirit, we can cancel it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there a clause to that effect in the contract?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Did the Dominion Steel Company have all their plant erected?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Dominion Steel Corporation have their plant partially up. There is no machinery or plant in it at all, and it is very far from completion. I understand it is only barely started.

Mr. GAUTHIER: The Order in Council of 26th March 1918, clause (j) reads:

> That all the machinery, plant and material of whatsoever nature or kind refined in the construction of the necessary mill, power facilities, steel making equipment, etc. . . . . to produce the steel plates covered by this proposal, shall be admitted into Canada free of all customs duties.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I was in negotiation with the president and the vice-president only as late as yesterday and they inform me that they have not brought any plant or machinery from the United States.

Mr. DUFF: The minister informed us earlier in his remarks that contracts had been entered into with different shipyards at from $180 to $215 a ton. I presume this price was made in view of the fact that either the shipyards or the Government would have to pay to the Dominion Steel Company or other manufacturers of steel $4.15 a hundred pounds. If, as the hon. gentleman has just told us, they make a new contract with the Dominion Steel Company, or if the steel company modifies their contract to meet American competition at $2.25, will the Government pay the shipbuilders $215 per ton dead weight for these ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. gentleman could not have understood me correctly. As I said, the contract price was not based on the price of steel that we contracted for with the Dominion Steel Company, but on the price of steel that we contracted for with the United States Government at 3½ cents. It has really nothing to do with that price. Just before I leave this question may I say that I hope to receive the approval of the House for the $30,000,000 that I am now asking and I trust that when my Supplementary Estimates come down for the additional sum, for the reasons that I have explained this afternoon to the best of my ability, hon. members will give the Government their unanimous support. I hope they will not look upon this as a party question at all. I consider that our shipbuilding programme is a large, national question.

It has just occurred to me that I did not explain how these ships were going to be operated and if I might do so now I would say that at one time I thought I would organize a shipbuilding branch under the Department of Marine and Fisheries and engage a capable manager to operate the ships. But after careful and serious thought I could not see how I could keep the operation of these ships free from political influence, as it was desirable that we should, and therefore I thought the best policy for the Government to pursue would be to follow the good example of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which has its own steamships, while owned by the same shareholders as the railway, operated separately under the name of Ocean Services Limited. Therefore I recommended to the Government that Mr. D. B. Hanna and his board of directors should be responsible to the Government for the operation of the Government ships the same as they would be for the operation of the Government railways.

But in order that Parliament and the public would know what profits and losses these ships might make, I proposed that a steamship company be formed and it has been formed under the name of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited. The operations of the ships are going to be kept separate from those of the railway. Mr. Hanna promised that he would procure one of the best stseamship managers that he could get and an efficient organization. In addition to that, as so many inquiries come into the Marine and Trade and Commerce Departments, there will be an advisory committee here that will not in any way interfere with the management of the ships by Mr. Hanna and his board of directors, but will act more in an advisory capacity

The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Johnston, and the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. O'Hara, will consult as often as necessary with the general manager of the Government ships in regard to what cargoes should be moved because there is more cargo available than the Government has ships to carry. As these ships are built for Canada alone, Mr. Hanna understands full well that they are not to be used in any foreign trade if there is business available in Canada. I am sorry to have taken up so much of the time of the House but if there is any further information that any hon. member wants I will be very glad to furnish it.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Is it the present intention of the Government to retain in its service these 45 ships and such additional ships as may be built or, inasmuch as the work is largely for the purpose of giving employment, is it intended to sell some of these ships and build others?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That would depend altogether on the business offered. At the present time it would not be wise for the Government to sell any of their ships especially those that are ready to go into commission now. I had an offer from a New York firm to-day at $190 per ton which I have refused. It may be possible that some of the ships will not be completed until a later date and if we find the demand for ships and the volume of business falling off the Government might possibly sell some of the ships.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Some time ago the British Government, I understand, had a number of trawlers constructed in Canada which trawlers were sold. Inasmuch as the fishing business is only in its infancy in Canada might I ask the minister if he has considered the advisability of the Government, possibly not now but later on, assisting Canadian corporations in the construction of trawlers in Government yards, or under some other system, so that we may have our own fleet of trawlers engaged in the fishing industry in this country with ocean ships to convey the products to the nations of the world?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member (Sir Sam Hughes) knows as well as I do that of the trawlers and drifters built in this country only 6 were built for Canada. These trawlers and drifters were built probably more for war purposes than anything else. A large number of trawlers and drifters, which some people think belong to the Canadian Government, are at Liverpool at the present time. The British Government have sold some and they might possibly sell more. The Canadian Government have only six trawlers on hand for the time being.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not assist in developing that trade by encouraging a corporation here to go into the business? Would it not be well for the Government to assist them in building ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There would never be any demand for trawlers except by fishermen, and I am quite sure that they would not pay the price of these expensive war trawlers. The sum they would want to pay would be so small that no one could build a similar type of trawler for it. I hope our friends in Canada will build the type of trawler that our fishermen need and at a price which they can pay.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: As the Government railways are under the control of the Railway Commission as to rates, tolls and tariff agreements, is it the intention of the Government to place the ships under the same commission in regard to rates and tolls?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That would be a matter for Mr. D. B. Hanna and his board of directors to consider more than it would be a question for the Government. It would be a very difficult problem for any Government to undertake to control rates for ocean traffic. But if it is at all feasible, the Government would be willing to join in with the others.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I might call the minister's attention to the fact that I received to-day from the United States Shipping Board a complete statement of all the rates that they have made for their ships going out to all foreign ports. They have hundreds of different rates and they have tariff agreements and such things in connection with shipping.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is a little different from the statement in a newspaper article that I have before me. I did not want to take up the time of the House, but if it will bear with me for a moment I will just refer to it. Mr. Hurley, the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, says that they have built 555 ocean-going steel ships, that they have contracts for 1,336 similar vessels yet to be built, and that when the programme is finished they will have 16,732,700 tons of shipping. Mr. Hurley's proposal, which he is going to submit

to the American Congress, is that the United States Government shall sell these ships to private persons. Mr. Hurley goes so far as to say that he is willing to recommend to the American Government that they be sold, not at the cost of construction to the Government, but at the cost of construction at the time the sale was made.

He also, of course, states that he hopes the American Government will be able to control rates; but I do not see how they can very well do so. He further states that they are going to set aside the large sum of $15,000,000 for what he calls a Merchant Marine Development Fund, so that if any of their ships are on a trade route that does not prove to be profitable, the American Government will come to their aid. He also states that the United States is striving to be the leading maritime nation of the world; and consequently we must recognize the keen competition that we are going to have from the States.

Mr. GERVAIS: Has the Government any ships under construction at Sorel; and if not, why not? The yards have many facilities for ship construction; the necessary skilled workmen are available, and as the Government seems to be in a hurry to build ships, why not take advantage of the Sorel yards?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Sorel has no shipyard that could build the type of ship we have been ordering. That was the reason we could not place any orders there.

Mr. GERVAIS: Have not the Government in the past built at Sorel ships three or four hundred feet long?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government have not built any ships at Sorel equal to the tonnage of the ships I have just referred to.

Mr. T. FOSTER: How many orders have been placed in Toronto, and have the Polson Company been given any?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government have not placed any orders with any of the Toronto shipyards, for the very good reason that the two shipyards there had their berths all occupied either by ships they were building for the Norwegian Government before our ship-building programme was undertaken, or by ships they were building for Canadian register. I know they have berths vacant now, but whether the Government will be able to place any orders with them or not will depend on the amount that I bring down in my Supplementary Estimates, and the approval of the House thereto.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I would like to get information on two points. I understand from the minister that he does not intend to carry out the proposal made in the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department. In that report at page 15 I find that the Government purposed to build annually 200,000 tons of merchant shipping at an estimated cost of $40,000,000 to $50,000,000. The minister to-day does not seem to hold the same view, because, if I understand him correctly, he says that when the present orders are filled, the shipbuilders will have to look out for orders elsewhere. I would like him to explain if there is really a change in the policy of the Government in that regard. I quite understand that when this policy was inaugurated ships were very scarce and the policy was justified on account of the war. The criticism of my hon. friend (the leader of the Opposition) is quite pertinent, however, when he says that the Government were very slow, that they allowed three or four years to elapse before they did anything, and then when prices were almost as high as they ever will be and when the war was nearly over they embarked on the shipbuilding programme. When this report was issued I understand the war was over, but in it I find, as I have said, that there is a proposal to go on with this shipbuilding programme.

The minister has told us that the programme is justified in order to afford ocean freight facilities for our railway system. We are undertaking the management of an enormous railway system, and of course we hope to have a great deal of traffic for export to deliver at seaboard. But I think the minister has undertaken to build the wrong class of ships, if he expects them to make connections with the National Railway system. He mentioned that the Government were following the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That company has never embarked on the building of tramp vessels. It has built liners that make regular trips, connect with its railway system, and undertake to route goods to certain places and to deliver them on certain dates. That does not seem to be what my hon. friend is doing. He is building a large fleet of slow tramp vessels that are not suitable, and never will be suitable, for that class of work. He tells us that the speed of a certain class is 8 knots, of another class 11 knots, and of the highest class only 13 knots. Well, my hon. friend

will be very far behind in competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway system with ships of that class.

I would like the minister to explain to me how a tramp vessel owned by the Canadian Government is any better to carry freight from or to our railway terminals than a privately owned tramp vessel. If the rates are the same, the service is the same; they are exactly alike. There is no advantage to the trade of Canada to have the work done by a tramp vessel owned by the Government rather than by one owned by John Smith or anybody else. The only advantage that I can see at all although I do not advise it, would be to have regular liners to carry our mails and passengers, and which would enable the Government to say to a merchant: "We can take your freight at a certain point on a certain day, and we can deliver it at Liverpool, London, Bristol, or some other point on a certain day." Then we would be able to get trade in that way routed through our own transportation system. But I do not see for the life of me how tramp vessels are going to be any advantage to our railway system. Cargo for shipment from Montreal to London does not belong to the Canadian Government, it belongs to some merchant, and he does not care whether the Government boat or any other boat carries it. If he has cargo to ship he asks his broker to put it up on the exchange, the broker does so, and the shipowner who quotes the lowest figure gets the business, and no one asks who owns the vessel. There would be no advantages to the trader or the farmer unless the minister intends to cut rates. If he intends to do that, then the question comes up as to how he will get along. I submit that he will have a lot of trouble if he undertakes to compete for cargo at lower rates than those quoted by the ordinary tramp vessels. The first thing he knows those tramp vessels will desert the St. Lawrence river, and go where the prices are highest. If the minister attempts to quote below the market rates that is what will happen, and he will drive away all vessels not owned by the Canadian Government. He knows very well that ocean freight rates are not subject to the same rules as railway rates. A railway line has a monopoly between certain points, but the tramp vessel has no monopoly. If there is cargo to carry to any part of the world every tramp vessel is ready to compete for it. The proposal is put up on the blackboard in London or New York, and it makes no difference what the ownership of the vessel is, she will get the cargo if she will carry it at the cheapest rate.

That is one of the incidents of trade that you cannot overcome. So that when we embark upon the construction of tramp vessels we are simply putting our money unnecessarily into something that might far better be left in private hands. My hon. friends who are in favour of public ownership might justify the public ownership of a regular steamship service that would connect with our railways, but I do not see how they can justify the ownership of these tramp vessels. The minister has not had very much experience so far in running these vessels; the half dozen or so that he has, he has turned over to the Canadian Government Railways, under whose control they are operated. Members of the House who have been making inquiries about what these vessels are doing have not been able to ascertain so far that they have been developing Canadian trade. On the contrary, we find that they have been developing the trade of the United States and paying very little attention to what our railways are carrying to the seaboard. Several questions were asked about these vessels. Inquiries were made with regard to the steamer McKee, and we were frankly told by the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) that this Government-owned vessel was chartered by a New York concern to carry a cargo of coal from New York to Chili, and that she was going to carry back a cargo of ore. The minister was criticised for using a Government ship in developing foreign trade, and the excuse he gave was that the ship was small and he did not want to send her across the Atlantic in the winter season; he thought it was much safer to send her around Cape Horn to Chili. That is an excuse that any shipping man would laugh at, because if there is a stormy spot in the world, it is around Cape Horn. Crossing the Atlantic would be a much safer trip for any small vessel. I do not think, therefore, that the reason given is the real reason. The same thing came up in regard to the Voyageur. She was not engaged in carrying Canadian goods; at the time the inquiry was made she was carrying sugar from the West Indies to New York. I do not know what the others are doing, but so far the experience has been that these tramp vessels are not doing anything in the way of developing Canadian trade.

With regard to the price of these vessels, I think I was mistaken in the quotation I gave to-day from the article in the Financial

Post. When I looked at it more closely I found that it referred to ships produced in Great Britain in pre-war days, not at the present time. I do not want to make any mistake about that; I want to get as near to the truth as I can and to assist the minister in any way that I can in this matter. I find the following article in a despatch from New York published by the Montreal Star:

"The average cost per ton to build ships in England now is about £23, or $115," said Lt.-Col. Claude Bryan, who is a director of the Palmer Shipbuilding Company, at Jarrow-on-Tyne, on his arrival here this week.

"Elimination of Germany as a factor in shipping means the restoration of the industry to a normal and practical basis. There will be no more ships built of the enormous tonnage of the Vaterland and the Aquitania. Germany tried to outdo the world in building these huge vessels, but the Cunard came back with even larger ships, but all to no good purpose financially. The German liners have been marine failures while the Cunarders, with greater and more convenient passenger accommodations, have shown a profit entirely out of proportion to their investment."

"All the shipyards of England are booked up for at least two years. Contracts are made 'time and line' or cost plus a profit of from seven and a half per cent to ten per cent to the builder."

He says that the average per ton cost to build ships in England now is about £23, or $115—not half, but approximately half the cost of producing ships in Canada. So that we are paying a very high price for the ships that we are producing.

Mr. STEVENS: The statement of the eminent authority quoted by my hon. friend is that the British yards are booked for two years and that the contracts on which they are working are on a cost plus ten per cent basis. How, therefore, can my hon. friend say in the same breath that the cost is $115 a ton?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The hon. gentleman is quite correct. We must make that allowance. We cannot produce ships at that rate in Canada. My hon. friend is not able to show that we can logically go on with the building of ships in Canada at the price we are now paying. Of course, we may be able to do it with Government assistance; that is how we are doing it now. But we could not do it without that Government assistance.

This programme is not a shipbuilding programme at all; it is a ship-owning programme. The Government is ordering ships at practically $200 a ton and they are bound to lose part of the money by the time they get through. If the Government arrived at some policy that would enable private capital to build the ships, they would be doing something worth while for Canada; but when the Government stop pouring out their money, the shipbuilding will stop. My hon. friend hinted a while ago that the Government did not intend to go very long on this policy of building ships and that the shipbuilders would have to look out for themselves. Well, that is a very poor prospect for any person who wants to put his money in a shipyard. If the Government really want to assist shipbuilding, what they should do is not to buy tramp vessels at enormous prices, but find some means by which the Canadian investor can put his own money into shipbuilding and compete successfully in that business with the outside world.

The minister is simply buying ships at a very high price, a price that will enable any builder to build them for him, but he is not doing anything to make it possible later on for a Canadian to build ships himself and to enable the Canadian people to become maritime ship-owning people. That is really a matter that the Government ought to tackle. The shipbuilding efforts of the Government have so far not been very successful. The trawlers, about which the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) spoke a few minutes ago, were built in the yards of Vickers, and Polson's.

Mr. BUTTS: Did I understand the hon. member to say that the Canadian Pacific do not own or did not build tramp steamers?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: No, I did not say that. I said that the Canadian Pacific were building a different line of vessels altogether that were capable of carrying their freight from their railway terminals to the markets of the world.

Mr. BUTTS: What I understood the hon. member to say was that the Canadian Pacific does not own any tramp steamer or did not build any.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The Canadian Pacific, I understand, never owned tramp steamers as such. They have some old passenger steamers which they are using for carrying freight, but they are not in the tramp steamer business.

I was referring to trawlers that were built by the present Administration in connection with the war. I have been looking over the accounts for the construction of those trawlers, which accounts any hon. member can find in the room where the Public Accounts Committee meets, and I find that the seven trawlers that were sold at

Halifax recently cost $704,955.51. It would appear from the information that we get from questions answered by the minister that they all had to undergo repairs very shortly after they were built; that they were built in such a haphazard way that they were unseaworthy. According to the Public Accounts, $134,917.22 was expended in repairs. Those trawlers were sold a few weeks ago.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not wish to curtail the discussion in any way, but the hon. member is referring to trawlers which were built for the British Government, and which have nothing to do with the subject under consideration.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: They may have been built nominally for the British Government, but they were really built for the Canadian Government. The Canadian Government paid for them and they appear in the Canadian Government accounts which we are now examining in the Public Accounts Committee, so that I think I have a right to refer to them. I find those trawlers were sold for $270,000. They cost including repairs $839,872.73, so that they were sold at a loss to the country of $569,872.73. The extraordinary thing to me is that the minister or somebody in the Department of Marine and Fisheries did not think of utilizing those trawlers on the coast for fishing purposes. The price at which they were sold is a mere bagatelle compared with what they cost, and it would surely have been profitable for some enterprising Canadian to use them on our coasts in developing our great fishing industry. I find also that 65 per cent has been allowed Vickers by the minister for what are called overhead charges. I am not very familiar with manufacturing, and I am not going to say that that is an extortionate rate, because I am not sure, but it looks large to me. For example, I find, for labour in connection with the construction of those trawlers in Vickers' yard in Montreal, an account dated August 29, 1917, amounting to $10,790.86. The builder is allowed to add 65 per cent to that for overhead charges, or $7,014.08, making a total of $17,804.94. Sixty-five per cent looks large to me for overhead charges, and has the appearance of profiteering. But this account is certified that the prices charged are fair and just, signed by Mr. James A. Wilson, Director of Stores. Another certificate reads:

> I hereby certify that the prices are according to contract.
>
> (Signed) L. J. Beausoleil,
> Chief Accountant.

It appears, therefore, that the minister must have made a contract by which he allowed Vickers Limited to charge an overhead charge of 65 per cent in addition to the cost of labour. Take another account:

War appropriation vote—6 steel trawlers.	
Labour	$5,491.23
Commission, 65 per cent	3,569.30
Total	$9,060.53

I should like the minister, if he does me the honour at any time of replying, to explain to the Committee if he regards that 65 per cent overhead charge as reasonable.

Last night some very serious charges were made against the Department of Naval Affairs by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). They were so serious that the leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) decided that he would not go on any further with the estimate, but would give an opportunity to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) to answer the hon. member for Lunenburg.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is not quite correct in his statement. I did not say that it was in consequence of the seriousness of the charges made by the hon. member for Lunenburg that we would not proceed further with the Bill. I stated that I would direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the speech of the hon. member for Lunenburg and that the minister would make a reply at a convenient time upon his estimates.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The Committee were told last night that this was a matter that would come better from the Minister of Naval Affairs, and that an opportunity would be given to-day to discuss this very important matter. I was surprised that the Minister of Naval Affairs took his seat without making any reference whatever to the serious charges brought before the Committee last night by the hon. member. There were charges of incompetence, of extravagance, of injustice in regard to the employment and handling of men, and although some of them were very serious charges no reply to them has yet come from the Minister of Naval Affairs. We were told that a certain warship called the Lady Evelyn was well equipped and well officered and was in the vicinity of a German submarine at the time the latter was sinking fishing vessels off the coast of Nova Scotia.

But instead of being employed, as she was intended to be employed, in protecting the vessels and the fishermen from the German submarine, she was sent to the Magdalen Islands with half a dozen lead

pencils and some packages of paper. I believe it is true that the log of the Lady Evelyn shows that on the very day the German submarine was sinking Nova Scotia ships off Canso the Lady Evelyn was within 80 miles of the point where the submarine was operating.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The item under discussion is a vote of $30,000,000 for the building of the Government merchant marine. I am sorry that an engagement prevented me from being in the House last night when the hon. member for Lunenburg made his long list of charges in regard to naval affairs. I have not had time to read those charges yet, but I shall do so at the first opportunity, and when the Naval Estimates are under consideration I shall reply to them. I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should confine his remarks to the item before us, which has to do with marine, and not with naval affairs.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I had no knowledge of the minister's intentions. I had supposed that in his speech he would deal with both naval and marine affairs. I was very much surprised that the minister made no reply at all to the charges of the hon. member for Lunenburg. When the minister interrupted, I was pointing out that the Lady Evelyn was in the vicinity at the time—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The minister has risen to a point of order.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I had only half finished my sentence when the minister interrupted me. With regard to the shipbuilding programme of the Government, I have no doubt whatever that the ships we have built have cost us altogether too much money. Furthermore, I have no doubt that the situation is very largely due to our tariff policy, which makes it impossible for us to build ships in Canada at a price to compete with the ships built on the Clyde and other points in Great Britain. There may be other factors. The cost of labour, for instance, is a very important item, but that cost has gone up very much in Great Britain during the last year or two. I am told that it is ninety per cent higher in Great Britain than what it was two or three years ago, so the chances are that the cost of labour in Great Britain and Canada will come to be about the same. I think the Canadian workman can do just as much in a day as the British workman, and perhaps more. Our great handicap is our high protective tariff. Something could be done to relieve the situation by bounties, and bounties have been granted in other countries. Germany and France have both given bounties to shipbuilding. France, indeed, paid bounties not only on the building of ships, but on the running of the ships after they were built. French ships a few years ago, in order to help them compete with British ships built in a free trade country, were paid so much a mile for every voyage made, and we had the ridiculous situation of French captains steering the most crooked course in order to make the longest possible voyage. During all this time Great Britain has held her own, because she has acted on the principle that the cost of the material that goes into the building of the ship is the main thing, and that ships can be built cheap only in a free trade country. The difference between Great Britain and Canada in the cost of the material is enormous. The Financial Post says:

> At present, ships built in Canada are costing about double what they cost in the United Kingdom. This is due to the high cost of material which, in turn, is due to the high cost of labour mainly.
>
> Steel plates have been available to buiders in Great Britain at a price of approximately, fifty-five dollars a ton. Compare that with the following schedule, showing the delivered cost of steel per long ton from Pittsburg and Chicago to different points in Canada:

From Pittsburgh to	Cost per long ton.
Vancouver, Victoria and Prince Rupert	$102.25
Port Arthur	89.37
Toronto	74.84
Collingwood	80.19
Montreal	96.89
Three Rivers	81.87
Quebec	81.87
Halifax	84.67

If the man in Vancouver has to pay $102.25 a ton for the plates which the British shipbuilder can get for $55 a ton, how can his ship compete with the ship built in England? The economic law is very simple. The British and Canadian ship are both competing for the same business.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member quoted $55 a ton as the British price. That was the pre-war price of plates in Britain. In quoting the American prices, the hon. member gave the war price. Every one knows that during the war the cost of building plates in Britain was greater than in the United States, for Britain was buying its plates from the United States.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend is mistaken. These are the only figures I have. This article says that steel

plates have been available to builders in Great Britain at approximately £55 a ton. If that means anything, it means they are available now to builders in Great Britain at that price.

Mr. CURRIE: A loaf of bread in London costs the workman 25 per cent less than the Ottawa workman has to pay. How does the hon. member account for that?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I quite understand that prices vary from time to time, but they have not been going down very much so far. I admit there has been a slight decrease in United States prices. I was saying that the economic law is very simple. A ship —I am speaking of freight vessels—that is built in Halifax or Quebec at $200 a ton cannot possible compete with the ship that is built on the Clyde or the Humber at $100 a ton. If there is a cargo of wheat to carry from River Platte to Liverpool both these ships have a chance at the business, and the ship that costs the less will in the end beat the other. If the Minister of Marine intends to do anything permanent and satisfactory in the way of establishing Canada as a ship-owning country he must adopt a low tariff policy. Give the shipholder of Canada a fair chance and he will fight his way and win.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is rather difficult for me to follow the hon. member. He refers to the Government merchant marine ships as tramp ships. If these ships are tramp ships, then all cargo vessels that ply the various waters are also tramp ships. The hon. member goes on to say that unless a ship is a passenger ship she cannot make time from one port to another. For the life of me, I cannot see why a ship, we will say of eleven knots sea speed, leaving the port of Montreal for Liverpool should not make her schedule time just the same as a passenger ship can. My hon. friend is a business man and he realizes that cargo ships are necessarily for carrying cargoes, and that it would not be an economical policy for the Government to build palatial passenger vessels to carry the cargoes that these ships are designed to carry. He goes on to say that there is no difference between the freight ships built in the United States, in England, or in Canada. He must know that there is a vast difference in the design, speed and types of ships, just as there is in the various kinds of automobiles that are made. I cannot understand the hon. member when he classes all freight ships together, as regards cost and design. He is at a loss to know what particular use the Government are going to make of their merchant marine ships to co-operate with the railways, and suggests that instead of having these freight ships we should have passenger ships plying on the various oceans. Every one knows that a passenger ship has not as much available space for cargo as a cargo ship, and therefore the policy of the Government is a sound business policy. These ships were never designed to carry passengers at all, but were designed and are being built to carry cargoes. They are what the Canadian National Railway Company wants, because the government ships will carry freight from the Orient to Vancouver, and the Canadian National Railway System will carry the freight to whatever point in Canada it may be destined for.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the Canadian Government ships carry cargo at current market rates?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Rates are very high and profitable now, but as market rates drop it would not be supposed that the general manager of the steamship company for the Government would ask for higher rates than those ruling at the time. These ships are being built in order that the people of Canada and the Government may control the freight from the time that it leaves the port from which it is shipped to the time it reaches its destination in Canada, and they will carry export cargoes from mine, field, and forest, and from our industries here. The United States Government have put a ban on the export of wheat from the ports of Baltimore,New York, and Boston. What would this Government do to carry the wheat of our great western prairies if we had not the ships we had now? I really cannot follow the hon. member's reasoning at all. Cargo ships are built for the very purpose of carrying freight, and the Government shipbuilding programme does not include a passenger service. Whether we shall build passenger ships and have them ply on the Pacific and Atlantic is a subject that has not yet engaged the attention of the Government, but I may say that the ships we have built are modern up-to-date cargo ships, and I do not think they should be referred to as ordinary tramp ships. They are built for the purposes of the trade of Canada and to assist the Canadian National Railways, and I am sure the majority of the members of this House will support the Government policy.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am sure that the Committee will agree with me unanimously when I express my own pleasure at seeing the hon. minister (Mr. Ballantyne) back in his seat after a very serious illness.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I want to say just a few words upon this part of the Government's programme and I want those words to be words of moderation. I suppose that shipbuilding in this country was undertaken under the pressure of war time, and as the war is over I trust I shall keep within the bounds of moderation when I express the hope that the Government will very carefully consider this business before they give a very wide extension to it. I was very much interested and edified by the remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough with regard to the operation of tariffs in relation to shipbuilding. As a matter of fact this shipbuilding programme of the Government is only one more illustration of the extraordinary things which people do when they are under a protective tariff. As my hon. friend indicated, we in Canada are under a very high protective tariff—not the fault of either party. With the exception of the war-time addition to the tariff, the present tariff of Canada was a bequest to the present Government from the previous government. I do not think that is capable of successful contradiction. There has been practically no change, except for war-time additions, from the tariff which prevailed practically from 1896 to 1911. If one comes to think of it, it really seems a ridiculous thing to want to build ships and do commerce at sea under high protective tariff, because a tariff is to prevent the taking of goods into your country, and when a ship goes across the sea with a cargo from Canada, it can only do successful business by bringing back a cargo. So that there is an absolute incompatibility between high tariffs and successful shipping. They do not go on together in the world to any great extent. If you make your tariff high enough you may need penitentiaries and jails and all sorts of institutions within your country, but you will not need many ships, and if you build them you will not be able to use them. That is not only a matter of sound economic study, as my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has indicated, but it is a matter of history.

There has only been one great shipping country in the world and that has been the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland under free trade. I promised to use the language of moderation and perhaps I am putting that a little too absolutely, but how near it is to the truth will be brought home to every one in this Committee when we reflect that before the war sixty per cent of the ships of the entire world were being built by and were owned by Great Britain; with her two little islands which occupy less than half the area of the province of Alberta. In the face of that single fact, I think it is scarcely the language of exaggeration to say that there has only been one great shipping country in the world. We hear sometimes about Germany being a competitor with Great Britain in shipping before the war. Before the war more work was being turned out on the Clyde than in the whole German Empire. Germany, to do the work she did do, had to adopt free trade up to a certain point because everybody knows who knows anything about this question that Germany for years was allowing in free of duty all articles entering into the building of ships. For that reason the Committee will understand why I feel that I should be just a little cautious in advising the Government to embark upon a very large shipbuilding enterprise in Canada and a little cautious about supporting them if they do.

But, as I say, this thing was done under the pressure of war time and from that point of view I should desire to make my criticism of the policy as moderate as possible, especially having regard to the fact that the minister has been suffering from a very serious illness. However, I should not be doing my duty to the Government or the country if I did not say that I do not believe that under her present system of tariffs Canada can compete for one moment with the Old Country in shipbuilding. I do not believe it is a possibility.

I am afraid the Government made a mistake in taking this work out of the hands of the Imperial Munitions Board. We are all familiar with what has been stated openly in the public press about that, and I fear that unless we have a very careful contradiction of these statements we will have to admit that the Government made a mistake in taking this shipbuilding business out of the hands of the Imperial Munitions Board, even during war time because we know that war time produced all sorts of fads, such as shipbuilding, daylight saving, and any number of other nonsensical things which will die a natural death. I do not mean that shipbuilding is a nonsensical proposal;

it is only nonsensical when you attempt to make it a success under a high protective tariff. I would like to make that qualification of my statement.

It is also said that, in the work which we have done in connection with shipbuilding in Canada, we have entered into very unprofitable, if not ruinous, contracts. I do not know much about the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. I suppose we should look for light in connection with this subject from my hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie). He must know something about it, as these works are in his constituency, and he will no doubt enlighten the Committee as to the figures which have been published in the daily newspapers, as to the contract that has been entered into between the Dominion Government and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and as to the price paid for steel plates. I am sure, from the deep interest that he takes in matters concerning his own constituency, he will give us the benefit of his information and of the accurate statistics which must be within his reach on such a question.

Mr. McKENZIE: If my hon. friend will allow me—

Mr. M. CLARK: My hon. friend will have an opportunity; I will be finished in a moment.

Mr. McKENZIE: I only want to correct my hon. friend in the statement that he has made. I would be very proud to have that industry in my constituency, but I must not take something that does not belong to me. It is not in my county.

Mr. M. CLARK: Has the steel company no connection with your county at all?

Mr. McKENZIE: No, not the Dominion Steel Company.

Mr. M. CLARK: Well, the province is not so great, and my hon. friend is always well acquainted with everything that is going on in Nova Scotia. His information about Nova Scotia is not confined to what goes on in Cape Breton. We know the encyclopædic nature of his knowledge, and I do not use the word in any sneering sense. We all admire the hard work that he does on behalf of the Opposition which he leads in this House, and we would be glad to have from him information about this contract between the Government and a company which has its main works in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. DUFF: Does my hon. friend not think that he could get that information more readily from the Government which made the contract with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, seeing that he is a friend of the Government?

Mr. M. CLARK: I will take any suggestion whatsoever and be glad to co-operate with my hon. friend in getting information that this country and Parliament should have. But I would suggest to my hon. friend that it is treating the Opposition rather cheaply if he delegates to one who is supporting the Government on many subjects the duty of the Opposition. I should advise him to readjust his ideas about what the duty of the Opposition is in this House. My suggestion was not made to my hon. friend. It was made to the leader of the Opposition, who, at least, will be able to deal with my point in his own way and at his own time. There has been something said about the price of steel plates in war time, at the present time and before the war. My information, Mr. Chairman, is that the price of steel plates and the price of freights are both tumbling at the present time—tumbling fast—and it will be a good thing for the poor people of all countries if the prices of ordinary articles of use in the household tumble at the same time. I think the Government should have something to do with that "tumbling" and should do something not only to relieve the high cost of contracts but to relieve the high cost of living. That is the information we have about both freights and steel plates at the present moment and if it is correct I think that it is a very good reason why the Government should go very slowly about further extending this shipbuilding programme of theirs.

The minister has asked how we will get our wheat out unless we have ships to carry it. I should like to point out that if we are going too far along the line of high tariffs we will be landed in the situation of keeping both the wheat and the ships. We shall only be able to sell the wheat that we produce when we are up against the competition of the world again if we carry on trade in the way I believe it will be done in the very near future. We can only sell a certain amount of wheat in the world in competition with other countries that are producing it if we take the proper method of building up international trade and you cannot build up international trade or operate ships successfully unless you reduce your tariff in this country.

What is happening on the high seas of the world at the present moment? I am

glad my hon. frend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) is in his seat because I want this last breeze to reach him before he brings his Budget down which will be fateful in its effect both in regard to the political conditions in this country and to the prosperity and progress of Canada and our ability to take our proper place in the commerce of the world.

I am credibly informed that within three weeks of the armistice British ships laden with cargoes of dry goods from Lancashire and with other merchandise were heading their way, after having done nothing but war work for four years and a quarter, to South America and to other parts of the world. And I want to ask my hon. friend (the Minister of Marine) in regard to this difficulty of getting wheat out, what he thinks those ships would do when they discharged their cargoes? Why Mr. Chairman, inevitably they would load up with wheat, if it was to be had, and if not, they would load up with some other return cargoes to pay for those dry goods and other merchandise. But we have indulged in the folly of trying to foster a cotton trade in this country; which the biggest man in the cotton trade has said never should have been attempted—that this country is not adapted for it. As we refused in a large measure to take excellent Lancashire cottons—I am talking of pre-war prices—at half the price we have to pay for them in a country where there never should have been a cotton industry, naturally the vessels go elsewhere, and of course they do not take our cargoes back.

I am glad my hon. friend from Guysborough raised this question. The trade question is at the root of shipping. The instinct of shipping is in the very blood of Britons, because for centuries they have gone down to the sea in ships. And to try to build up a shipbuilding policy in this country while we maintain a high tariff, is a contradiction in economics, a contradiction to common sense, and diametrically opposed to all commercial history. I wanted to say that on general principles. I wanted to show how, and how alone in my judgment, shipbuilding can be promoted in Canada. I wanted to impress upon the minister (Mr. Ballantyne) and the Government that unless the fiscal policy of the country is changed this shipbuilding policy will be a white elephant, and all the subsidies you may grant, and all the artifices you may use to make it otherwise will fail. I do hope my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has been listening to me, because this has a most important bearing upon the reconstruction of Canada in which we are all interested, and which we wish to see taking place upon a proper basis and with every chance of this country being the country it should be amongst the nations of the world.

Mr. CURRIE: I had the idea, Mr. Chairman, that I was one of the bluest Tories in Canada, but I have at last found one hon. member whose views stick tighter than those of any other man in this country, because the views he has enunciated on free trade are the old, old story, and he remains positively the same. He has decided that we must have no industries in this country.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: What is there old about the story of vessels going to South America as soon as the armistice was concluded? That was up to date.

Mr. CURRIE: I am just going to answer that. One argument he put up was that Canada should not have a cotton trade, and he advanced cogent reasons why Lancashire occupies her premier position as the centre of the cotton trade. Of course this House knows very well that cotton is not grown in Lancashire; they import it just the same as we do. He cannot therefore argue that we should not have a cotton industry in Canada just the same as they have in Lancashire. They are able to compete in the markets of the world because they have their skilled workmen; and we can do exactly the same thing. We do not grow cotton in Canada, but we have cheaper power, and in the long run the cotton industry in this country will be in just as strong a position as it is in England, and there is just as much reason why we should have a cotton trade as there is that England should have it.

Now, there is nothing so vital before the people in this country at the present moment as this question of trade and shipbuilding. I am in touch with the shipbuilding industry, there being a large shipbuilding yard in my riding; and I am also in touch with foreign trade. This country during the war did not confine itself entirely to the manufacture of munitions. It carried on trade all over the world by ousting German goods in South America, China, Japan, India and other countries. That trade grew to vast proportions, it amounted last year to something like half a billion dollars—that is outside of munitions and foodstuffs—and that is a trade I think we should carry on. That is the

condition that obtained during the war. Previous to the war it was difficult to carry on shipbuilding in Canada on account of this so-called free trade. The hon. gentleman who has spoken (Mr. Michael Clark) told the truth in that respect. We had free trade in ships. Ships that were built in Great Britain could come into Canada free, they could go up on the Great Lakes and carry on their trade as long as they were of British registry. There is no necessity of changing our policy in that respect, because protection did not touch that matter at all, and the hon. member for Guysborough knows that very well. He knows that British ships traded in Canada free. Ships from Great Britain carried on a coasting trade from town to town and from Fort William to the Lake Erie ports freely, and not a cent of tariff was paid by those ships.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend will perhaps admit that the size of our canals afforded some protection, because only a certain class of ships could come in?

Mr. CURRIE: The moon is made of green cheese. That is no argument. That is only a question of the length of the ships. Other nations could have brought their ships in here. The Germans, for instance, could have done so. The canals were free to any nation in the world. The question of free trade versus protection was not involved, in this subject at all. My hon. friend knows very well what is the fact to-day, that all the material entering into shipbuilding can be brought into this country free of duty. There is no duty on bars, plates, or anything of that kind, that enter shipbuilding, and for that reason shipbuilding can be carried on in this country regardless of tariff and should be encouraged.

What was the reason that we wanted to get into a shipbuilding business, and why were these contracts given for ships? We all know that with the advent of the submarine the economics of war, as I might say, underwent a great change. The world found that ship after ship was being lost, that there was a great shortage of ocean shipping, and that the goods of this country might not find their way abroad. As a matter of fact at the present moment there are millions of dollars worth of goods in the warehouses of Canada awaiting shipment to China, Japan, and other foreign countries, and we cannot get the bottoms to ship them out. The absurdity of standing up and opposing a programme that will give us a few ships to carry on this foreign trade shows to my mind the ignorance of those men who speak on topics they do not know anything about. If you go to any Canadian manufacturer to-day you will find that his warehouses are filled with goods for export to South America, China, South Africa and India, and that he cannot find any shipping for them. For New Zealand they will not take a car of stuff from any station in Ontario to-day until ships are provided, and there are no ships for the thousands of dollars worth of merchandise lying in our warehouses waiting for shipment to that country.

Hon. gentlemen who discuss questions affecting the commerce of the country should post themselves a little better in the matter. The world is moving; conditions to-day are not as they were twenty years ago. The wheat of the country should be taken out on our own ships. Every nation to-day is jealous of its shipping. At the very moment that the Government gave its first contract for the building of ships the Japanese Government established a programme, to extend over seven years, for the purpose of absorbing every pound of plate they could get in Canada or in the United States. If the Minister of Marine wants to sell his ships, he can sell them to-morrow to the Japanese Government at ten or fifteen dollars a ton more than he is paying for them. There is no lack of market for ships to-day throughout the world. The contracts were not improvident.

The hon. gentleman quoted the Financial Post as saying that plate was selling at $55 a ton. With pig iron selling at Lancaster at $50 I do not see how you can get plate at $55. The quotation given in the Post is an absurdity. Plate is really selling higher to-day in England than it is in Pittsburg; the Government absorbed the difference. If we do not have our own ships during the next five or ten years we cannot carry on business with any foreign country, because each nation has taken hold of its shipping as a national business and will not allow its ships to be used in the trade of any other nation. Great Britain has absolute control of its own shipping; a British ship cannot go to a foreign port without getting authority from the British Government to do so. During the war embargoes were placed on shipping as against foreign countries. For nearly a year foreign shipping was not allowed to go to Norway because Norway would not allow its ships to be used by the Allies, and thousands of tons of freight were lying in the harbours of New York, Boston and Montreal awaiting shipment to Norway. A short time ago the United States placed an embargo on

the products of Canada going to Norway through American ports. It will be only a matter of weeks before the United States Government places an embargo on any Canadian products going out in United States ships, because they want all that trade themselves, just as every other country wants its own trade.

As to the cotton industry and the shipping industry of Great Britain and free trade, school boys who do not know anything about history might say that free trade built up the shipping trade of England. But every one knows that the shipping trade of England originated in the navigation laws of Cromwell, which were a most effective form of protection. Great Britain put the old navigation laws into force during the war, and made them more rigid than they ever were. She would not permit any foreign neutral nation to carry trade to belligerent ports. Is that free trade? That is the condition we ourselves are up against; we want our own ships to carry our own cargoes. I will give an illustration of how Great Britain desires to curtail the trade of the world. A Canadian firm had a cargo of goods for consignment to Calcutta. The goods had been manufactured in Canada and had remained in stock a considerable time awaiting shipment. The man who manufactured the goods asked the Canadian Pacific Railway Company if they would give him a freight rate to Calcutta, and they did, quoting him a rate of something like say $70 a ton via the Pacific. The manufacturer tendered this rate to the British firm which had the goods here, and they said that the goods had to go via London, and that the freight to London was over $60 a ton and only $7 or $8 a ton from London to Calcutta. This shows what steps are taken by the British Government to control traffic to and from British ports. If you are going to build up this country; if you are going to make Canada a country which does business all over the world, you must start out in a proper way. Before the war Great Britain's most prominent competitor was Germany. How did Germany carry on her foreign trade? How was it that she went into the foreign market and took one-third of the trade away from Great Britain inside of fifteen years? The reason is simple. She bonused her ships and shipbuilding. It is absurd to say that the plates and material that entered into the manufacture of German ships were made in Great Britain and taken over to Germany and fabricated. That is not so. When the war came Germany had more plants manufacturing steel plate than Great Britain had. Moreover, they had purchased many of the steel manufacturing industries of Great Britain and moved them over to Germany. When the war broke out not one firm in Great Britain was manufacturing cold rolled shafting, because they had been accustomed to get it cheaper from Germany. During the great pageant at Quebec I had the pleasure of visiting one of the greatest ships of the British fleet, and when I set foot on the deck of that warship I saw that the plate on the side was stamped "Krupp steel," presumably made in Germany. That indicate what the condition of affairs was before the war; and that is the condition of affairs that an adoption of the policies advocated by free traders would bring to any country. Free traders would bring about a condition in which the nation would be only a jobbing nation, not a manufacturing or producing nation. That might do for Great Britain, but not for Canada.

Germany built up her maritime and foreign trade by subsidized shipbuilding and encouraging shipyards. Before the war, when the shipbuilders had gone on strike in Great Britain, the emissaries of Germany were at the Clyde, at Newcastle and other places in Great Britain, offering these skilled workmen big inducements to go to work in Germany. Many of them went over, and a shipbuilding industry was established in Germany such as we are trying to establish in Canada with the same class of men. The greatest ships of the world were built in these German shipyards previous to the war. The supremacy of speed on the ocean was successfully contested by German shipbuilders as against British shipbuilders. Now, what was at the bottom of all this shipbuilding? There was a desire on the part of Germany to get the trade of the world. You cannot get the trade of the world by simply making the stuff; the secret of getting the trade of the world is to provide the necessary transportation. If we left it to the people of the United States to build up our railways in the West, how far would our West have gone? It is the old story of the lark and her young ones; if you want to do anything properly you must do it yourself and then you will know that it is done, and as you want it to be done. If you want to carry on foreign trade you must provide the transportation for it; otherwise you are at the mercy of all foreign nations and traders, who will absorb your profits. Germany realized that. She established lines of trading ships between

German ports and all the leading ports of the world. Moreover, she provided that all inland manufacturers in Germany should have the benefit of the same rate to any of the ports of the world as that paid by the manufacturers on the seacoast. In other words, a manufacturer in Leipsic could get the same rate from Leipsic to Smyrna as a manufacturer in Hamburg could get. All manufacturers were on the same footing in that respect. The same policy should be adopted by our National Steamship Company so that manufacturers in all parts of Canada will have the same freight rate to all parts of the world. The Germans established a freight rate from Germany to other countries which was fully one-third less than the freight rate from Great Britain to other countries; and they made a profit on the return trade. For instance, the freight rate to-day from New York city to Calcutta, as established by the United States Government, is $20 a ton. The United States control their shipping, and a United States ship may not carry a cargo to a foreign port without a license or charge more than this rate. That is what we are going to be up against, and if we have no ships of our own we shall not be able to get a pound of any commodity out of this country unless we pay exorbitant freight rates. If this country could give a freight rate of $18 per ton to Calcutta, we could secure the business, so closely is international business mixed up. With ocean rates the freight rate is the controlling element. That is the whole question in a nutshell, and if I had my way —I do not know whether my voice will be heard in the councils here any more than that of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) —I would suggest this. We as a young country must make up our mind that we have to take up our task as Empire builders. We have all the raw material for Empire building; we have the farms, the fields; we have the power; we have the workmen; we have the finest men in the world to undertake the task, men who have gone through the war and acquired discipline and training. If we are to be a great country, we must put our shoulder to the wheel and make up our minds that we are to be Empire builders. Germany was a protectionist nation, and was the one nation in the world that successfully contested the supremacy of England in matters of foreign trade, and we can remain a protectionist nation and we can follow out a similar policy. We must establish a number of steamship lines. We must establish a steamship line from here to the East Indies, where there is a very profitable trade, where we can send manufactured goods of our own and bring back in return tea, jute and other articles that are brought in to this country now in foreign ships, and that might very well be brought back as a return cargo in our own ships. Before the war this enormous trade with India went to Germany. Besides we are going to get an Imperial preference. We must not, because the war is over, lie down and go back to our little five acre lot and say: Oh, well, we are done with the war, we want to revert into our shell again. We have taken a place in the sun and we must now stay in the sun. We should have a line of steamers to Australia and New Zealand. At the present time the New York manufacturers and traders are lying awake in bed at nights wondering what preference we shall have with Australia and New Zealand. They are all wanting to open branch offices in the cities here in order to see if they cannot get a share of that trade. There are many things we could bring back from New Zealand. We could bring back a return cargo of hides and wool to Great Britain, and then we could bring back from Great Britain a cargo of other things which we need. The hon. member for Red Deer may wonder what we require from Great Britain, but there are many things which we need which Great Britain could supply just now, but she cannot furnish ships to send them here. There is no lack of demand in this country for British goods; the only thing we really lack is shipping.

In South America there is a market for all the goods we manufacture, such as hardware, furniture, clothing of various kinds, cottons, goods of all descriptions, and we could bring back coffee and hides. "Oh," but the hon. member for Red Deer says, "That is a contradiction to your policy of being a protectionist. Why should you bring back hides? Your policy is to produce hides here." That's true, but we can get only hides for fully fifty per cent of the leather we turn out in this country. We are large manufacturers and exporters of finished leather, and if we endeavour to get hides from South America via the port of New York, as we do now, we are liable to be tied up by the United States Government. They will say: We will allow you only so many hides, as if we were an "adjunct." Therefore, if we had our own ships, we would not be under the necessity of looking to them for favours. We could bring

the hides back here in our own ships, so that the New York merchants would have no control over our trade and would not be able to milk the profit out of it as against the Canadian manufacturer.

In these countries we have traded with during the war and established a market for our goods, and we did not have to furnish a national credit. They have plenty of gold. Unless steps are taken to establish lines of shipping from Canada to these various countries we shall have lost all the advantage of trade during the war, and Great Britain, France and the United States will have gone into these countries and secured the business which we had.

The hon. member for Red Deer spoke the truth when he said that the ink was not dry on the armistice when English ships were going out laden with goods to capture the trade of the world. Before the ink on the armistice was dry Canada should have been ready, too. In fact, we were doing a large amount of that trade which Great Britain could not do before the war. But, knowing a certain phase of trade from the ground up as I do know it, I would say to the minister that the worst thing that this country ever did in the matter of shipbuilding was when it lent money to Great Britain to build ships for the so-called Imperial Munitions Board, in order that those ships might go into competition with the ships we own ourselves. There was no necessity for that, and all those ships should have been held by us, so that we could control our own shipping and trade, and do something to adjust matters that the freight rates on our Western wheat would not be so great and would not bear so unequally on the man who lives in the shadow of the Rockies, so that he would have an equal chance in the markets abroad. These ships were built for the Imperial Munitions Board; Canada lent the money to Great Britain for them, and no sooner were they launched into the waves and sailing out on the sea than the fleet was turned over to the Cunard and other lines that have been milking this country for many years on the Atlantic. If we had those ships, they would have assisted us in carrying on our foreign trade, and I make this prediction that before four years are over this country will realize it has not enough ships to carry on its business.

Let me say a word in reference to the price of steel plate. Everybody knows the price of plate and other steel commodities was very high, and when the minister made the contract for the steel plate for ships it was almost impossible to get plate for any work whatsoever. Shipping was all under control and the whole world was tied up, and I think the contract that the minister made was a very easy contract at that time, because, comparatively speaking, the price was low, and it would have been a good thing for this country if, during the war, we had had two or three firms making plates, as there was a great shortage of plates in the world. But the economic war is not over yet and I am going to make another prediction, namely, that before many years are over the minister will find that he has not made a bad bargain in the matter of plate mill. The shelves of the world are empty so far as iron is concerned, and while at present there is a halt in the purchase of such goods, the fact will very soon be realized that there is not sufficient of these goods available and prices will rise accordingly.

The Saar valley, which was a great mining field where the Germans got their iron ore and which furnished forty per cent of the steel materials that went into the foreign trade of their country, has been put under international control. Germany has lost the Saar valley where all her great iron mines were. Her furnaces and steel mills are in Westphalia where her coal mines are, but where there is very little iron, and it looks as if the products of those mines are going to be out of the market for the next three or four years until France can build blast furnaces that will take that iron and smelt it and roll it. The result is that there will be a shortage of steel, while the trade of the world which has languished during the war will, within a few months after the Peace Treaty is signed, increase by leaps and bounds and be far greater than it ever was before, because people are trading and doing business abroad who never did any trade of any description before.

As to the influence on shipbuilding of free trade or protection, I trust that the minister and the Government will realize that there is nothing in that story; it does not affect shipbuilding to the extent of a five-cent piece. Every hon. gentleman knows that the materials that enter into the building of a ship come into this country free of duty; at all events, the duty is rebated. We could not build ships unless that was the case, as the British ships would simply be brought in here. I think that when war broke out there were on the Great Lakes ninety large cargo carriers which had been brought here from Great Britain. All of them went to sea when

war broke out, and possibly sixty or seventy per cent of them were destroyed by submarines, and many of the crews gave up their lives in the service of the Empire. The officers and men of the merchant marine of Canada have no need to be ashamed of their record during the war. I trust that the people of this country will support those who are endeavouring to keep alive the maritime traditions of our race. I can assure the minister that the manufacturers of this country and the farmers who need the ships to carry their products abroad will support him in any measures that he may take for seeing that this country is not divorced from shipping as it likely will be within six months or a year if we do not have shipping of our own. Trade will expand so rapidly and the scarcity of shipping will become so acute that foreign countries will control their ships just as the United States and Great Britain are doing now. The United States has fixed the freight rates between New York and every foreign port. Great Britain is controlling her ships in the same way, and Canada's voice is very small in the counsels of these nations when our trade comes into competition with theirs. If we are to compete in foreign markets we must have ships of our own, and we would not be progressive if we did not adopt this policy of establishing a merchant marine.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

LT.-COLONEL GEORGE HAROLD BAKER, M.P.—PROPOSED MEMORIAL.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Hon. Messrs. Bradbury, Casgrain, Foster and Pope, have been appointed a special committee to confer and act with the committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, who have in charge the building and arrangement of the new Parliament Building, in order that there may be erected therein a suitable memorial of the late Lt.-Colonel George Harold Baker, M. P. for Brome, he being the only member of Parliament who lost his life on the field of battle, and inviting this House to appoint a like committee to act jointly with the committee appointed by the Senate.

[Mr. Currie.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the message that has just been read from the hon. the Senate, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Reid—the consent of the House being necessary—

That Sir Sam Hughes, Sir Herbert Ames, Messrs. Boivin and Kay, be appointed a Special Committtee on behalf of the House of Commons, to confer and act with the Committee of the Senate and House of Commons, who have in charge the building and arrangement of the new Parliament Building, in order that there may be erected therein a suitable memorial of the late Lt.-Colonel George Harold Baker, M.P., for Brome, he being the only member of Parliament who lost his life on the field of battle; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

WAR EXPENDITURE—$350,000,000 VOTE.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 68, for granting to His Majesty aid for demobilization and other purposes, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—payment of three hundred and fifty million dollars may be made:

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to bring to the notice of the Acting Prime Minister a communication which I have received from Halifax concerning the men engaged in the naval service during and since the war. The largest number of men engaged there did not much exceed 3,000, and there are still, I understand, 900 men on the pay roll, about 2,000 having been demobilized. The cry among those who are still on is that demobilization is proceeding too slowly and that there is no occasion for keeping them there. They are doing nothing, and in letters I have received they assert that they are simply kept there by the officers as an excuse for the latter to retain themselves in office. The statement is broadly made both in the newspapers in Halifax and in the communications that were sent to me, that all the officers on the Niobe, in the higher ranks at all events, are English naval officers who were loaned to the Canadian Government for this service, and that when they came to this country they were promoted in rank from what might be regarded as petty officers to a higher grade, with a consequent increase in wages, and, as it is remarked in these letters, promotion in social standing, and so on. It is asserted that they are having an excellent time and good pay and are just keeping it going in order that their salaries may be continued. The men appear to be highly dissatisfied and write me that they believe their time will be up on the 11th of this month, that

is, six months after the termination of hostilities, when they are entitled to leave. I was anxious to bring this matter to the notice of the authorities to-day so that we would avoid if possible the disagreeableness and, to some extent, the disgrace of having any trouble among our men, and in order that the most effective and speedy action should be taken by the Government to meet any brewing difficulties among them. They have sent me a copy of a general order issued by W. Oswald Story, Admiral Superintendent of that service at Halifax. It reads:—

In view of the misunderstanding which appears to exist, with regard to demobilization, attention is called to the fact that all officers and men are liable to serve for a period of six months after cessation of hostilities. As some officers and men will be required volunteers were called for, in order that, so far as possible, those retained might be volunteers, but it must be understood that others will also be required, if insufficient volunteer, and will be retained as necessary.

Those who do not volunteer to continue to serve will be demobilized after cessation of hostilities as their services can be spared.

W. Oswald Story,
Admiral Superintendent.

November 23, 1918.

The men in the service interpret this Order to mean that hostilities ceased on the 11th day of November. They had a contract to stay in the service until the cessation of hostilities and for six months thereafter. When the armistice was signed on the 11th of November, these men, it appears from the tenor of this Order, wanted to get away at once, and this Order was made then to make their position clear. They understood by it that those who volunteered were bound to remain for six months after the cessation of hostilities, or up to the 11th of this month, and they want to get away at that date. I have here copies of newspapers that are friendly to the Government—the Halifax Herald and the Halifax Evening Mail, both of them strong supporters of the Government, speaking editorially—I shall not take up the time of the Committee reading it—they sustain exactly what I have said. They put forth the same theory, that these officers are unnecessarily prolonging the time of demobilization. The Mail is just an evening edition of the Herald, both being owned by the same people, and both issues set forth, as an argument to show the unreasonableness of the time that is taken in dealing with these men, that 150,000 men have been brought home from England and disbanded and dealt with by the authorities in the military service.

While this has been done there are only 2,000 demobilized altogether and about 1,000 on the hands of the officers doing nothing, according to the report that comes to me. I think it is quite proper for me to read a letter I received to-day:

Halifax, N.S., May 4, 1919.

Dear Sir:—I have been delegated on behalf of the Boys from the Lower Deck to direct a letter to you, asking you, if you would take up our case which is stated below, in the House of Commons.

We men have resolved, on or about the 11th of May to discontinue our services in the "Canadian Navy" and demand that we be demobilized forthwith, on the grounds, that our contract as far as the Canadian Navy and Government is concerned, is completed, observing, that we have carried out our duties 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. We further base our claim on the General Order, which I enclose, dated November 23, 1918, ...

That is the general order that I read—

—and signed by Admiral Storey. Will you, on our behalf ask in the House of Commons the following question: "What date, after November 11, 1918, do the contracts, signed by the Canadian Naval Ratings become void? In the event of the men refusing duty after the 11th of May, what stand will be taken by the Government?"

The letters which I enclose, published by the Halifax Herald express the feeling of every Canadian sailor in the service. We have stood everything during the war, and when war ended, to our great surprise the Government had no policy formed, as to dealing with our demobilization. We have waited our six months, and even to-day they have not declared themselves in regard to the ultimate date of our demobilization. We are all anxious to get back into civilian life as soon as possible, in order to get re-established in our civilian occupations.

That is the substance of the complaint made by these men, together with what I have already stated. I think that it is not necessary to keep them there, and that the officers are simply making jobs for themselves. That is not my language; it is what is communicated to me by these men, and I think it is my duty to represent the matter to the Government so that such action may be taken as will prevent any difficulty between these men and their officers. I trust that immediate action will be taken upon these facts, as I believe them to be facts. I would have some hesitation perhaps if I did not have exactly the same story in the form of an editorial signed by the editor of the Evening Mail. He puts his own name to the statements which appear in his paper, and I feel confident that a paper of the standing of the Evening Mail would not give its countenance to these statements by publishing them if the editor did not believe they were true.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of the Naval Service): The other day, when this matter was brought to the attention of the House, I stated that the total number demobilized amounted to 3,490 out of a total establishment of 5,468. I can quite understand these naval men who are probably tired of the service and anxious to get back to civilian life, all writing that they have nothing to do. But I can assure the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) that they would not be kept in the Naval Service if they had nothing to do. There has been a great deal of talk in regard to the Niobe. We have altogether a total down there of 779 men; on the Niobe 231, guards in the dockyard, etc., 99; troops in reserve 206; on vessels at Liverpool, Nova Scotia, 40; in hospital 80; to be demobilized this week, 123. The Naval Department cannot let every man in the service go until we can enlist enough civilians to perform the duties that are necessary on board the Niobe. Seamen returned from overseas, boys from the Niobe and members of the accounting staff are kept busy with the details of keeping accounts, discharge, etc., and it is necessary to accommodate on the Niobe both Canadian and Imperial naval men who are returning to Canada. Then, we have to keep men with the large number of drifters and trawlers owned by the Imperial Government, and until such time as we can enlist a sufficient number of civilians to take charge of these vessels we could not allow every man to go. Allow me to assure the hon. member that energetic steps are being taken constantly to demobilize these men and to see that this week alone we have demobilized 123. I hope that before long they will all be demobilized. Whoever wrote that letter considered that he was free from service six months after hostilities ceased. I do not claim to be a naval authority, but I know that no man is free from the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and no man is free from the navy, until six months after the war, which means six months after peace has been finally declared. While we do not want to hold these men unnecessarily, it would be very ill-advised, indeed, for any one to be absent without leave on May 11 because I hold that the men are not free until six months after the war. But, in any event, I am as anxious as any one else to have them demobilized as rapidly as possible. I am urging it every day. Just as soon as I can get civilians to take the places of these ratings I will do so. I will have something more to say upon the navy when I answer the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), but I regret to note that there always seems to be a tendency to malign our little navy and to say that our men are not doing anything when as a matter of fact they are doing good work and have performed very satisfactory service for King and country.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am pleased to find that the minister is taking every reasonable step to meet the views of these men. I do not profess to be a military or a naval man, I am only an ordinary lawyer; but if this document were dealing with ordinary commercial business, I would have to say that it dates from the signing of the armistice, because hostilities did end on that date. Whether the man who drafted it meant that or not, that is the language of the Order. I understand that the contracts that men sign in the infantry contain the expression " six months after the end of the war." "The end of the war" and "the cessation of hostilities" are separate and distinct things. There have been no hostilities since the armistice was signed, and, unless there is some peculiar interpretation of naval and military contracts, those men have the right to believe that their six months commenced to run from the 11th of November last and will expire on the 11th of this month. Those men are Canadians and are deserving of our best attention. They are not rebellious. They interpret their contract in a certain way, and it is quite possible that they got the opinion of some legal gentleman in Halifax in regard to it. I would like the minister to take positive action, so that those men will see that they are not treated as if they were nobody, that "they can mutiny if they like and they will see where they are going to land." I do not want them to have that idea; I want them to feel that the minister is concerned about their welfare and will see that they are properly treated. If they do hear something from the department before the 11th recognizing their position, I presume they will be pleased and there will be no trouble; whereas if they are ignored, if nothing is done beyond the stereotyped reply that the minister makes to me across the floor, we may have another Kinmel situation on our hands. We do not want anything of that kind; rather we desire our naval as well as the rest of our military operations to end properly, for we may want those men again. That was mentioned in one of the letters addressed to me, that naval and military men may

be required at other critical stages of our national life, and it is well not to leave any stings or heartburnings in connection with their demobilization. I hope such action will be taken that those men will realize that they are treated as Canadians who have rendered good service to their native country and in whom the Government feel a deep interest.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Last night I offered a few observations on the different matters which are covered by section 2. I do not intend to repeat what I said then, except perhaps to emphasize one point only in connection with transportation and the promotion of trade and industry. I listened this afternoon with a great deal of pleasure to the statement made by my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), and as I told last night to my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) to promote to some other department the present incumbent of the Department of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), might I not suggest to him at the same time that my friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is exactly the "live wire" I would like to see in the Department of Trade and Commerce?

I do not offer any criticism of the contract between the Naval Department and the Dominion Steel Company which was mentioned this afternoon. I have not seen that contract, and I have the word of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that it may be altered or even dropped. I do not purpose to let politics interfere with my views on the questions of trade and transportation, for I am a Canadian, first, last and always, and I sincerely approve of the policy of any Government which will promote our shipbuilding and improve our transportation facilities. I happen to reside in Montreal during several months of the year, where I represent one of the constituencies most interested in shipbuilding. The county of Maisonneuve has within its boundaries the establishment of Canadian Vickers Limited, and I think it is to the credit of the Laurier administration that we have that great shipbuilding plant. Canadian Vickers Limited employ thousands of men, and they have been able to build up an industry which some years ago was considered as only a dream and impossible of realization. I cannot forget that in 1912 when the question of a Canadian navy was being debated in this House doubts were expressed as regards the practicability of that policy. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) himself stated, in a now famous speech, that not in twenty-five, or even fifty years perhaps, could we expect to build a Canadian navy. And we had the candid advice of Mr. Churchill, who told us—with some ingenuousness I should say—that we could not find riveters in Canada, and there were so many swamps that we could hardly lay keels for the proposed Canadian navy. Sir, let us not refer to that debate, because really it is enough to make us lose confidence in some of the statesmen of the Mother Country. We have passed the period when the British Government could at their own sweet will thus impose their views on credulous colonials. We have had the satisfaction since that time of establishing shipyards on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, on the river St. Lawrence, and on the Upper Lakes, and the British Commissioners who were appointed some years ago to study the trade conditions of the British Empire, reported that Canada was fully equipped for shipbuilding and had nothing to fear from competitors. I have under my hand the report of those commissioners, published in February, 1917, from which I read the following:

> Before leaving the subject of the overseas communications of Canada we may allude very briefly to the capacity which the Dominion has for shipbuilding. We visited yards for ship construction and ship repairing both on the Pacific coast and at Montreal and we were struck with the activity generally prevailing at all places. There is also considerable shipbuilding work on the upper lakes.

I do not know what the commissioners would say if they came back to Canada today. Had they come last year they would have seen how our shipyards kept the wheels of industry running at full speed during a very crucial period. But Canada must not be satisfied with her war industries only. During the war Canada established her ability to do things; she must go on now and adapt herself to peace conditions, profiting by the development which has taken place during the war.

The member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) spoke this afternoon of British shipbuilding as compared with Canadian shipbuilding. If we are satisfied always to look upon John Bull as the privileged one who should take care of our shipping interests we shall never make any progress along that line. Let us learn from the old gentleman. During the last century—indeed, since Waterloo—John Bull, much to his credit, has been able to take toll in the way of trade from every nation in the world. We Canadians, members of the great Em-

pire, should get our share of that business which John Bull has taken unto himself. I stand for a moderate and wise policy of shipbuilding for Canada, and if the Acting Prime Minister, under section 2 of the Bill, intends to apply some of that money for the promotion of shipbuilding and the improvement and development of our Canadian transportation facilities, I shall vote for the amount which is being asked this evening.

Nothing, in my judgment, has proved more adequately the ability of the Canadian people to do things than the enormous development which has taken place in our shipyards during the last three or four years. It is urged that the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne) took away from the Imperial Munitions Board a business which that board was carrying on at our Canadian yards. It seems to me that the answer given by the hon. gentleman is a common-sense one. During the war Canada gave to the Mother Country the exclusive use of her shipyards, in which ships were built of British registry. Our ships were also commandeered. Of course, it was for the common cause. But the moment war ceased, the moment we come to peace activities, it is only common sense that Canada should take control of these shipyards and build her own ships with her own men and her own money, with a view of improving her shipping and transportation facilities.

While on this question of shipping and shipbuilding—because all this is more or less implied by the word "transportation" —may I refer once more to the report of the Dominions Royal Commission? The report is a very interesting one, containing data on a variety of subjects. It is from reports prepared by people who do not live in your country that sometimes you can learn the most about your country, and I would ask my fellow members to glance over this report at times, because it contains most interesting information about Canada and about the possibilities of trade development in this country. Speaking about trade through Canadian ports, the commissioners use the following language:

> When we turn to the question of the general development of Canadian trade routes it is somewhat disappointing to find, in view of the excellence of the harbours of the Dominion, that much of its overseas trade is still carried on through the ports of the United States. It is estimated that in 1913 two-thirds of the Canadian export wheat was shipped through United States ports, and though quantities and proportions differ no doubt in different years, considerable diversion from Canadian ports appears to be a normal condition.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

> No doubt a partial explanation is found in the fact that the St. Lawrence ports (and Montreal especially) are not available for five months in the year, during which time there is a shorter haul from Canadian centres to New York and other United States ports than to the Canadian Atlantic ports open throughout the winter. But it seems worth while to examine the position and to set out briefly
>
> (1) What appears to be the main hindrances to the use of existing routes; and
>
> (2) What other alternative routes could be created or developed.

I wish to refer especially to the hindrances referred to in this report. The first is the "depth of the St. Lawrence channel between Montreal and Quebec, and the present rates of marine insurance in respect of Canadian eastern ports." I understand that the Minister of Marine has a relatively large amount in the Estimates this year to enable him to proceed with the further deepening of the St. Lawrence channel, and that the port of Montreal will receive fair treatment at his hands. I understand that the terminal facilities of the harbour of Montreal are to be considerably improved. But the main hindrance to the development of Canadian transportation—Canadian shipping, Canadian business overseas—it seems to me that this should attract the attention of the Acting Prime Minister—is the, shall I say, conspiracy?—yes, a conspiracy, of the marine insurance companies in the Old Country. Here is what the commissioners say in this respect:

> It was also represented to us that a difficulty in the way of more extended use of Canadian Eastern ports lies in the heavy insurance rates now charged—
>
> (a) on cargoes carried to and from those ports,
>
> (b) on the hulls of vessels using them.
>
> We were told that these rates are unduly high in comparison with those in force at the Atlantic ports of the United States, and in particular—
>
> (1) that underwriters charge an extra premium on hulls of tramp steamers for one or more voyages to the St. Lawrence during the summer season,
>
> (2) that this extra premium is further increased for voyages during the last two months before the close of navigation.

I believe we are being very seriously discriminated against by the marine insurance companies. It is admitted to-day that our Atlantic ports are safe and that the St. Lawrence route has been so considerably improved, so well buoyed and lighted, and the channel so well deepened, that it offers practically no element of danger. Why is it, then, that the marine insurance companies of England are so drastic in their terms to shipping companies? That is something which is not clear to my mind and which

somewhat prejudices me against those British marine insurance companies. It was suggested some years ago that the Canadian Government should itself assume responsibility on account of the St. Lawrence risks for a period of, say, five years. It is contended that in the course of this period the Government would ascertain exactly the extent of the additional risk involved and that in the meantime extra shipping would be attracted to St. Lawrence ports. If we are going to improve our transportation facilities, we should strike at once at the root of the whole trouble. Doubtless, the high insurance rates against the St. Lawrence route will always be the main hindrance to Canadian transportation interests, and I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is a keen business man and who knows the St. Lawrence route just as thoroughly as an old sea captain, to put another feather in his cap by settling the question one way or the other. He knows that business men and shipping interests not only in Montreal, but all over Canada, are up in arms against Lloyd's, and that a solution must be found now that we have reached peace times. We must improve our transportation facilities in order to develop our trade, because, as I stated last evening, we cannot expect to have a favourable balance of trade now that we have passed the war period. Foreign trade is the trade that we must look after, and our country should be, above all things, a big exporting country. We have all the raw materials, and we have the whole world to which to export our raw materials, wheat, pulp, the products of our forests, our mines and our fisheries—which last is an industry which has hardly begun to exploit the foreign market. The Canadian Government ought to have trade agents in various countries of the world and to advertise our products and our industries, and by means of a safe transportation ensure that those products are sent overseas. Unfortunately, in the past, we have overlooked our interests, but when we know that Canada's prosperity depends upon a favourable balance of trade, a reasonable expenditure should be made in order to promote the trade of Canada in foreign markets. In 1913, Canada exported $1,216,000,000 worth of in 1914, $432,000,000 worth; in 1916, $741,000,000 worth—in which year we had for the first time a favourable balance of trade amounting to $233,000,000. In 1918, Canada exported $1,540,000,000 worth of goods, with a favourable balance of trade of $577,000,000. For the twelve months ended February, 1919, Canada exported $1,216,000,000 worth of goods, with a favourable balance of trade of $284,000,000. But now the war is over; we have reached peace times and we must, if possible, maintain a favourable balance of trade. We cannot hope to reach the same high figures as during the last three or four years; but if the Government is an up-to-date, alert administration, it will see to it that our products are advertised broadcast and that our transportation facilities are bettered, so that our export trade may give our people the means of paying the enormous war debt which we have contracted.

Once more, subject to the criticism that I offered last night, I say to the Acting Prime Minister that I will vote with pleasure for the development of our transportation facilities, but this implies the development of our trade, and with all due respect to the ability of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), I do not believe he is the right man in the right place. I would put in that department an active young man, who has new visions of things and who would transform that musty department into a business one. With these few remarks, I shall resume my seat, and I wish God-speed to my hon. friend in the administration of this enormous sum of money. I am afraid that my hon. friend has become colour blind in money matters. A dollar, a hundred dollars, a thousand dollars—there is no difference between them to my hon. friend. He has been rolling in millions and billions since the beginning of the war, and I am afraid he has lost his sense of proportion. Whether he speaks of one million or one billion, it is all the same to him. Perhaps it is due to the fact that he is an optimist; but there are limits to optimism. My hon. friend should not forget that Canada has a population of barely eight million, that we have a war debt of two billion dollars, and that although the resources of the country are immense, it may not be an easy thing in this general bankruptcy of the world to develop our resources. To develop our resources we shall need the aid of foreign capital, and in order to obtain the aid of foreign capital we must certainly maintain our credit on the safety line, but I am afraid my hon. friend has long since left the safety line. However, I am willing to give him another chance. I suppose when the Budget comes down he will outline such a policy that we may soon expect the millenium for Canada.

Mr. BRISTOL: Coming from a city which is very much interested in the trade and commerce of Canada and also in shipbuilding, I am very glad indeed to find myself so much in accord with my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). This country is passing through what might be called a transition stage; that is since the cessation of the manufacture, on an enormous scale, of munitions, normal conditions of trade have not yet been resumed, and, in the ordinary course, probably will not be resumed for some months to come. Under these circumstances the Government, as I understand it, have felt called upon to consider in the national interest the expenditure of sums of money for the purposes referred to in the second section of this Bill, to stimulate trade and industry and improve our transportation facilities.

I was very much interested in the statement presented this afternoon to the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the ship-building policy of this Government. I want to say in answer to the criticism that the Government did not start on this policy quite soon enough, that as a matter of fact it was in 1917 that the British Government became thoroughly convinced of the necessity of building ships all over the world and endeavouring both in the United States and Canada to supplement their building in the British Isles by building ships wherever possible. As a result of that policy, in the spring of 1917 the Imperial Munitions Board undertook the building of ships, and a large number of contracts were let in this country for the building of ships of various kinds. In 1918 the Government of Canada who had been financing the expenditures of the British Government in this country in connection with shipbuilding thought that if it was in the interests of Great Britain to build ships in this country with Canadian assistance, it certainly would be in the interests of Canada to build those ships herself and own them for her own benefit. I do not think anybody would seriously argue that that was anything but a good policy for the Dominion of Canada. It is perfectly obvious that if Great Britain, which at the outbreak of the war had some 18,000,000 tons of the 40,000,000 tons of shipping which the world possessed, thought it necessary to pay from $185 to $210 for a ton deadweight for ships in Canada, it would certainly be in the interests of this country to follow that lead. As a matter of fact in 1918, although the price of labour was undoubtedly higher, and that of material somewhat higher, the average price paid by this Government for Canadian shipping was, I should think, about $5 a ton less than the price for which Great Britain had let contracts in this country. That certainly was the case in the Vickers' yard at Montreal; I cannot say as to the other yards. The price therefore for which the Government were getting the ships constructed was reasonable from every aspect.

The minister told us to-day that the United States has built about 3,000,000 tons of shipping, and is contemplating building 13,000,000 tons more. I have a fairly accurate knowledge of the cost of American shipping during the war and the best information got from the shipyards themselves is that American shipping cost from $250 to $350 a ton deadweight, which is largely in excess of the price paid either by the British or Canadian Government for their shipping. The policy of the American Government to-day is practically to write this enormous war loss off, just as if it was an expenditure for dreadnoughts which would be no good for commercial purposes.

What I consider the essential reason why this country should continue to build ships, not merely 260,000 tons which the minister has spoken of to-day, but a very much larger tonnage, is this: If Canada wishes to have the certainty of getting her products to other countries she must own her own shipping. The shipping of Great Britain is perfectly willing to handle any business that Great Britain wishes it to handle. The shipping of the United States will look after the interests of the United States first; so if Canada is to be a great exporting country, as we know she will be, she must own a certain amount of her own shipping to ensure the country getting proper attention along those lines. For that reason, if for no other, it is a national safeguard for the Government to build not only 260,000 tons of shipping, but a considerably larger tonnage.

Looking at the matter from a national standpoint, the Government have taken over certain railway systems. Controlling those railway systems and controlling ocean transportation, this Government can route everything on their own lines and on their own boats to any country we wish to export our goods to, and get a profit from one end to the other. That is one of the greatest national assets you could possibly have. The control of both railways and steamships will make for national wealth, and will improve freight rates between our West and the ports of other

countries to which our exports are to be shipped.

It has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen that the Railway Board should fix the rates on these Canadian ships. Imagine, Mr. Chairman—50,000,000 tons of world shipping, and 300,000 tons of Canadian shipping which is quite inadequate to handle the needs of our own country. If you want other ships to come here, you must pay the rate; otherwise, they will not come. If you wish to attract shipping to this country so that we can export our goods, you must pay the current rate, and I am sorry to say that so far as Canada is concerned we shall have to pay more than the current rate because of the reasons given by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve. If a boat comes from London, England, to South America, from South America to New York, and from New York to London, on what is called the Atlantic triangle, its gets a load at every place, and the result is a cheaper rate. When a boat goes from Montreal to Liverpool it has a cargo for Liverpool, but what cargo is it going to bring back to Montreal? That is a very important factor in the rate from Montreal or any other port in Canada. On top of that, is the insurance on the St. Lawrence. It therefore seems to me that we should have a certain number of ships which the Government of this country can control, so that shipping for the transportation of Canadian products will be available, so far as the Government can make that possible.

The hon. member for Red Deer, for whom I have a deep affection and esteem, was arguing to-day that with the protective tariff we could not have shipbuilding in Canada, that shipbuilding and protection were incongruous, that imports would not come into this country if we had protection on the one hand and built ships on the other. Yet before the war, for years under protection, our imports exceeded our exports. Take the example of the United States. Twenty-five years ago England practically had control of the iron and steel trade of the world, but under a protective tariff the United Statets to-day is unquestionably supreme in that regard. Take Germany forty years ago. Under Bismarck they started a protective tariff. The country was poor and they had no shipping, but in practically forty years they built themselves up by aid of a protective tariff to be practically the second shipping country of the world. Free trade may be an ideal thing, but if you do not protect your own people and your own markets and manufacturers you certainly cannot expect other countries to do it for you. Coming to the question of shipbuilding in this country, the difference between the cost of shipbuilding in Canada and in England is practically the cost of labour and material. So far as steel is concerned, places like Toronto and Montreal that get their steel from Pittsburg or wherever it may come from, are going to be able to get their steel plates practically as cheap as they do in England. The enormous manufacture of steel in the United States is constantly reducing the price just as it reduced the price of steel rails below the price in England. As to the question of cost of labour, I am dealing with it as a pure matter of competition, and I have as high an authority as Colonel Carnegie, who represented the Imperial Government on the Munitions Board with reference to Canadian labour. After inspecting the two yards at Toronto, especially the Dominion Shipbuilding yard, he said: "Mr. Bristol, in the Dominion Shipbuilding yard at Toronto, owing to your splendid facilities and the efficiency of Canadian labour, you are going to manufacture just as cheaply as they do in England." I hope the prediction is true. When people talk about ships for $100 a ton dead weight in England it is absolute nonsense. You cannot possibly get contracts of that kind. The best contract you can possibly get is a cost plus 10 per cent. From the best information I have been able to get on the subject, I have not found any man in the United States or Canada who wanted to buy a ship in England, and who could get a contract price of $175 a ton dead weight, or who was satisfied if he let the contract in England that he could ever get a price that would work out at $175 per ton dead weight or get delivery of his ships before 1922. The importance of shipbuilding in this country is absolutely paramount. The objection has been made to the smaller boats of 3,700 tons built on the lakes as distinct from the 8,100 and 10,500 ton boats built in Montreal. Any man engaged in shipping will tell you that the most useful boat on the Atlantic has been for years and is to-day the 3,500 and 4,000 tonner. The reason is a simple one. It is easy to pick up a cargo of 3,000 or 4,000 tons, but for a boat of 8,000 tons you practically have to take a cargo of grain or a through cargo from Montreal to Liverpool, and the question is, what will you fill that 8,000 or 10,000 ton boat with when you come back? The same thing applies as regards trade between Montreal and South America, or Montreal and South

Africa, with which countries we are opening up trade all the time and would open up still further if we had ships. The same applies to the West Indies. A friend told me to-day that in the Seven Islands, near Quebec, they had a great deal of pulp to ship. There was a 10,000 ton boat offered them, but they could not load more than 3,000 tons because they had not facilities. The Acting Prime Minister and the Government will be justified not merely in the programme that they have so far announced, but in the programme that has been foreshadowed to-day by the Minister of Marine in the spending of a very considerably larger sum in shipbuilding in this country, and I hope that this consideration will weight in the minds of hon. members.

We are passing through a period of unrest, when the industries of the country have not been able to resume full swing. It is in the interests of the country that the labouring classes should be kept occupied, and I submit that it is important that all shipyards, at all events during the present year, should be kept going at full capacity so that the 30,000 or 40,000 labourers referred to to-day may be kept at work.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend (Mr. Bristol) thinks that the Government just started at the right time to build ships. I do not agree with him in that. I think any person starting in a new enterprise would naturally watch for the time when labour was fairly cheap and material fairly reasonable, so that he might invest his money to the best possible advantage. In 1910 the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier formulated a policy on the question of the Canadian navy, which incidentally carried with it shipbuilding in this country. The naval and shipbuilding policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier at that time was agreed to by hon. gentlemen on the other side, and if it had been carried out we would have had 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913 and the best part of 1914 to our credit in our shipbuilding before the war broke out, and even in the first years of the war, being fairly under way, we would have been able to handle our business before prices went sky high. For that reason I have made the statement several times that we started our naval and shipbuilding policy at a time when the prices were four hundred per cent higher than they were when we could and should have started, and at a time when the productiveness and usefulness of these ships will be three hundred per cent less than they would have been if we had had them at the commencement of the war. I say three hundred per cent less, because by the time we get into the commerce of the world with our ships things will be getting normal and we shall have to accept the same rates as other people who had their ships built in normal times and who are therefore able to go back to normal rates. We will have to go into the market to compete with those who built at ordinary prices. We are too slow. If we were spending these large sums in shipbuilding for the purposes of the war we fail of our purpose, for the war is over and the ships are not yet available. My hon. friend's very clever and well-delivered address does not give any good reason why we did not launch upon a policy of shipbuilding at the time it was properly formulated some eight or nine years ago. As he knows very well, the reason was that the present Government would not admit that anything good could come out of Nazareth —they would have nothing to do with any policy formulated by the Laurier Government for fear it would carry any credit to that policy and to the Liberal party. They would rather let everything drop, hoping that some day in the future they would formulate a policy of their own for which they would have the whole credit.

The day came when they formulated a policy of their own, but they do not seem to be able to get very much glory out of it. It is not a policy at all; it is a sort of a driving of the scapegoat into the wilderness. The leader of the Government knows what the scapegoat was? The sins of the people were put on its head, it was blind-folded, driven out into the wilderness and left there in a place from which it would never come back. The policy of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in so far as these manufacturers is concerned, is a policy of starting them out. He makes them invest their money in providing the plant necessary for shipbuilding, he is going to take them out beyond the three-mile limit and then say: "Now gentlemen, I have got you under way, and this is as far as I propose to go; you can either continue to go to sea, or turn back; I am through." That is the policy that he has given to us to-day. He says that he is going to spend a certain amount of money, to build a certain number of ships, and then he is going to tell the people: "You can provide your own money; it is none of my affair. I have given you a start, induced you to go into this business believing that I had a fixed, permanent policy, but I have not. You can go on or turn back, or do what you please." Does any

person call that a policy? I do not believe it is. A policy that is permanent would be based upon some principle, whatever else it might be. We had a fair sample when, from the Conservative side of the House, they launched the National Policy in Canada. That was a permanent policy in so far as that party was concerned, and they look upon it as their policy down to the present day. But when we do not know whether it will last for a day or a week or six months nobody would call it a policy; it is only an expedient for the time being and they are likely to drop it at any minute. Really, the Government have no policy at all in regard to shipbuilding, and no policy in regard to naval protection. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) came to the aid of the Government with some of the product of his brain, saying that he would lead them in the way they should go.

This section points out that some of the money is to be used for " the defence and security of Canada." If any of that money is to be used for the purpose of securing us against extravagance, recklessness and expenditures that are wrongfully proposed and badly conducted, I should say that it would be well spent. I think that is the only security we really need at the present time. Then, provision is to be made for—

> The conduct of naval and military operations in or beyond Canada and the demobilization

I have already said to-night all I intend to say about demobilization. Another provision is:

> The promoting of trade and industry, and transportation facilities therefor.

I wish to take advantage of the fact that we have a gathering of the ministers here to-night that we do not very often have to say a few words on this subject. I do not know what is in the air, but we had a masterful array of talent a few minutes ago and there are still quite a number of ministers present. I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the importance of doing something to promote the fishing industry in this country. There is no other industry in Canada that has such magnificent possibilities as the fishing industry both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific coast. We have only been gathering the pebbles on the beach compared with the ocean of development that is open before the Canadian people. I trust the minister will take that into his serious consideration and that he will come down to the House with a well-considered scheme for the development of the fisheries and will ask Parliament for enough money to carry out that scheme. It will involve the establishment of storage for bait in convenient places along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and the proper looking after of these bait storages so that they can gather the bait at the time it is available and so that the fishermen may be able to get it when it is required. The condition in Cape Breton to-day is that very often, when fish is running along the shore in hundreds of thousands of tons and within easy reach of the fishermen, they have no bait. In September and October you find people simply sitting on the banks and doing nothing because they cannot get any bait. The fishermen, as a rule, are poor, they have no cold storage facilities, they cannot preserve the bait and although it is to be found by schooner loads around the shores, they cannot get it. If the Government would provide proper facilities for storing away that bait and selling it to the fishermen at the time it is needed the catch of fish would be quadrupled in many places. Together with that, there must be the necessary cold storage on the railway for carrying the fish to the market centres. The people are beginning to realize what a magnificent life-giving, strength-producing food the codfish, herring and salmon of Nova Scotia and British Columbia are.

Mr. BUTTS: And a brain producer.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, and it is needed most strenuously.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: I had no reference to my hon. friend. My good friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Butts) knows me too well to think that I would say that he had no brains. That is not the worst part of the business. I wish to take the opportunity that this Bill gives me of placing before the minister and the Government the suggestion that they should devote some time, thought and energy to the development of the fish trade of this country. Perhaps on some other occasion I shall have a better opportunity of quoting data that will show the importance of this trade, but I hope—particularly in view of the observations made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was a " live wire " and that he would like to see him in charge of the Department of Trade and Commerce—that he will give particular attention to this subject. This is the business of which he has charge at the present time, but according

to the Scripture those who are faithful and useful in small things shall be put in charge of greater things and shall enter into the joy of their Lord.

I hope that he will show in the apprenticeship that is assigned to him in the Fisheries Department such ability as will justify the next Prime Minister—who will, of course, be the hon. gentleman who is now leading the Government—promoting him to the Department of Trade and Commerce, where it is suggested his energetic personality will find fuller scope.

I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia and of the Acting Prime Minister where some of his money that is to be expended in connection with war gratuities and demobilization should go. An Order in Council was passed by the Government some time after the 11th November (when the armistice was signed) giving gratuities to certain military men who were in the service on that date, but not to those who had served their country at least equally as well but had been already demobilized. Here is a concrete case in my own town. The 94th Highlanders, a regiment of militia, was ordered to camp at North Sydney in the early stages of the war. It was put on home service and formed a sort of nucleus to which recruits were sent, trained to some extent, and as rapidly as possibly moved overseas. I am told that something like 1,200 men passed through the 94th to the front, and that the 94th itself would have gone had it been given the opportunity. A short time before the 11th of November the 94th was demobilized to a very great extent and a new establishment was set up in which the military authorities retained a very small group of those men. The colonel, the captain, and a great many soldiers were sent home as being no longer required. Those men would certainly have been in camp on the 11th of November had it been left to their own volition and would be entitled to the gratuity. I submit to the Minister of Militia and to the Committee that that is not a fair deal, that those who for nearly four years rendered good and faithful service are equally entitled to the gratuity although they were obliged to leave the regiment before the 11th of November. This phase of the subject has been strenuously presented to the Government and to the minister already from several quarters and I need not elaborate it further. I have not heard what the decision of the Government is, but I trust they will so amend the Order in Council that those who were demobilized before the day of the armistice will be treated as well as those who happened to be retained in the service.

There is another point I must bring to the notice of the Minister of Militia in connection with the 94th. When that regiment was called out first the colonel—Colonel J. D. McRae—was obliged to hire a house in the city of Sydney while proper barrack accommodation was being prepared for the officers. When the regiment went into camp under canvas the house was given up; and I am very much surprised that the department up to this date has refused to reimburse the rent paid by the colonel. I have not had an opportunity of bringing this matter to the notice of the minister himself, although I have had it up with the department and have been turned down. I had practically given the case up as hopeless, but seeing that this vote covers money to be paid out in connection with matters of this kind I wish once more, with the greatest possible confidence, to ask the minister that this rent —it is only $75, a very small amount indeed for the department, but too much for a poor officer to pay out—be reimbursed to Colonel McRae.

Major-General MEWBURN: I am very glad that the hon. member has brought these two matters to my attention. With regard to the war gratuity, I can assure him that personally it will have my sympathetic attention. It is in the hands of a committee, and I hope the situation will be satisfactorily dealt with. With regard to Colonel McRae, I think my hon. friend should not be tired in well doing. He says that he has already brought it to the attention of the department and been refused; but I can assure him that I will see what the trouble is.

Mr. BUTTS: I would not have been inclined to speak at all to-night were it not for what I might almost describe as the discourteous manner in which I was treated by the hon. member for Guysborough and the hon. member for Maisonneuve. I attempted to ask my hon. friend from Maisonneuve whether or not there was any difference at Lloyds between the Atlantic seaboard of Canada and the British Islands in respect to the rates for marine risks. My hon. friend did not see fit to allow me to ask the question. I do not think there is any difference in the rates. I intended to ask my hon. friend (Mr: J. H. Sinclair) whether it was not true that much British shipping in Canada is put under Norwegian register in order that

it may be operated more cheaply. My hon. friend would not allow me the question. The Storstad, when she rammed the Empress of Ireland in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, was a British ship, but under Norwegian register. Nearly every ship that has carried coal from Sydney Harbour to Montreal, Three Rivers and Sorel during the last twenty years has been a British ship under Norwegian register.

Mr. BUREAU: How could that be?

Mr. BUTTS: I do not know, but it is so. They were British ships under Norwegian register.

Mr. BUREAU: It could not be.

Mr. BUTTS: It is true. Now, a Government ship was sent from Canada to the West Indies under special conditions and my hon. friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) complains that the ship came back from the West Indies to New York with a cargo. Did he want her to come back empty. The hon. gentleman is a shipping man; he owned three of the poorest ships that ever crossed the Atlantic. My hon. friend criticises the Government for taking up shipbuilding. Are we to wait until the time when shipbuilding will pay? Was the building of the Canadian Pacific railway delayed until every one was sure that it would pay? No, we built it in order that it would bring returns to the country and afford transportation facilities, and that is the policy I hope the Government will carry out in respect to shipbuilding. There are many reasons for believing that at Sydney Harbour we can procure the cheapest pig iron in the world; why, therefore, can we not produce the cheapest ships in the world? The only advantage that the Old Country has over us in the matter of shipbuilding is the advantage of wages—and surely we do not wish to curse this Dominion with cheap labour. About twenty years ago we built a ship at Three Rivers—it was either the Montcalm or that other little ice-breaker we have down there—and it did not cost so very much more than it would have cost to build it in the Old Country; the difference was simply the higher wages, which is the cost of labour, I repeat that we do not want to curse this country with cheap labour.

We have at Sydney Harbour blast-furnaces, open-hearth furnace and a plate mill in course of construction. We have a rail mill that has sent from Sydney Harbour around the Horn to British Columbia rails at a lower price than that at which you could send them by rail from the Sault. We have opportunities for the greatest shipbuilding in the world. Even if within a decade, even if within our lifetime, it should cost a little more to build ships, why should we not be anxious to develop the shipbuilding industry. The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) are simply trying to stand in the light of this country and to stamp out an industry that represents one of Canada's greatest possibilities. We have our coal; we have our coke; we have our iron; we have our steel; we have our blast furnaces; we have our open-hearth furnaces; we have plate mills in course of construction; we have a rail mill from which rails have been shipped in competition with England to be used in railway construction in the north of Ireland, right in Belfast. In view of these facts it is too bad that prominent public men should try to throw cold water upon Canada's greatness. All we want is more people, more money, and more development, and the sooner we get it the sooner shall we see in Canada ships built as cheaply as they are built on the Clyde or at Belfast.

The only insurance that it in any way high in Canada is the insurance applicable to the upper reaches of the St. Lawrence, and that is quite natural. It is a large inland waterway that must be piloted for six or seven hundred miles, where ships without skilful pilots are in danger of being run ashore. But we do not know of any heavy insurance in respect of the ocean ports of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island. When you come to run six or seven hundred miles on the upper St. Lawrence or to the upper reaches of lake Superior, which is 2,500 or 3,000 miles inland, what can you expect? Insurance must be heavy; pilotage must be heavy. From the time you leave Cabot strait, between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, you must have two, three, four or five pilots on each ship. Shipping in Canada is one of the big questions, and the sooner we give encouragement to a Government that is prepared to go ahead with a bold policy in the matter, the sooner we shall become a shipbuilding country.

It is not many years ago; it is within the lifetime of almost every man in this Chamber that Nova Scotia built the County of Yarmouth, the largest wooden ship that ever floated on the seven seas of the world. I can remember when she ran ashore on a ledge in Sydney harbour. Is there any reason for believing that Nova Scotia can-

not build the largest steel ship in the world, when she has the men and the coal, when she has the steel and every other commodity that enter into the building of a ship? That is the situation, and I say: All power to the Government that goes ahead with a real, good, strong, forcible shipbuilding policy, and let the Government give us the largest plant in Sydney harbour it possibly can.

Mr. COPP: I desire to direct the attention of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Mewburn) to a matter that is important in the passing of this measure, because a certain portion of the money that we are voting in this Bill is to be expended in demobilizing the different military depots throughout Canada. Since the armistice was signed, there have been kept in military district No. 7 at St. John, N.B., some two or three or four hundred men. Some have been released from duty at different times so that I cannot say exactly how many men are at present engaged in this garrison duty, whatever that may imply, at this military depot. Quite a large number of these men are farmers' sons who have been kept there during the winter months when they were much needed at home to look after the farm work and provide wood and other fuel for the winter as is always customary in country districts. Some of them whom I know well, are married men with farms of their own. I have given this particular matter a great deal of consideration; I have visited the place on several occasions; I have talked with the officers, and, in my judgment, there is no reason for keeping two or three hundred men at St. John doing garrison duty when they do not want to remain there. If they were returned men waiting to be discharged who wanted to remain there, then I am prepared to say that they are entitled to recieve their per diem allowance and whatever is necessary to keep them there. But these were men who were called for duty to St. John after the armistice was signed and who have been kept there ever since at the expense of this country. They are doing no good either to this country or to themselves; they are absolutely idle around this military garrison or depot or headquarters, or whatever may be the correct military term, and I would suggest to the minister that these men should be allowed to return to their homes, thus saving the country the expense of keeping them there and permitting them to render valuable service on the farms, as is demanded by the men who own farms and by the fathers of those who are not farming for themselves. It has been suggested to me by one of the men and one of the officers that the only good reason for keeping these men at St. John is because the officers who are there must have some excuse for remaining. I asked an officer whom I know very well what they were doing at St. John and why it was necessary to keep these men there. I had been down there and examined the situation, and the men were apparently not doing anything. This officer turned round to me and said: "Copp, what do you expect us to do?" Hon. members can draw their own conclusions. I have not the slightest objection if the officers who are there are returned men and it is necessary to keep them there in the pay of the Government. If that be the case I hold up both hands and say: Do so. But it is not necessary to keep two or three hundred men at St. John who do not want to stay for that purpose. I have had communications; I have had correspondence with the officers in regard to the matter, and this is a mere case of keeping men there against their will; it is doing the state no good; it is an expense to the country, and it is causing a hardship to the farmers, because the men ought to be engaged in the work of greater production. I would, therefore, urge the Minister of Militia as strongly as I can to look into this matter and release these men from further service.

Major-General MEWBURN: There are eleven military districts in Canada. The hon. gentleman refers to Military District No. 7, St. John, New Brunswick, where we have maintained a very small garrison unit which is considered, from a military standpoint, absolutely necessary for a certain period during demobilization. We gave the men who have seen service at the front the first privilege of discharge, and some men were retained there, but after the armistice was signed nobody was taken there except some men who volunteered. The men are being released as rapidly as possible, and I am glad to inform my hon. friend that, on account of the opening of navigation in the St. Lawrence, very few troops now disembark at St. John and most of that unit will be demobilized within a few weeks.

Mr. COPP: If the minister will say: "Within a few days," that will be of great importance to the district.

Major-General MEWBURN: If, as my hon. friend apparently thinks, the demobilization of these men were simply a matter

of walking out and locking the door, I would be very glad to have it done, but there is a little more required in the way of cleaning up matters than the hon. member would imagine.

Mr. COPP: The minister no doubt desires to give correct information, but when he tells me that it was necessary to keep these men at St. John doing garrison duty I doubt it. I do not profess to be a military expert, but I visited the camp, or drill hall, or armoury, or whatever it may be called on several occasions; I inquired of military men and I have never yet found a military genius, so far as we have them in the province of New Brunswick, who could give me the slightest reason or excuse for keeping the men in the city of St. John for any length of time they have been kept. The minister says the garrison will be demobilized in the next few weeks.

Major-General MEWBURN: Possibly sooner.

Mr. COPP: The few weeks between now and the first of June are the very three weeks in which the people of the province of New Brunswick will suffer for lack of farm help. I know of three cases almost within a stone's throw of my own office. I know the farms from which these men come, I know all the conditions, and when I asked the officer commanding at St. John to have these men released he wrote me that an investigation had been held and gave me what he said were the facts. But the so-called facts were as absolutely unfounded as anything could possibly be. I say that because I know the facts. These are the things which bring military affairs into disrepute in this country. So long as the war was on, I never said a word to stop a man from going into the training camps, but since the armistice was signed I have on different occasions written to the officers about certain cases, but have never received the slightest satisfaction. In one case I tried on different occasions by personal request and correspondence to get a married man home because his wife was lying sick in bed. I went down and saw him at St. John. He was performing no military service at all; he was not doing twenty minutes work a day; he had never had any training, and there was no need for any training. After some three or four weeks I had the slight satisfaction of securing five days' leave for him so that he could go home and look after his wife and family. Now this is not reasonable, it is not just. The minister may say that it was necessary to have the men there for garrison duty. However that may be, I say it was not necessary to keep a married man there who was required at home to look after and protect his sick wife and family.

Mr. ROBB: I wish to support what the hon. member for Westmorland has said as to the demand from all over the country, not only from Western Canada but from Eastern Canada as well, for the release as soon as possible of the men who are required on the farms and in the industries of this country.

I rose more particularly to refer to the statement made by the Acting Prime Minister last evening as to the accounts of Canada. He gave a very complete account of our war expenditure, but did not give the statement that I more particularly required as to the exact financial position of the country. However, as we are led to believe that the Budget will be brought down shortly, I suppose that the Minister of Finance intends to give that statement then.

The Committee is no doubt aware that the vote of $350,000,000 now under consideration represents a sum greater than the total debt of Canada prior to 1914. The Government at this session are asking for enormous credits, and I am not sure that the country fully realizes the magnitude of these credits. The Estimates that have already been brought down provide for an expenditure of $437,000,000 odd; this item is $350,000,000; the level crossing Bill calls for an expenditure of $200,000; highways about $20,000,000, and housing $25,000,000. A total of $832,000,000 is asked for, and we are yet to have Supplementary Estimates, judging from the statements made by the different ministers. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House do not intend to criticize this vote so far is it relates to defence and demobilization. We have supported during the war all the votes the Government has taken for war purposes.

Last evening as I listened to the Acting Prime Minister I could not help thinking that he was setting up a man of straw for the purpose of knocking him down. He was trying to make the country believe that we on this side of the House were not in favour of encouraging the manufacturing industries of this country. The facts are quite to the contrary. The Liberal party has never discouraged the manufacturing industries of this country. In fact, the manufacturers as well as the farmers of this country enjoyed their greatest pros-

perity during the fifteen years of the late Liberal administration. It never was, and is not to-day, the policy of the Liberal party to do anything to injure the manufacturing industries of this country. We wish to help them, and we believe that the best way to help them is by removing certain restrictions which to-day are an incubus upon them, as well as being very harmful to the agricultural interests of this country. We believe that the larger and the wider the market we can obtain for our agricultural products, the better it will be for the manufacturing interests of this country.

Last evening the Acting Prime Minister laid great stress upon the rate of exchange and the adverse trade balance against Canada. I wish to say to him that he and his Government are in some measure responsible for the adverse trade balance against Canada at the present time. I would remind him, so that he may deal with the matter when he brings down his Budget, that his action in connection with the pulp and paper industry in this country did very much to create an adverse trade balance against us. Had he treated properly the pulp and paper industries of this country, had he allowed them greater freedom in exporting their product, it would have been better for Canada and better for that industry. If that had been the policy of the minister, instead of the trade being curtailed, it would have expanded.

Now let me give a case in connection with agricultural products. No later than last fall this Government put an embargo on dairy products going out of this country. They fixed the price on the products of butter and cheese factories. The farmers all along the international line—the embargo did not apply for the whole length of the international line because deputations came here from Manitoba and Saskatchewan protesting against the embargo —these farmers, when the price of butter and cheese was fixed began to ship their milk and cream to the United States. So the Government put an embargo against dairy products entering the United States. When we buy corn from the United States for our dairy herds, we are ready to pay for it with butter and cheese. Otherwise, we must pay in money. That is another reason why we have an adverse trade balance, and this Government have largely contributed in bringing it about.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), whose voice I regret we do not hear oftener in this House, referred to a condition that prevailed on the lower St. Lawrence in connection with some ship at Seven Islands. He made the statement that a mill at Seven Islands had been offered a 10,000-ton ship which they could not use, but that had they been able to get a ship of lesser tonnage they would have been able to avail themselves of it. That reminded me that the Government, who boast that they are trying to do so much for Canadian industry, have again come in and crippled a Canadian industry in Ontario. That story of the Seven Islands brought to my mind the fact that there is at Thorold a very large paper mill, which I understand is controlled by the Chicago Tribune. They manufacture pulp at Seven Islands. This company own their own vessels which for several years have been carrying pulp from Seven Islands to Thorold, and which are under American register. Sometime early this spring the American Lake Shippers' Association convinced their board at Washington that it would be a good thing to cancel the reciprocity in trade that existed between the United States and Canadian vessels on the Upper Lakes, and the Canadian Government retaliated. The result is that boats of Canadian register are not now allowed to trade from one United States port to another, and our Government have brought in regulations preventing boats of United States register from trading between two Canadian ports. This mill is unable to get boats to carry pulp from Seven Islands to the mill at Thorold, and no later than last Saturday a representative of that company, whom I accidentally met at the Chateau Laurier, told me that unless they could obtain vessels somewhere the mills at Thorold were going to be closed down. This is one example of what our Government are doing to "assist" Canadian industry—assist in crippling it. Let that same condition be protracted until the fall, and when we commence moving our grain and wheat crop from the head of the Great Lakes the farmers of Western Canada will be at the mercy of a combine of shipowners in Canada. These shipowners will fix the rates and the western farmer will have to pay the piper. But he will not have much reason to complain because his representatives in this Parliament support a Government that is responsible for these conditions.

Last evening the hon. Acting Prime Minister made much of the important

duties that Mr. Lloyd Harris was discharging—what he had done for Canada at Washington and was now doing at London. I could not help thinking of the position that Mr. Lloyd Harris occupies. Mr. Lloyd Harris, a very good personal friend of mine, left the Liberal party because that party wanted to obtain wider markets and trade with the United States. That was his only reason. Now how can we hope to get extended business for this country when we send as a representative a man who only a few years ago was absolutely opposed to export trade, and whose policy was the home market and only the home market? If my information is correct, we in Canada are suffering from an unfortunate condition of affairs in England. I am making this statement publicly, so that the ministers may interest themselves in it, because the matter to which I am about to refer is common gossip in London, England, and in Canada. The statement is that in London the secretary or some of the officials in the High Commissioner's office and some of the officials in the Trade Commission are not on speaking terms, and that when communications from Canada, intended for certain of these officials in London, go to the other officials, instead of being mailed directly to those in London for whom they are intended, they are sent back to Canada and have to be re-mailed to the proper parties. The sooner that sort of thing is straightened out the better it will be for Canada. These conditions prevail, not amongst the men higher up—I have no fault to find with Sir George Perley or Sir Edward Kemp; they are suffering from the incompetence of understrappers who are running the office over there to the detriment of Canada—and the sooner this Government instruct their representatives over there to get rid of these understrappers who are causing injury to the trade of this country, the better it will be for Canada.

I am sorry I have taken up so much time. I do not intend delaying the passage of this Bill, but there is another matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the Acting Prime Minister so that he may be in a position to make a statement in regard to it when he brings down the Budget. Or perhaps the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) may deal with it when he has his estimates before us. During the past few years we sold a great many rails which had been ripped up from the railways throughout Canada. Those rails were sent overseas, and I have never seen in any of the printed statements any account of them. I think the people would like to know who owes us for those rails and if we are to be paid for them, or if they are taken into consideration in the accounts that will be filed of the indebtedness to us by Germany and those who owe us.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The question as to the value of the rails which were removed from the tracks of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and, I think partly from the National Transcontinental and some other lines, is under adjustment at present between the Dominion Government and the Imperial Government. My hon. friend will understand that after a war of such long duration there must necessarily be a number of items subject to adjustment, and it will take considerable time before the transactions can be closed up. I said last night that I would make as comprehensive a statement as possible upon the occasion of the Budget speech with reference to the national debt of Canada, especially its increase during the war, and our estimated expenditures for the coming year, our borrowings of last year, and our proposed borrowings for the present year, and would aim generally to lay as fully before Parliament as I could the facts relating to our financial position, in which, I know, all members of the House and citizens of the country are specially interested at this time.

My hon. friend has referred to the state of exchange between Canada and the United States. It is quite unfavourable to Canada, almost to the extent of 3 per cent. The hon. gentleman is a business man and will not have failed to observe that exchange between Great Britain and the United States is still more unfavourable to Great Britain, approximating 5 per cent. It is not correct that we have an adverse balance of trade to-day, as stated by the hon. member. Our balance of trade is favourable and has been exceedingly so during the last two or three years of the war. All the products that Canada is selling to-day outside of our own borders are being paid for by outside money, that is to say, by what we call technically, exchange. To ascertain a country's real exchange position the whole world position must be taken into account.

I stated last night that one reason why exchange was unfavourable was that by having to provide so much money here in Canada to pay for our products which, in normal times, would find outside money and thus redress our exchange, we neutralized for exchange purposes that amount of our exports. If Great Britain was able to find exchange outside of Canada, that is to

say credits in New York, or if she could buy in London exchange for our wheat, flour and other products which she purchased, our New York exchange would speedily rectify itself.

My hon. friend referred to a matter that I do not desire to enter upon at any length to-night, but which has been discussed on more than one occasion in this House, and that is the action taken by the Dominion Government in regard to newsprint. He drew the inference that on account of that action our exchange was not as favourable as it might otherwise have been in the United States. My hon. friend is no doubt aware that the amount of newsprint consumed in Canada by Canadian publishers is only about eleven per cent of our entire output. and therefore, I submit that the regulation of the price in Canada with respect to that eleven per cent has not any vital bearing upon the question of exchange between Canada and the United States.

The action of the Government was taken, as my hon. friend knows, for the purpose of providing, in a very critical time, newsprint at reasonable rates to the Canadian publishers who were very hard hit by the war, especially during the first three years. I am quite satisfied that when the matter comes up for more extended discussion, as my hon. friend indicates that it may, I shall be able to carry the judgment of the House and the country in favour of the proposition that the action of the Government was well advised and in the national interest at the time it was taken. The control of newsprint has continued down to the present time; it will continue until the end of the war, and until, I think also, the Paper Tribunal, which has been created by the Government for the purpose of hearing an appeal from the Newsprint Commissioner, renders its decision. There was submitted to it the question of the price of newsprint for the period since—I am speaking from recollection—July 1 of last year. No Government likes to take, even in war time, any action by way of restriction. It is a very unpleasant thing to do. It is done only from considerations of national duty and the national interest, and these were the motives inducing the Government, in connection with newsprint, to put into effect the Orders in Council and regulations referred to by my hon. friend.

The action of the Government is not singular in that regard. I believe that in Norway, which was a neutral country, such action was taken quite early in the war. In the United States, which takes the largest portion of our newsprint production, there was regulation, as my hon. friend knows, of the price of newsprint. There is regulation in that country to-day. I think my hon. friend is scarcely fair in his criticism of the Government for taking that, what we regard, very necessary action. My hon. friend also referred to the regulations which were in effect some little time ago prohibiting the export of butter.

Mr. ROBB: The embargo.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend knows that no Government would think of taking action of that kind, which is quite unpopular among the farming community, the most influential part of our population, without there being grave reasons in the national interest. It was taken in war time and as a war measure. It was a necessary war measure at a time when it was hard for our Allies to obtain the needed supply of fats. I can assure my hon. friend that that action especially was not taken by the Government on its own initiative without its being convinced of its necessity from the standpoint of the allied cause and of the proper feeding of the armies and the people of the allied countries.

I shall not enter into a discussion of the question of reciprocity. I shall also not follow my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) in what he said as to the naval policy. I had so many all night sessions in 1913 in respect to that interesting and important subject that I have not quite got back my sleep yet. I therefore hesitate to embark upon the discussion of so highly controversial a question. I had the view and I think I said so on more than one occasion, that the country could have stood both a Canadian navy and the contribution of three dreadnaughts. Sometimes a combination policy is a very good one. We have found that out since the war, but those were the days in which, quite properly, I think, we scrutinized expenditures very carefully and an undertaking of that kind seemed to be formidable.

I am not unmindful of what has been said by hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) in regard to the desirability of the Government considering carefully the question of expenditures and I take in good part what he said as to a minister who has gone through the war probably becoming accustomed to expenditures of large sums without realizing their full signifi-

cance. But, I endeavour to check myself up from time to time and I may say to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who also referred to the subject, that I do not in the least minimize to the House and to myself the extreme gravity of these large expenditures.

The expenditures which we made during the war were imposed upon us by military exigency. Canada did not count the cost during the war. She put forth her maximum effort and if the war had continued as long as this or until a year from now, instead of diminishing, we should have been increasing our efforts. Expenditure during war is, I will not say beyond the control of the Government, but in many respects it is practically so. The nation is doing its utmost to win the war. Every effort is being put forward, every energy strained, the public are in no mood to accept the excuse of financial considerations standing in the way of anything that appears necessary to promote the national effort in the struggle; consequently the position of the Finance Minister during the war is one largely of finding money for huge military expenditures. He endeavours to exercise a certain measure of control but after he has done his best, while the war is on, there is a vast amount of expenditure that is uncontrollable and it is his duty to find the money.

Now, the war is over, but, as I pointed out last night this is a war year.

We had the situation confronting us, when the armistice was declared, which I mentioned last night, and which threatened to throw out of employment some 200,000 people; we had the prospect of so many of our men returning, and returning quickly, to be reabsorbed into civil life. It is a time of great unrest all over the world, we are not exempt from that unrest, and with every desire to keep our expenditures down I am satisfied that the policy for this year is to make expenditures upon a large scale for productive undertakings in order to furnish as much work as possible. Our people have suffered, as people all over the world have suffered; the cost of living is very high, and the combination of unemployment and high cost of living is one which leads to serious situations wherever it occurs.

With regard to that, may I put forward a suggestion which has occurred to me on more than one occasion? The concomitants of war are always plague and famine. The world has had plague in the shape of influenza, and to-day, if the world is considered as a whole, there is famine. There is no famine in Canada, for we are a food-producing and food-exporting country. But if we take into account central, southern and southeastern Europe, parts of Belgium and France, and especially Russia, we realize that agriculture on that continent has been partially destroyed by the war. Millions of men have been withdrawn from tillage, cattle have been killed, herds necessarily have been allowed to run down, horses have been taken for the use of the armies, implements have been destroyed on a vast scale, particularly in Russia during the agrarian risings throughout that great republic, and if we take the vast tract of desolate occupied territory, it is not too much to say that the world is suffering to some extent from famine. Now, that makes a great world demand for foodstuffs; that in turn causes high prices, and, as I stated, we have here, as we have in all other countries, high prices for the commodities that are essential to life. If we should have also unemployment on an extensive scale throughout this country the consequences would be quite serious.

The Government has endeavoured to do its best to meet that situation. I do not say that every action of the Government has been the wisest possible; I am only speaking of the average of what we have done since the armistice in November last. I desire again to assure the House that I realize the enormous liabilities that have accumulated as the result of the war, and that I am very vitally seized of the importance of not engaging in any expenditures that are not productive or are not necessary to keep our industries going to the extent of furnishing employment to those of our population who may be in danger of unemployment and who have rendered such patriotic service during the war.

I think I have covered nearly all the points adverted to by hon. members opposite. It was not my intention last night to reflect on hon. gentlemen of the Opposition as to their attitude towards manufacturing industries. I was simply answering the argument which was put forward, as my hon. friend will see on perusing Hansard.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to ask my hon. friend to be a little more explicit about the purpose of subsection (d):

—the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the war;

Could he give me a concrete case?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is really put in to meet a case which could not well be

foreseen, but which might arise. My hon. friend will find that precise section in the first and second War Appropriation Acts. I remember, it was drafted in my office by Mr. Ross, who was Assistant Deputy Minister at the time, and I think I suggested the word "deemed." During the war cases arose from time to time which could not have been foreseen, and which were clearly cases where the Government was justified in deeming the expenditures necessary to be war expenditures because they arose out of the war. I am afraid I cannot give a concrete case to my hon. friend without having time to look into our expenditures. But it has not been drawn to my attention that the clause has been abused, and I do not think it is likely to be abused.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps my hon. friend might approach the question from the other side. Would he tell us what could not be done under that clause? I think that under it they could get an Order in Council to hang you, Mr. Chairman. I really do not see any limitation to the power of the Governor in Council under the clause. I am not opposing it, because it has been in previous Acts and no harm has come of it; but it strikes me that that is a very broad power indeed, and I cannot imagine anything done by the Governor in Council under it that would not be deemed legal.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am inclined to think my hon. friend is right. I would point out to him that, in 1914, when the war commenced, Parliament passed the War Measures Act, which practically devolved upon the Government the legislative powers of Parliament. It was an extraordinary power, implying great confidence, and I have always felt that the Government should exercise that power keeping that fact in mind. Speaking generally with regard to the War Measures Act, I believe that almost more than any other single thing except the patriotism and courage of our soldiers, that Act enabled Canada to achieve the degree of success in the war which she did achieve. I have heard men in the United States—where the system was not nearly so flexible until they had been in the war for some time, when the entire executive and, I think, legislative power was vested in the President—refer to this War Measures Act and the extraordinary power that it gave to the Government to deal quickly with questions as they arose. It would be quite impossible to provide in Estimates, or by legislation in advance, for all the multitudinous cases arising during the war; and this War Measures Act, while it did give the Government extraordinary power and was concurred in by the Opposition, and, as I say, implied the reposing of great confidence in the Government—which for my part I have always recognized and gladly acknowledged—enabled this country to do what it could by no means otherwise have attempted to do in the carrying on of the war. I wish to say that, and I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to the powers devolved upon the Government by that Act—powers which would never have been given, and never should have been given, except in war time.

The War Appropriation Acts of the past two years and this War Demobilization Act are intended to give the Government power to deal, as to expenditure, with all matters arising out of the war. It is very wide, I admit. I am a strong believer in the Government bringing down estimates in detail rather than in blanket votes, showing as far as possible the purpose for which the expenditure is to be made. That is a sound principle, in ordinary times at least. This year I took up in my office the question of what amount we should provide in this Demobilization Bill. The instructions I gave were that the estimates of my own department and of all other departments to which the request was transmitted should contain practically all the items we could specify, and that the Demobilization Bill should cover only the war gratuity, demobilization expenditure, and other items that could not be specified with accuracy in an estimate. I do not know how far we have succeeded in doing that, but we appreciate the confidence expressed in the vote and will endeavour to administer it as trustees should.

Mr. FIELDING: I cordially agree with the hon. gentleman that the War Measures Act was a necessary and proper Act. During the war, owing to the patriotic feeling of the country, people were not critical; you could get pretty nearly anything that was asked for in the name of the war or for the purposes of the war. But the time has arrived when the people will be more critical, and if we continue war measures at a time when there is no longer any war, there will be keener inquiry and more criticism. I do not object to the passing of the Act, but I think it is just as well that we should begin to adapt ourselves to the condition of peace which is happily upon us.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I entirely agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Could the Government, for instance, buy the wheat crop under this provision of the Bill?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, I suppose if the Government stated that it was deemed to be a war purpose, the Government's discretion would not be questioned, let us say, by a court. But it is not the intention of the Government to use this vote for that purpose, although a great part of it may be used for financing the wheat crop in the way that I intimated last evening.

Mr. VIEN: There are some questions that we want to put to the Minister of Militia in regard to the $5,000,000 voted last year which, I fancy, would naturally come under this item. If we have the assurance that when the Supplementary Estimates of the Department of Militia are before the Committee we may put any question to the minister as to the expenditure during the war and the accounts of the Department of Militia Overseas, I shall not insist upon receiving further information at this stage.

Major-General MEWBURN: I shall be very glad to endeavour to answer any questions on the Supplementary Estimates of the Department of Militia.

Mr. VIEN: The Minister of Marine told us to-day that he was asking Parliament to vote $30,000,000 to meet his shipbuilding programme of last year, and that a further amount would be required for the programme that he is to lay before the House on a future day. What amount of the $350,000,000 is to be expended upon transportation facilities, and in what way? Is the expenditure to be for the building or the purchase of ships?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is a general clause to enable the Government to take such action as may be necessitated by conditions to provide transportation for our troops or for our commerce.

Mr. VIEN: It could hardly be understood as being for the transportation of troops, because it is for " the promotion of trade and industry and the transportation facilities therefor." We could hardly be expected to provide for transportation facilities outside of the building, buying or chartering of ships. How could we expend money under this Bill for the promotion of transportation facilities except through the Department of Marine and Fisheries or Naval Affairs?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A part of this money could be used for shipbuilding. I requested that the estimate for shipbuilding for 1919-20 should be in the Supplementary Estimates for this year, but down to March 31 the expenditure for shipbuilding would come out of last year's vote, if that vote were sufficient for all purposes for which it was voted, including this. If there should be a shortage there, this vote, I think, would enable us to take it up. The wording of section 2 practically follows the wording of the corresponding section in last year's war vote, with the changes which, in the opinion of Council, were necessitated by the altered conditions. We wanted to have it wide enough, with the remainder of the vote of last year, to meet any expenditures in excess of the war vote of last year, if there should be such, as well as expenditures of this year. So far as I know, no specific expenditure is in view under this clause.

Mr. VIEN: I do not believe that in the clause in the Act appropriating $500,000,000 there was any specific amount mentioned under the title that we now find in subsection (c) of section 2. I do not remember that last year we voted any amount of money for the promoting of trade and industry and transportation facilities therefor. This is entirely new, and if the term " transportation facilities " is not to be construed as meaning shipbuilding, I hardly see how we could be called upon to give to the Government the right to facilitate transport and expend any money for that purpose unless the items are brought down in the Estimates of some department. The Acting Prime Minister does not appear to know much more on the subject than I do. This is not for shipbuilding; it is not for the chartering of ships. The demobilization of our troops is covered by other sections, and this is not for carrying war materials back to this country. If it is not for the building of ships, how should we be called upon to vote any money for the payment of transportation of our goods or for bringing into Canada the goods we buy? I fail entirely to see any purpose which would commend itself to this Committee for which we would give to the Government a blanket authorization to spend any portion of the $350,000,000, if it does not come under the title of shipbuilding. I would, therefore,

suggest that the words "transportation facilities" be struck out.

Mr. CANNON: Clause (d) of section 2 says:

The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in consequence of the war.

Is this a revival or extension of the War Measures Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This is a vote of money, and it can be availed of by the Government for the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary by the Governor in Council in consequence of the war; that is to say, in connection with any measures relating to demobilization, or to many questions which might arise. I am sure it does not extend the powers of the Government under the War Measures Act beyond the limitations imposed by Parliament in that Act.

Mr. CANNON: I think it does.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CANNON: Hon. members need not be in such a hurry. The section will be carried when we are through with it, and not before. Some hon. members do not seem to appreciate the importance of this clause, and we shall discuss it as long as we deem it necessary to do so. I am not quite satisfied with the explanation given by the Acting Prime Minister. The scope of this clause is very wide. This is for carrying out any measures deemed necessary in consequence of the war, not for the prosecution of the war, because the war is over. How far will it go? Where will the Government stop? Now that the war is over, are we, by this Bill, going to have government by Order in Council, just as during the past five years? I do not think the people of this country would be satisfied with such a condition of things.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Section 2 authorizes the paying out of a sum not exceeding $350,000,000 for the purposes mentioned, amongst others, for the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the war. The purpose of this is to place the Government in funds to carry out measures which it is lawfully authorized to carry out. This is not a measure like the War Measures Act, authorizing the Government to do specific things.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand from the Acting Prime Minister that these words were taken from similar Bills of previous years?

[Mr. Vien.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With certain changes to meet altered conditions.

Mr. FIELDING: I have in my hand the $500,000,000 loan resolution of 1917, and I do not find these words in it. I have not looked at the others.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Which words does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. FIELDING: Clause (d).

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think they are in the Act of 1918.

Mr. FIELDING: If the minister says that they are in the previous resolution, I am content.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not sure; I will send up for the Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the words of clause (d) were used in the Act of 1918, that could be very readily understood, and it would be quite proper, because the war was on and unforeseen conditions would have to be provided for. The minister, however, may see when he gets the Act. There are so many things in connection with this very comprehensive clause, it is difficult to exhaust them all. Is the $70,000,000 for which the Government have made the country liable by Order in Council, included in this appropriation of $350,000,000? I refer to the $20,000,000 for roads in the provinces, $25,000,000 for housing, and $25,000,000 for trade with Rumania?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The first two would not be. The Highways resolution is on the Order Paper, and it would provide for payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The vote for Housing is in the Estimates, and it will also provide for payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The credits which I mentioned last night would be payable, partly out of this appropriation and partly out of any balance from the last vote.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Did the War Appropriation Act not provide for an expenditure of $500,000,000?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I think the minister stated some time ago that a large portion of that appropriation was still unexpended.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Why, then, do we say in clause (e), "For the purposes mentioned in the War Appropriation Act, 1918, and in excess of the amount authorized by the said Act?"

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If any excess. I am not able to state precisely what the expenditure on war account would be for the last year. This provision was in the War Appropriation Act, 1918, and it was found necessary to take care of an expenditure in excess of the amount authorized for the previous year. The corresponding clauses in last year's Act are as follows:

(a) the defence and security of Canada;
(b) the conduct of naval and military operations in or beyond Canada;
(c) promoting the continuance of trade industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise;
(d) the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war; and,
(e) payments made for the said purposes during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and eighteen, in excess of the amount authorized by The War Appropriation Act, 1917.

Now the Government deemed shipbuilding to be a war measure, and payments were made up to the end of the last fiscal year, and I think have been made since, on that account out of the War Appropriation. The paragraph to which my hon. friend has referred would undoubtedly authorize an expenditure upon shipbuilding, for instance, to the extent that is necessary.

Mr. FIELDING: May I add in explanation that I sent for the Journals of 1914, and I find that in the original resolution the words to which exception has been taken are to be found exactly as they have been read by the minister for the year 1918. It so happened that the Act of 1917 did not contain them.

Mr. VIEN: Last night the Acting Prime Minister stated that the net debt on March 31, 1919, was $1,584,000,000. What was the gross debt on the same date?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Unless I could at the same time inform the House as to the assets on the other side of the account, especially the liquid assets, the information would not be of value in reaching a conclusion as to the financial position of Canada. It is the net debt that conveys the information which the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) asked me to obtain for him. My hon. friend knows that part of the gross debt would be the currency, although it might be secured by gold, by liabilities of banks in respect of loans, and by other assets.

Mr. VIEN: At a later date would the minister state what the gross debt is, and how the net debt is arrived at?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes; perhaps when the Estimates of the Finance Department are up.

Mr. McKENZIE: How does the minister propose to borrow this money?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is not always wise to state precisely how one intends to raise money, but I think I said in the House a short time ago that it would be necessary to have a domestic loan this coming fall, possibly in September. We have some borrowing to do in New York between now and August next, but the borrowing under this Bill will be by way of a domestic loan. I shall not state to what amount we shall borrow, because I am unable to state that accurately. It might be that we would borrow temporarily from the banks and make a loan for the remaining amount. I say that because interest rates are pretty high, and it is advisable to limit the amount of the loan to as low an amount as possible, in order that we may not have to pay a high rate of interest over a period of years.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—loans authorized:

Mr. McKENZIE: This section empowers the Governor in Council to borrow "such sum or sums of money, less any amount borrowed in excess of the amounts authorized by any war appropriation Act." What is the exact amount that the minister proposes to borrow under the powers given him by this Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This is to ensure that when this amount is raised we shall not have borrowed more than we were authorized by Parliament to borrow. For example, the amount we were authorized to borrow last year was $500,000,000, speaking from memory, and we received $670,000,000 by the Victory Loan. We took practically all that money, and I am not sure that the Dominion has not slightly exceeded the borrowing powers it had. The purpose of this section is to correct that so that when this money is borrowed it will be borrowed in accordance with legislation.

Mr. McKENZIE: You have $150,000,000 more than was authorized last year?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, but there might have been some borrowing power in respect to the previous year. The hon.

gentleman knows that in connection with the Appropriation Bill every year when the general estimates are passed there is a provision that the borrowing power of the Dominion is so much. Sometimes that is rather arbitrary, but it is put in just to ensure that the Dominion has the borrowing power necessary to raise the money provided in the Appropriation Bill. That is a point that has to be watched by the Finance Department. I asked my deputy to give attention to that in connection with this Bill so that we should not find ourselves without legislative authority in respect to all the amounts which we might have raised by loan in excess of actual borrowing powers at the time. It would not happen in ordinary times, but during the war it did happen that we slightly overborrowed.

Mr. McKENZIE: We had power last year to borrow $500,000,000. That loan brought to the Treasury $650,000,000. There is therefore $150,000,000 for which we have no authority under the former Act. Is that to be regarded as part of this $350,000,000, or are we going to borrow out-and-out $350,000,000 under this Act together with the $150,000,000 standing over from last year?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It will enable us to get this $350,000,000 in accordance with existing legislation. If there were not some such clause as this, when we came to borrow notwithstanding the vote of $350,000,000 we would find ourselves in the position of being able to borrow only, say, $300,000,000. The situation with regard to the last loan was not quite as described by the hon. member. Let us assume that for 1917-18 we had a war vote of $500,000,000 and expended $350,000,000. Then if, the next year, we had a vote of $500,000,000 and raised a loan of $650,000,000 the previous authority would apply to the excess on the second Bill. The intention is to enable us to raise $350,000,000 notwithstanding that we may have raised some moneys voted by Parliament but in excess of borrowing powers then existing.

Mr. VIEN: Is it the intention of the Acting Prime Minister to have these war bonds which are to be issued on that loan tax-free, or are they to be subject to taxation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am unable to make a statement with regard to that because I don't know what conditions we shall be confronted with when we float this loan. If we could float a taxable loan at a rate of interest which would compare favourably with the rate which we should obtain on tax-free issue, and having regard to the amount of income tax we would receive if the loan were taxable, I would be strongly in favour of issuing bonds not tax-free. My hon. friend is no doubt aware that when you come to face a market you have to pay a much higher rate of interest, even upon Government loans, where your securities are issued subject to taxation, than you do where the securities are tax-free. I am speaking only from memory, because it did not occur to me that the question would arise to-night. In the United States I think there is a point difference between tax-free securities and taxable securities, and on a large loan the annual difference in interest which you have to pay as between tax-free and taxable issue is very large, and if one looked at it purely from the business standpoint he would calculate as to what revenue would likely be received from a taxable loan, and in that connection he would have to consider the exemption granted under our Income Tax Act. In this country he would, I am sure, reach the conclusion that the tax-free issue gives a better result in an annual budget than a taxable issue, because the amount which would be received by way of interest on a taxable bond would not be as great as the annual amount which the Government would have to pay in excess interest upon the taxable issue. There is another aspect of the matter to which attention must be given. Under an income tax graduated as ours is, there is reached a point at which there is a decided advantage to those of large incomes in buying the tax-free bonds. That is unfortunate. To some extent the issue of tax-free bonds is inconsistent with a steeply graduated income tax. One must consider market conditions, and whether outstanding issues which are in competition with him in his loan are tax-free or not, and be guided by the situation with which he is confronted. It is very difficult to say in advance what one will do until the time is reached. When we put out our first loan in New York and the second loan in 1917 the very first point that arose was that the bonds must be tax-free. You could not sell an issue at that time in the United States on taxable bonds for the reason that Canada was at war. They did not know but what they might be taxed at their source here, and you could not sell an issue of taxable bonds in the United States at that time. You could not sell a taxable issue of Cana-

dian bonds in the United States to-day. I raised the question as to whether these bonds might not be taxable to parties not resident in Canada, but on account of the proximity of Canada to the United States, parties in the United States want the benefit of the markets both of Canada and of the United States, and the result was that our bonds in our issues there had to be tax-free. Our bonds being tax-free there, people in Canada desiring to buy bonds, by reason of the exemption given in respect of income tax, could buy them in New York. All the securities we issue here are in competition with all the securities outstanding here and in New York. It is a matter to which I have given a great deal of anxious thought, and there are two sides to the question I frankly admit. It is a question of calculation as to what will give the best results to the Dominion. There will always be a certain dissatisfaction if parties of large incomes can buy tax-free bonds and thus escape to some extent from income taxation. But, on the other hand, we must consider what the rate of interest would be as between a tax-free and a taxable bond and endeavour to do the best we can with the situation.

Mr. VIEN: On the Victory Loans that have been floated in Canada the Government has fixed the rate of interest. Does the Acting Prime Minister believe that with the rate of interest fixed at 5 and 5½ per cent the last domestic loans floated in Canada would not have been subscribed as cheerfully if they had been taxable?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Most certainly not. We should have got a substantial subscription but nothing like the amount we did get. I can say that positively because I went into the matter most carefully. Take, for example, financial institutions which are purchasers of bonds that are offered on the open market; they would have purchased a certain amount but nothing like the amount they did purchase. They could go on the open market and buy. Take the situation in the United States last year. Large insurance companies there which have to earn a certain rate of interest upon their investments in order to make a slight profit, or to carry their liabilities, can take a certain amount of taxable loan at a lower rate of interest than the market rate, but if they had all their surplus funds invested in that and found that these bonds went down five to ten points it would be a very serious thing for them. The rate of interest in the market is determined by supply and demand the same as the price of any other commodity and it is a most extraordinary thing that at the end of this war in which the finance of all countries has been disturbed and dislocated, in many cases shattered, we find ourselves with our securities during the war standing at par and above. Over a million and a half of the people of this country invested in the Victory Loan, and there is a much better feeling in this country among the people who subscribed to this loan that their securities are standing at par and over and that they can realize, if they want to, the amount they paid for them. If these securities were down five or ten points and if we put out another loan on a 5 per cent basis, or on a 5½ per cent basis, only one thing would happen and that would be that we would have to count on a discount. If the previous loan had gone to a discount, when it came to the floating of the next loan, the fact of that discount would have an important bearing.

I feel that our war financing has been very successful, even if I do say it myself. I felt that we should pay a reasonable rate of interest upon our borrowings. I do not mean to say that the Canadian public might not have taken once or twice a loan at a rate below the market rate, but I do not believe that is a wise policy especially in connection with a long war. When you offer securities to the public the best factor you can have is a lot of pleased subscribers to the previous loan. From the beginning of the war we were in competition with Great Britain's securities in New York and when I offered some of my loans in New York and some of the loans in Canada British securities were selling as low as on a 7 or 8 per cent basis in New York. So were the securities of France as well as other securities of the highest grade. In our financing during the war we had to take conditions as we found them and deal in New York or here as best we could.

In the war loans we engaged the interest of all sections of the community; and I want to pay my tribute here and now, as I have on every platform on which I spoke, to the members of this House on both sides, and to the Canadian people without distinction of class, race and creed, who assisted me to the utmost of their ability in floating these loans. Otherwise we could not have done it. There was co-operative effort on the part of everyone. I have heard no complaint from the time the first loan was floated down to the present, of there being any favouritism, or discrim-

ination, or political influence, or patronage, in reference to the flotation of our Canadian war loans.

Mr. VIEN: As the clause gives the Government power to determine under what conditions the loan is going to the floated, I think it is proper to draw the attention of the Government to the bitter criticism which has circulated among the public against the floating of tax-exempt loans. There is, it is true, the question of dollars and cents to be kept in view,—whether the discount that you will lose on the taxable bond will be equalized by the amount that the public exchequer will receive from the taxation on this bond. But there is also something else than the dollars and cents aspect of the question, there is a question of principle; and I say it is not democratic to have bonds floated which are tax exempt. There is a great deal of criticism of the action of the Government in floating tax exempt bonds. It allows those who have made a lot of money during the war, by profiteering or otherwise, and financial and banking institutions which have a lot of money to dispose of, to place that money in tax-exempt bonds. They were either as patriotic as they pretended and boasted they were during the floating of these Victory Loans, in which case they would have subscribed as freely whether the bonds were tax exempt or not, or else some of the feathers should be taken off their caps—and I think the Acting Prime Minister has done that to-night in stating that in his opinion the last loan would not have been as freely subscribed had it not been exempt from taxation; we would have received a certain amount but not have quite as much as we have received by issuing tax-exempt bonds. I had some knowledge of the floating of the last Victory Loan in the district of Quebec, and in that district the exemption did not influence very much the people who subscribed to that loan. They subscribed because an appeal was made to them to do so on the ground that it was necessary, for the successful prosecution of the war, to help our industries and to help the Government to carry on, to accomplish the task which they had on their hands. I believe that if a proper appeal had been made to the people of Canada at large the response would have been equally as good whether the bonds were taxable or exempt. There is a great deal of unrest and criticism among the labour classes at the present time. I have heard a lot of it in Montreal, Toronto and Quebec. The labouring classes contend that we owe great sums of money as a result of our domestic loans.

[Sir Thomas White.]

To whom do we owe them? We owe them to those who have made money during the war either by war contracts or by profiteering on the necessaries of life—and we have examples high up. They contend that not only do we owe the capital of our domestic loan to those people who made their money sometimes by the sweat of the working classes, but that those people have taken care that the interest they are going to derive from the money they have loaned to the Government will be tax exempt, and that it will be the wage earner and the small man who will have to pay the greatest part of the amount which the Government has to raise to meet our expenditures and our liabilities. And thereby we invite to a great extent the criticism which is now so prevalent throughout the country. I believe the better practice would have been even to pay a higher rate of interest or a discount on the floating of our bonds. The true democratic principle is that every one should pay his proper share of the country's expenditure, and if I might be at liberty to offer a little advice to the Government it would be this, that in future when floating loans they should not make them exempt from taxation.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not sure that I correctly caught the answer of the minister to the question of the leader of the Opposition as to the amount he is at liberty to borrow under this clause. Am I right in understanding that the object is to raise a new loan of $350,000,000?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, $350,000,000, and to any amount for which we have not borrowing power, but which we have borrowed.

Mr. FIELDING: If I read the resolution aright, the maximum the hon. minister could borrow under the Bill would be $350,000,000; but from that he must deduct the $150,000,000 which he says was over-borrowed last year. If that is correct, he will only borrow under this Bill $200,000,000. I would just draw the hon. gentleman's attention to that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall be glad to have the clause examined by the Department of Justice. It seems a little complicated, but it was settled by my department for the purpose of insuring that we had borrowing power necessary to raise $350,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING: It is not within this Bill, if the hon. gentleman over-borrowed $150,000,000 last year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I merely used that as an illustration. I do not know what amount was over-borrowed last year—at least, I have not accurate information. I stated to my hon. friend that if we raised, as we did, $670,000,000 by the Victory Loan of last year, and had a war appropriation of only $500,000,000, and if we had a surplus from the previous year, and had not borrowed the amount we were authorized to borrow the previous year, that unused borrowing power would apply in respect of the surplus expenditure. I will look at this section, but I do not think it should pass because it was settled, as I say, with that in view.

Mr. CANNON: How much of the $670,000,000 of the 1918 loan was subscribed as cash, and how much by way of conversion of previous loans?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If we had taken into account the amount of conversions the last loan would have been very much in excess of $670,000,000. That amount represents cash subscriptions.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—power to re-issue, sell or pledge securities:

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not aware that legislation of this sort has ever been passed before by this House. Is not this a rather extraordinary power? If there is to be any further borrowing should not Parliament have something to say about it?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As to section 4, I have looked at it more closely since my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) spoke, and I would direct his attention to this:

> The Governor in Council may, in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed. . . . raise by way of loan, ... such sum or sums of money, less any amount borrowed in excess of the amounts authorized by any war appropriation Act, as are required for the purpose of making any payment authorized by this Act.

Does my hon. friend see the force of the last few words there? That is to say, this section authorizes us to borrow in any event the amount required for making any expenditure if authorized by this Act. That is the way I would construe those last words:

Mr. FIELDING: That is the way the money raised would have to be applied; but I do not think it creates power to raise money. I can understand the possibility that, as respects the war loan particularly, there was overborrowing of over $150,000,000; but if there were other borrowing powers unused, some portion of that $150,000,000, possibly the whole of it, might be covered by such other unused powers, and in that way there would not be overborrowing. But if there was actual overborrowing, meaning something in excess of what you have power to borrow, then clearly that must be deducted from the $350,000,000. However, it is enough to call my hon. friend's attention to it, and his solicitor no doubt will look into it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes. I will have the Department of Justice consider the section, and if any change is necessary to effectuate the purpose we have in mind I will have the matter attended to on the third reading. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, asked a question about section 5.

Mr. McKENZIE: Section 5 states that after those securities or bonds are paid and called in they can be re-issued and re-sold without any reference to Parliament. I think that is rather unusual.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is a frequent clause in company legislation and arises out of a decision—some of the lawyers in the House will recall it—under which it was held that if securities had been pledged, and the amount of the loan paid off and the securities got back again, they could not then be sold, that they became extinguished by virtue of their redemption; hence this clause, which, I believe, is usually inserted. Supposing the Dominion had issued bonds with the intention of selling them outright but in the meantime had borrowed against them from the bank—which the Dominion now seldom does—and paid off the loan to the bank, and then desired to sell the securities, it is advisable that they should be able to sell them without getting fresh borrowing powers; in other words, that they should not be deemed to be extinguished. Frequently loans are effected for the purpose of carrying securities which it is intended to sell and repay the loan from the proceeds so obtained.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the clause had its origin in reference to a railway company, and the principle having been laid down by the courts it was thought as respects all Government loans that the same precaution should be taken.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, that is right.

Section agreed to.

On the Preamble:

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to ask the minister in connection with the many borrowings and bonds of the Government that are outstanding, has the Government any power to recall those bonds at any time, or must they remain outstanding for a set period of years? We are paying very heavy interest; that we can readily understand, having regard to the nature of the period through which we have been passing. But we hope that some day we shall get back to normal times, when money can be borrowed much cheaper than it can be borrowed now. If the Government had power to call in these bonds, pay them off, and convert them into new securities at a smaller rate of interest, it would be very much in the interest of the country. Will the minister retain to himself such powers in connection with future borrowings if he has to pay a very high rate of interest?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With regard to future borrowings, the policy should be to borrow for shorter terms. No one can foresee what interest rates will be. My own view is that they are not likely to drop materially for a considerable time; I do not see how they can. What I have said is subject to this: in putting out loans one has to consider the financing that has already been done and not have his loans in large amounts too close to the present time. Let me illustrate. Suppose the Dominion Government during the war had been fearful of the comparatively high interest rates and had resorted to short-date borrowing, which is all right for comparatively small amounts in times of high interest rates. And suppose the Minister of Finance had to face within the next five years, let us say, the raising of five, seven or ten hundred million dollars; that would be a very serious matter. The amounts expended in this war, the debt of Canada and the debts of all nations, are so vast that funding is not possible as it would be in normal times. One of the advantages of our situation is that our loans are distributed over five, ten, fifteen and twenty years. I know precisely what my hon. friend has in mind—that we shall have to pay high interest rates over a period of fifteen and twenty years. That is true in respect of certain of our loans. But I do not see what advantage it would be to us within the next five or ten years, having regard to the loans we have to meet before ten years are over, to be in a position to recall the other bonds, because the financial operations would not be possible to enable us to retire them and replace them with further issues at lower rates; it seems to me that the transactions are too great. I do not like, any more than my hon. friends, the idea that the Dominion has to pay that rate of interest over so long a period. But short-date borrowing is almost fatal in war time, because you get accumulations of debt ahead of you and when you need fresh money you are confronted with maturities coming due, and a very serious situation results.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Friday, May 9, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT DEFAULTERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, now that we have a Bill for the disqualification of defaulters under the Military Service Act, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) if he will be good enough to bring pressure on the hon. the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) to grant relief to the farmers' sons now in goal, or to be apprehended, especially in Quebec, on account of the fact that their services are so badly needed on the farms, because of the lateness of the season caused by bad weather?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I shall be glad to bring my hon. friend's request to the attention of the Acting Minister of Justice.

CASE OF ESDRAS BERUBE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: Now that the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) is in his seat, may I be permitted to ask that he will recommend to the clemency of His Excellency the Governor General the case of a young farmer of Temiscouata, Esdras Bérubé—who was shot and wounded and spent two months—

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a request which should be conveyed in the ordinary course by letter. It is not a matter of policy and should not be brought up on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. GAUVREAU: It is such a bad case that I shall insist on putting my question if allowed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's request must take the course I suggest.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply —Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Government shipbuilding programme—amount required for the construction of vessels in accordance with the Government programme, $30,000,000.

Mr. MURPHY: In the discussion yesterday, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) was good enough to give the Committee certain information with regard to the carrying out of the obligations assumed by the Dominion Steel Company in connection with the contract that was referred to. May I now inquire if the hon. gentleman will tell the Committee how much money was expended by the Steel Company in fulfilling their obligations under the contract up to the most recent date in regard to which the hon. gentleman has information?

Mr. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) the information that he has asked for. The buildings are only partially up and I have asked the Dominion Steel Corporation to let me know how much money they have expended. For the moment I have not the information, but it cannot be a very large sum.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to know positively from the hon. gentleman if, in any of the pourparlers which he has had of late with the representatives of the company, these gentlemen have agreed to have the terms of the contract altered if need be.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I thought I made that quite clear yesterday in answer to the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux). Last week the President and the Vice-president of the company met me in a very broad and generous spirit. If we do not modify the contract in conformity with the present price of steel in the United States the Government are at liberty to cancel it. The matter is not yet settled, the negotiations are still going on, but when they are finished I will be glad to give the particulars to the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: In so far as this mill is concerned, I would certainly urge upon the minister the desirability of seeing that it is erected and put into operation. I think every Canadian will say that we should have a plate-producing mill in Canada somewhere, and if we are to have it at all I think we should have it in connection with one of the big institutions of that class. The biggest steel-producing plant in Canada to-day is the Dominion Steel Corporation. There may be bigger ones later on, but at the present moment that is the largest in Canada producing steel of the very best class, as has been shown by what they were supplying during the war and what they have been doing in rail production. I think the Dominion Steel Company have produced as good a rail as is produced anywhere on the American continent. It was well understood last year, and I think it is still understood, that the Government were to build that plate mill and that arrangements had been completed for that purpose. The mere fact that a difference has arisen in price one way or the other is not a sufficient reason to disturb the policy agreed upon by the Government, considering that the production of steel plates within our own borders is such an important matter to the whole country. These plates are to be produced at tide water. The mill will be within a stone's throw of tide water of Sydney harbour, from where both coasts and inland by rail can be supplied. The ships are to be built in Halifax, and by steamers from the shores of Sydney harbour to Halifax the transportation of these plates is not a difficult proposition. It would be better, one would think, if both were going on at the same place, and the natural place for shipbuilding would be Sydney harbour, but the Government have decided otherwise, and they having so decided, I have no criticism to offer. But I certainly think it would be a retrograde movement to abandon the idea of producing these plates, and I trust the minister will determinedly carry forward the policy upon which he launched in connection with the erection of a mill. I am glad to find that Mr. Workman, president of the company, has met him in a conciliatory and businesslike spirit on that point, and I hope that nothing will interfere with an advanced programme in connection with shipbuilding and the furnishing of facilities for producing plate within our own country.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Would the minister be good enough to state what he estimates the price of the plates will be to the Government at Sydney under the contract?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am very glad indeed to hear from the leader of the Opposition the words of commendation that he has been good enough to utter in regard to the contract made between the Government and the Dominion Steel Corporation to manufacture two hundred and fifty thousand tons of ship's plate. The best price for the Government that could be agreed upon over a year ago was $4.15 per hundred pounds, based upon the price at which steel billets were selling at that time, viz: $25.50 per ton. Hon. members no doubt are aware that ship's plates are made from steel billets, and in talking with the president of the company I learned that steel billets would not in any event decline in price more than $10 a ton. When the Government entered into that contract with the steel corporation it was as a war project; as I stated in the House yesterday you could not get steel from the United States; and notwithstanding the fact that we had placed an eighty thousand ton contract there, we were only able to obtain six thousand tons. Other countries at war, such as Britain and France were depending on the United States for steel, and Japan was also getting steel from that country. The United States, having a huge mercantile marine programme themselves to carry out, naturally were going to serve their own necessities first before they supplied the needs of others; therefore, to make shipbuilding a self-contained industry in Canada, and to enable this country to get ships during the period of the war, it seemed to the Government that there was no other course open but to enter into the best contract we could to have the steel plates made here. It is greatly to the credit of the steel corporation that they were able to place before the Government a more favourable proposal than we could get from the United States. Another thing in its favour, and which is gratifying from a patriotic point of view, is that the ore used by the steel company to make the pig iron originates in British territory, and comes from Newfoundland, so that all the materials used in production are obtained on British soil. But after the armistice had been signed, the price of ship's plates being 2¾ cents in the States, against possibly a minimum price of $3.75 under the Dominion Steel Company's contract and the Government being obligated to take no less than fifty thousand tons per year for a period of five years, making two hundred and fifty thousand tons in all, it seemed to my colleagues and to me that we could not very well afford to pay that price. The arrangement looked very favourable a year ago when plates were selling at from four to ten cents a pound, but it does not look so favourable now.

I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition that to make Canada's shipbuilding programme permanent, the industry must be on a self-contained basis in this country, and that we ought to make our own ship's plates. I am quite satisfied that the Dominion Steel Corporation could carry out the contract, and I am also well satisfied that Sydney is a very good point at which to make these plates. No definite conclusion has yet been arrived at, but the company fairly stated that if they had completed their plant and installed the machinery necessary it would have been at a capital cost of $5,000,000. Therefore, if they are to meet the American price it would take them many years before they could do so, and possibly they might never be able to write off the initial cost of the plant, or a portion of it. If the Steel Company would give us a more favourable price, the Government would be more inclined to go on with the proposition than it is to cancel it. If, however, the company cannot see their way clear to modify the price, I think it is in the best interests of the country to cancel the contract.

Mr. DUFF: The minister has told us that the Government has only received delivery so far of six thousand tons out of the eighty thousand tons contracted for. I understood him to say yesterday that the contract with the United States was based on a price of 3¼ or 3½ cents per pound?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: 3¼ cents.

Mr. DUFF: Hansard gives the price as 3½ cents, but I understood the minister yesterday to say 3¼ cents. I would like to know if the Government has to take delivery at 3¼ of the other seventy-four thousand tons, and if so if the price it is paying ship builders for ships is based on 3¼ cents per pound, or on the contract price of $4.15 per hundred pounds which it made with the Dominion Iron & Steel Company? Another thing as to which I would like the minister to inform the Committee, if he would kindly do so, is this: An Order in Council was passed when the contract was made with the Dominion Iron & Steel Company, one clause of which states that the company shall be permitted to import into Canada free of duty all goods or machinery neces-

sary to build their plant. I would like to know what amount of goods or machinery the company have imported into this country under the Order in Council in question, also the amount of duty which Canada has lost by the importation of American goods instead of such goods being purchased in the Dominion?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Replying to the hon. member yesterday, I had the privilege of informing him, in regard to the forty-five ships under contract for the Dominion Government, that the prices were based, not on the contract made with the Dominion Iron & Steel Company, but on the agreement made with the United States at 3¼ cents per pound. I also stated yesterday that the Steel Corporation had not imported any of the required machinery at all. All they have done so far has been to partially erect the building; it contains no plant in the way of machinery, engines, and boilers.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): It is possible to take another view of the question which has been touched on by the minister and by the leader of the Opposition as to the wisdom of importing steel plates if the object is to build ships successfully and profitably. I remember hearing Mr. Lloyd George address a very enthusiastic audience in the Old Country and he was meeting the argument that had been advanced at that time, which was some years before the war, that free trade was hurting Britain because certain steel plates had been imported from Germany to Barrow-in-Furness. I am sure this Committee would listen to Mr. Lloyd George upon such a question with interest, and possibly with instruction. Mr. Lloyd George said that the person who complained of those steel plates coming to Barrow-in-Furness didn't know quite enough about his subject, and he pointed out that Sir Hugh Bell, one of the greatest iron-masters in the north of England, had taken the trouble to trace the history of the steel plates after they arrived from Germany at Barrow-in-Furness. It is quite true, said the great statesman, that those steel plates came to Barrow-in-Furness from Germany, but Sir Hugh Bell traced what happened to them, and it was extremely interesting, Mr. Chairman, as showing how the Old Country succeeded in shipbuilding. He said those steel plates came from Germany, and they enabled a firm of ship builders to take a contract for shipbuilding at Barrow-in-Furness against the world's competition. They converted Germany's steel plates, which they bought cheaply, into ships, and sold the steel plates in the form of ships back to Germany at a handsome profit. Well, that didn't seem a bad transaction—to employ the highly paid shipbuilding industry of Great Britain at Barrow-in-Furness upon the half finished articles of the less well-paid artisans of Germany, put them into ships and sell them, against the world's competition, back to the country that had sold to Britain the cheap steel plates. I merely mention this incident to show that it is possible to take a contrary view to that which has been expressed by my hon. friends on opposite sides of the House. It is possible to take that contrary view and to hold it very strongly if we look to the interests of Canada instead of to some provincial interests which may be helped by the spending of money locally.

Mr. BURNHAM: There is a disposition in this country to urge provincial interests, but I think national interests and wide economic interests should be more especially regarded. It will suit a particular case sometimes in order with considerable cunning to draw a general conclusion, but it is a practice that must be guarded against. We are not here for the purpose of being beguiled by any such form of reasoning. The fact of the matter is that if you lay down the proposition that has just been outlined, you must also lay down the proposition that cheap products and cheap labour shall have free access to this country. The result would be that you would ruin production and reduce the producer to the level of the foreigner. That is the true general conclusion to be drawn from such a statement. In the particular instance which has just been developed it may quite reasonably have occurred just as outlined; but, as I say, to draw a general conclusion from it is both dangerous and harmful.

We cannot do anything of the sort, if we wish to develop Canada. I might say in particular that if you put a Chinese wall seven hundred feet high around this country and balanced consumption and production, you might well raise this country to the highest possible degree of economic equilibrium, which any man who knows anything about the science of economy is aware is quite possible. But he would also know that if you reduce that wall, if you disturb the equilibrium and destroy the balance of your own resourceful country by admitting cheap labour and cheap labour's products, you must ultimately reduce the country and the people to the level of China and the Chinese coolie.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: How does my hon. friend propose to get his ships over his seven hundred foot wall?

Mr. BURNHAM: I might answer my hon. friend by saying that in the case I supposed we would not need to get them over the seven hundred foot wall. That is just where the error of such reasoning as my hon. friend's comes in. We would have the ships employed within our own country; they would get all the employment they required. We would have the farmer raising no more than was necessary for the sustenance of the people, and we would have the manufacturer making no more than was necessary for their requirements, and we would have the administration employing its arts for preserving the admirable balance of trade in this country. Then we would have such complete immunity from confusion that there would be plenty of time to study economic subjects and bring into this House better conclusions than we have just heard announced.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no doubt that there are two sides to every question. I have no doubt that in order to build up any country its resources should be developed first to the fullest possible extent, and if we can have further expansion to permit of export, so much the better. But my good friend from Red Deer has been telling me lately that he is devoting a great deal of his attention to the reading of the Holy Writ, and I am sure in that sphere of study he will find no writer more congenial to his close reasoning than the Apostle Paul. He talks to me about provincialism and sectionalism. But if he will read Paul he will find that the Apostle tells us that we are members one of another. Paul says, "Will the eye say to the nose, 'I am not of the body because I am not the nose'? Will the hand say to the foot, 'I am not of the body because I am not the foot'?" Paul reasons that out and concludes that we are members one of another, and of the one body. That magnificent philosopher of former days has many points in common with my good friend from Red Deer and yet sufficient divergency of view to be distinguished from him, and I am sure we will be safe in following Paul's reasoning. And when I advocate the manufacturing of plate at Sydney Harbour it is not because Sydney Harbour happens to be close to my home town in the Gem of Canada, the province of Nova Scotia. I had nothing to do with the placing of that contract, I was not consulted; the Government of this country—and among the many things of which I accuse them I do not include sectionalism—in their wisdom selected Sydney as the place where those plates should be manufactured. All I am asking is that they shall continue to implement their decision.

While I am not a very high protectionist, I am not in favour of the tremendous wall that my friend from Peterborough would like to build; but I cannot help knowing that protection of certain industries has done much for this country. I cannot help knowing that in connection with this very plate industry we are talking about and the institution of the steel works at Sydney those steel works have furnished a market for our Nova Scotia coal and employment for thousands of colliers who to-day would not be employed were it not for the assistance which the Government in the early stages gave to the development of our steel and iron industry.

Now, if there is to be a further development of that industry and of the coal industry by the manufacture of plate and the building of ships in this country, I think that it is a wise move. I do not think any one is preaching any political hearsay when he advocates the development of whatever resources we have within our own country and making ourselves as far as possible self sustaining and independent. I have no doubt the day is not far distant when we shall have a navy of our own, and I want this country to be able to build its own warships, from stem to stern, with what we can ourselves produce. That is the policy I wish to advocate. As I said, I am not a high protectionist, but I am prepared to deal with facts and circumstances and not with any theory which may suit somewhere but not elsewhere.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I despair of ever getting the last word with my hon. friend, but as we are in Committee perhaps I may be allowed to say that I do not think the fact he has produced to us is very strong evidence in support of his theory.

I do not know the exact number of the inhabitants of Sydney. I hope they are numerous, and I should like to see the population of that town grow, but I should like to see it grow by a reasonable interpretation of the Apostle Paul's language and not by an unreasonable interpretation of it. Of course, I do not believe in a body which does not look after both the hand and the foot. What I object to is

a body that would be so unreasonable as to endeavour to clothe its foot with the glove of the hand. That is what protection does, and it is not very successful in the operation. I come from a part of Canada where we have some larger towns than Sydney. Winnipeg, for instance, is quite a city compared with Sydney; it has grown in a shorter time, and it has grown on products raised by people who are men enough to raise them against the competition of the world and who want no protection. The same is true of Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, and the other numerous cities of the West which will go on to be larger cities than Sydney is to-day. Pap-feeding never made a man and it never made a province. It is with men as with nations—people who stand on their own feet are in the end always the strongest, and I should like my hon. friend to take a leaf out of this book of economic sense and not confine his studies absolutely to the scriptures; because, after all, the scriptures were not made to teach either political economy or astronomy. The hon. member knows they get very far wrong on astronomy.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Would the minister take into consideration, when he is building these ships, the wisdom of establishing a few of them on our Upper lakes in order that we may be able to control freight rates. In 1909, wheat was brought from Port Arthur to Montreal for 2½ cents a bushel, while last year, steamships on our Upper lakes charged eleven cents for carrying wheat between those two ports, and the rates are constantly increasing, despite the fact that since 1909 we have been spending millions of dollars on our waterways.

Would the minister also take into consideration the fact that the Canada Steamships Company, a company that is now capitalized at $30,000,000, went in a merger in 1912 whereby six or seven companies merged together, and they invested only some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 of actual capital, but they floated that company with $12,000,000 of watered stock, $12,000,000 of preferred stock and $6,000,000 of bonds. What has happened? That company have increased the rates and have practically a monopoly of traffic on our inland waters, and they are in this position to-day that not only are they paying seven per cent on their preferred stock and bonds, but this year they started to pay four per cent on their $12,000,000 of common stock. In addition to that, they have set aside $5,000,000 of a surplus. This merely goes to show the need of some effort to control the rates, tolls and tariff agreements in connection with our boats on our inland waters. Therefore, when the minister is taking into consideration the building of ships entirely, as I understand, for ocean traffic, which is badly in need of regulation as well, I hope he will consider the advisability of building ships to be placed on our inland waters in order that we may be able to control freight rates there.

Mr. McMASTER: I should not like the debate on this Estimate to proceed further without saying a few words as to the principle on which I think shipbuilding and shipping interests may be successful in this country. If there is one interest in the world which has to meet the competition of the world, it is the shipping interest, and the fact that Great Britain, prior to the war, was earning, through the services rendered by her ships something like £100,000,000 to £120,000,000 a year, was because a ship could be built more cheaply in Great Britain than anywhere else in the world, and that it could be maintained and operated as cheaply, except as regards the personnel, because in Norway and Sweden, Norwegian and Swedish sailors were paid less than British sailors. But the fact that Great Britain was able to find her ships in everything that ships required, such as food, coal, wire and hemp rope, and everything of that sort at the world's cheapest price, gave Great Britain and Ireland their predominance on the seas. I say this with all solemnity, that we in Canada cannot hope to establish a shipbuilding or a shipping business on an artificial basis, and there is no interest in the country that can be served by attempting to do it. Let us look at what has happened in the United States. If I may be pardoned a personal reference, my father, who was a sea-faring man, told me that when he was a young officer at the time of the American Civil war, the Stars and Stripes floated in every harbour in the world. Why was that? Because before the Civil war the United States had a low tariff and at that time were carrying 50 per cent of its own exports and imports in its own bottoms. After the Civil war came on, heavy duties were imposed upon imports into the United States for the purpose of raising revenue, and at first those were also counter-balanced by very heavy excise duty imposed upon goods manufactured within the country, the latter duty being also, of course, for the purpose of raising revenue. After the war

was over, the manufacturing interests of the United States—manufacturing interests there as elsewhere are usually wide-awake to their own interest—saw that the excise duties were taken off, but they left the import duties on. What was the effect on merchant shipping in the United States? In a comparatively few years after the Civil war, the United States did not carry 10 per cent of its own exports and imports in its own bottoms. Let me give another practical illustration. We, who believe in the principle of freedom of commerce, are always being attacked as having splendid ideas but as not being practical folk. In the few years before the war our enemy, Germany, had succeeded in building up a very substantial mercantile marine. How did she do it? By building her ships under free trade conditions. The German Government arranged their fiscal policy in such a fashion that everything that went into a ship built in Germany, although Germany was a highly protected country, went in free, and on no other basis could Germany have challenged Great Britain as the mistress of the seas.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Did not Germany, in addition to that, subsidize shipbuilding in order that ships might be built more cheaply than in England?

Mr. McMASTER: Possibly. I am not prepared to say "yes" or "no" to that question, but no subsidy that Germany could have given could have offset the handicap German shipbuilders would have been under, had they had to build ships under protectionist conditions.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Does the hon. member not admit that a subsidy is the highest and worst form of protection?

Mr. McMASTER: No, a subsidy is not the worst form of protection. Subsidies are honest and tell the people what they are paying in order to assist some special interest in the country. One of my great objections to granting special privileges to some classes of the community at the expense of the whole is that the people do not know in that case what they are paying, while under the bonus or subsidy system they have some idea what is being paid out. I would respectfully submit to the minister that nothing less than disaster will meet any plan of shipbuilding, ship-owning or ship-operating if it is not upon a basis to meet competition from all over the world. I know the minister will listen to what I say with courteous attention, and I only trust that he will follow my suggestions.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Answering, first, the hon. member (Mr. G. E. Armstrong), who asked if it was the policy of the Government to have ships on the Great Lakes, I am happy to say that that is a part of our policy. We intend to have ships, not only on the Pacific and the Atlantic, but on all the principal trade routes, and certainly on the Great Lakes, so that our transportation chain will be complete.

In answer to the hon. member for Brome, I would have been disappointed if he had made any different speech from that which he did make. We both come from the same city, we are both very good friends, each of us respects the views of the other, but on this question we are certainly very far apart. He would have Canadians simply hewers of wood and drawers of water. Canadians have demonstrated that with the very moderate protection we have had in this country for a number of years they can hold their own with the people of any other country in the world. I am sorry the hon. member was not in his seat yesterday, when I explained to the Committee that Canadian yards have turned out ships equal in design and efficiency, and in every other respect to ships built in any part of the world. A few years ago some people in this country thought that ships could not be built in Canada, but it has been amply demonstrated during the last two years that ships can be built here successfully. If my hon. friend had been here yesterday he would have learned that, according to the opinion of Sir George Hunter, of the famous shipbuilding firm of Swan & Hunter, ships built in England, Ireland and Scotland at the present time are costing three times as much as ships built in pre-war times. No one believes for a moment that wages in the United Kingdom will ever reach again the low level prevailing before the war. Both skilled and unskilled labourers in the Old country are asking for a higher rate of wages, and I think they are perfectly justified in doing so. In view of the marvellous development that has taken place in Canada during the last few years, and the skill which Canadians have exhibited in turning out ships equal to similar ships turned out in the yards of the United Kingdom, I take issue with my hon. friend when he says that Canada will not be able to compete with the United Kingdom and other shipbuilding nations. As I stated yesterday, between now and the next session we are going to consider if it will be necessary to render any aid to our shipbuilders when the days of keen competition arrive, and

there will be plenty of time to deal with this matter at the next session of Parliament.

My hon. friend has referred to the United States and apparently he has not kept abreast of the times. The United States has constructed 555 steel ships of various kinds and tonnage. Chairman Hurley, of the United States Shipping Board, states that they are going to build 1,136 more ships, and that when their entire mercantile marine programme has been completed they will have the enormous tonnage of 16,000,000 tons. The United States Government are going to aid that vast mercantile fleet. With a fleet like that next door to us, my hon. friend's advice to the Government is that we should sit down with folded arms and go out of the shipbuilding business. That is not the policy of this Government.

Mr. McMASTER: I never said that the Government should go out of or continue in the business. I laid down as a principle that you could not have a successful shipbuilding or ship operating business except on a basis that would meet competition from all the world.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I accept my hon. friend's correction. I think I am correct in inferring from his remarks that he did not think Canada would be able to compete with other countries. I take issue with him there. When the time comes I think Canada, probably with some small assistance from the Government, will be able to compete with all other countries.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: At the risk of wearying the Committee, I should like to supplement the very interesting reference of my hon. friend from Brome to the case of the United States by a single figure. In the year 1861 the shipping tonnage of the United States was two-and-a-half millions, and the tonnage of Great Britain and Ireland four-and-a-quarter millions. At that time, as my hon. friend has very correctly said, Americans were very generally crossing the seas in American bottoms, and American shipping bade fair to become the greatest in the world. In 1910, after fifty years of free trade in Great Britain and fifty years of protection in the United States, the two-and-a-half million tons of the United States had sunk to one-and-a-half million tons, and the four-and-a-quarter million tons of Great Britain had risen to nearly twelve million tons. I think those figures are a perfect demonstration of the truth of the argument of my hon. friend from Brome.

The minister is still extremely enthusiastic about this shipbuilding programme, and I should like to add just one word more from practical experience to induce him to be cautious about going too far in this business. What happens to shipping in war time is no guide whatsoever as to the safety of a shipping policy in times of peace. I was indirectly interested in shipping in Great Britain during the Boer war, and ships about which I had complete knowledge, from my indirect interest, were paying dividends of twenty per cent. Within a very few years of that war, and during some period of it, the ships that were before paying twenty per cent were paying only a nominal dividend, of one to one-and-a-half per cent. I think those facts —and they are facts—about the United States on the one hand, and drawn, on the other, from my own personal experience of British shipping in and after the Boer war ought to make the minister cautious.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have no desire to enter into a discussion of the respective merits of protection and free trade, but I can scarcely forbear to say a word or two on behalf of the policy that the Minister of Marine has introduced. I am very strongly in favour of supporting all the industries of Canada, and as we used to be a great maritime nation I see no reason why we should not in the near future resume the high position we held forty or fifty years ago as compared with the other nations of the world. Some three or four years ago I waited on the then Minister of Naval Service and begged him to embark on a policy such as my hon. friend brought forward yesterday and has before us to-day. At that time my appeal fell on deaf ears. Had the policy been inaugurated three or four years ago, and had we ships afloat during the last two years of the war, if those ships had made two or three successful trips across the Atlantic they would have paid for all that they would have cost at that time. In my judgment, we did not embark on that policy early enough, but because the policy is a little tardy in coming that is no reason why we should not now endorse it.

One compensation has come to me this afternoon in the splendid tribute paid to this policy by the leader of the Opposition. I feel sure that the Maritime Provinces cannot go back on the shipbuilding industry. No one who has been in the House during the last three or four years and heard

the appeals of the present Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick (the Hon. William Pugsley), will fail to remember that day in and day out for weeks at a time he reiterated the desirability of embarking on just such a policy as the Minister of Marine has now introduced. Canada is largely a maritime nation. The Great Lakes are the greatest body of fresh water in the world, and the tonnage that passes through the Sault Canal is probably the heaviest that passes through any canal in the world. Is not that a strong reason why we should have ships of our own on the Upper lakes to take care of the wheat traffic from the West, and to furnish the necessary competition to railways? Our western farmers cannot get wheat to market unless they have cheap shipping on the lakes. It is an absolute necessity of the situation that we should have competition between boats and railways to get the best effect on freight, and that leads to a profit to the farmer of the West of several cents a bushel more than he would receive if his wheat had to depend upon our railways to bring it out. That is the point I desire our western friends to consider in looking at this naval programme. I am rather sorry for the hon. member for Brome, because he is an exceedingly decent fellow. He has told us that his father was a seafaring man. Well, I cannot accuse my hon. friend of any seafaring propensities, but I may tell him that in his tariff and trade ideas he has been at sea ever since he entered public life. I think he will appreciate that remark, because if the policy he proposes were followed, not only would we have no shipbuilding, but we would have no other industries to speak of in this country. As I said, I do not want to be drawn into an argument with regard to free trade and protection, but I want to tell my friend that it behooves him to prepare for the Budget debate which will come on in the near future, and in the meantime I will give him a problem as suggested by Abraham Lincoln, who was one of the fathers of protection in his day and generation, now fifty years ago. I would like my hon. friend to make a note of this problem and bring in a solution when he comes to discuss the question on the Budget. Abraham Lincoln made this statement: "If you want a ton of pig iron and you buy it from a foreign nation, you have got your ton of iron but you have parted with your money. But if"—

4 p.m.

Mr. McMASTER: Of course—

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Hold on; let me state the whole problem. "But if you dig that iron from the ground and produce it in your own country you have your ton of pig iron and you have your money." If my hon. friend can overthrow that doctrine I hope he will bring us the solution when the Budget debate comes up. In the meantime, I say both hands up for this shipbuilding policy. It means work and high wages for the labouring men of Canada, and I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) that he has done very well to-day in informing us he is not opposed to all manner of encouragement to industry. The light will burn better in the window for his having made that statement, I am sure. I may say, and this I know to be true, that I have lying on my desk in my office in this Parliament building petitions from 3,800 working men of the city of Brantford in favour of a protective policy and no serious changes in tariff, and what I have is only a sample of what is coming to others. The workingmen know that their bread and butter is bound up in sustaining the industries of Canada, and this is really a basic industry which the minister proposes. While it is true that prices on shipping are high at the present time, and while perhaps we cannot compete with Great Britain, I know the minister is very near the mark when he says that Britain is not going to build more ships in the near future at such prices as have obtained in the past. This is a good time for us to get in. The war has sunk about twelve to fifteen million tons of shipping and the question naturally is, who will make that up? The nations of the world will replace that shipping, and why should not Canada take its part in this work? Now is the time to embark on a shipbuilding policy so that Canada may step into the breach, and with her ability as she has shown in the war, I feel absolutely certain that Canada can put ships on the water that will make as good speed and carry cargoes just as cheaply and safely as any other nation in the world. She may not be able to do it quite as cheaply at the outset as she will later on, but once establish the yards, get skilled men into them and get the engine producing factories and all the other necessary appliances, and a nation like Canada that has produced more than half the shrapnel fired by the British armies in the war need have no fear that the same energy, intelligence and good policy that have been pursued in the past will lead to a triumph in shipbuilding, and that we will have a fleet on

the waters both inland and on the oceans to carry our traffic to all the nations.

Mr. MANION: I do not intend to enter into a controversy as to the advisability of either protection or free trade, but there is one point favourable to shipbuilding in Canada to-day which I think has not been brought out properly and which it is worth while to bring to the attention of hon. members. I refer to the matter of selling the wheat crop of Canada next year. The hon. member who has just taken his seat, mentioned traffic on the lakes. I wish to take up a different point and one that is important at the present time to the wheat growers of the West. The United States has fixed the price of wheat for this year in that country. For that reason they are going to have probably the biggest wheat crop in the history of the United States and the United States will also probably lose a great deal of money by paying these prices to the farmers. For the same reason she will make her greatest effort to unload that wheat upon the grain markets of the world which are European markets, particularly British. She will endeavour to sell that wheat in the European markets. in the past few years export Canadian wheat has been shipped to Europe and 65 per cent of it, or two-thirds of the wheat we have exported has been exported through American ports. Suppose the United States this year came to the conclusion that they had plenty of wheat to supply the markets in Europe. They are expecting to have four to five hundred million bushels for export. Suppose they say that having plenty of wheat to ship and having fixed the price of wheat they are going to oppose any Canadian wheat going through the American ports; in other words they would block the export of 65 per cent probably of our wheat unless we are able to supply shipping to export it. In view of that situation, it seems to me that this point is one of the most important that should be taken into consideration in a shipbuilding programme. There is no doubt that these ships will cost a great deal, perhaps much more than they would cost in the British shipbuilding plants, but I believe we should take into account, in considering this matter, the possibility of exporting the wheat of Canada. I may be asked the question, will these ships be built in time to handle this year's crop? One year's crop is usually shipped the following year, or a very great deal of it. I desired to bring this matter to the attention of the Committee because I did not hear it mentioned before. I believe the Minister of Marine referred to it but he did not elaborate it sufficiently to explain the point I wish to make.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Cargo vessels of the United States are privately owned, with the exception of a few that have been built by the Government within the last year or two. All these ships that have been built by the Government are now to fall into private hands. It has never been the policy of the United States except for war vessels to have a fleet of cargo vessels belonging to the United States Government in so far as I can learn and, if it is true that the ships in the United States are to be placed in the hands of private owners, my hon. friend if he will give half a cent a bushel more than market rate for carrying the wheat of Canada to the markets of the world will get the whole fleet of the United States to carry it. They will take the wheat without caring whether it was grown on the prairies of Western Canada or of the United States. They are looking for freight for their ships and they will go wherever the freight is best. The fact that the Canadian Government own their ships will not help the western farmers because the western farmer will have to pay the market price for carrying his wheat and there are always ships to carry wheat in normal times. In fact, there were so many of them that before the war they were carrying wheat for nothing. Wheat was going over as ballast because the rates were so low. That happened then; will happen again. Rates go up and down like anything else. The time will come when there will be enough cargo vessels to do the world's business and they will cut prices. That is only one of the laws of economics.

I do not think that the fact that the Government owns the ships will help very much. It is not helping at the present time. Attention has been called to the fact that the few vessels that we now have, owned by the Government, are not developing Canadian trade. They are developing the trade of the United States. A cargo vessel has to take business where it can get it. An illustration was given of the case of the Voyageur. The Voyageur took a cargo from Halifax to the West India islands. When she reached the West India islands I suppose she found that there was no cargo suitable to bring back to Halifax. But she got a cargo of sugar for New York.

She loaded the sugar and took it to New York. I am not complaining about that but I am pointing out to my hon. friend and the minister the absurdity of expecting to run these cargo vessels in the way that it is proposed that they shall be run as Government vessels and expecting that the western farmer will reap a benefit from their operation.

Mr. MANION: There are two points against the argument which the hon. gentleman has advanced. In the first place, as the hon. gentleman states, while vessels may be privately owned in the United States, the United States will control these vessels and make them sail as they like. That is the first point. In the second place, the hon. gentleman says that half a cent a bushel difference on wheat will bring the ships where we wish to bring them. I do not think that is correct. Ships go to United States ports for the reason that they have western bound cargoes. There is much more traffic from Europe to the United States than to Canada and that has been the great reason in the past why Canadian wheat has been shipped by United States ports. The fact that they could get cargoes at half a cent a bushel more would not draw these ships to Canadian ports for the reason that they would have to come light. Therefore, the ships owned by the Government would be used under the circumstances.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): If my hon. friend's ship is in Boston or New York it would not be very far to move her back to a Canadian port. There is no necessity, because she sailed from a Canadian port, of her coming back to a Canadian port. That is not the way shipping is carried on. I was going to refer to the contract with the Dominion Steel Company. I have not any particular or definite views on that contract because I have not studied it. But I have seen it stated that it is somewhat improvident. I do not say that a contract of that kind could not be justified on the ground that we are starting a new industry. I think that, as a free trader, I might take that ground. We had a very good illustration in the steel business. Some time ago we had no steel business in Canada. The Government was very anxious that something should be done to establish the steel business in Canada and the solution was a bounty. A bounty was paid to the steel industries for a number of years, decreasing year after year. That bounty was granted in order to establish the steel industry at Sydney, Hamilton and various other places. It cost us about $20,000,000. That was regarded, at that date, as a very large sum of money. It is only regarded as a bagatelle to-day. But I suppose there are very few men in Canada to-day who would want to go back to the old condition of no steel industry in Canada and get back the $20,000,000. They thought it was a good, progressive move and it has paid the country. On the same ground I would suggest that we might establish a plate-mill in Sydney by giving a certain amount of help. I agree with my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) that a bounty of that kind, when we know what we are paying, is far less objectionable than a protective duty. We understand that we are going to put up so much money and that is why I asked the minister to tell us just what we were expected to pay. I suppose that he is able to make a calculation that if we carry out this contract that has been made with the Dominion Steel Company, it would cost us a certain amount of money and it would be satisfactory to know how much it is going to cost us.

But the main point in regard to the shipbuilding industry is that we must make it attractive to private capital. Although the Dominion Government is going into shipbuilding and ship owning, if Canada is going to find a place on the sea it must be as a result of the investment of private capital. The Government can usurp certain things. The Government if it chooses to pay the price can own a certain number of ships, but the Government cannot build up a great shipbuilding industry unless the people will invest their money in it and become interested in it. It is only a makeshift for the Government to go in for the owning of cargo vessels. I am not a prophet but I would not be afraid to prophesy that the Government will not stay very long in the business. I would not be surprised if in ten years the Dominion Government were out of the business although the people of the Dominion of Canada will not be out of it. The people of Canada will go into the business and stay in it. Has the Government any plan to remedy the handicap that every one admits exists? Man after man has spoken in this debate and every one has stated the same thing; that we cannot build vessels in Canada to compete with vessels built in Great Britain. For this condition of affairs has the Government a solution? I would like to know what

the minister intends to do to remove that handicap and to enable private enterprise in Canada to go into this business, make it a success, and compete with the rest of the world.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Of course the Government believes that shipbuilding will be a permanent industry in this country. I may say that if the House passes the Supplementary Estimates that I shall bring down in the very near future to have a limited number of ships constructed in addition to the forty-five we have under contract, for the reasons that I gave to the Committee yesterday, the cost of these ships will be very materially less than the cost of the forty-five that are under contract at the present time. I have not had any firm offers because I have not yet received the authority of this House to order any more ships, and I will not have such authority until the Supplementary Estimate is approved. But, I firmly believe that I can buy an 8,000 ton ship for $160 a ton, and probably less.

I explained to the House yesterday that for a year and a half to come no ships could be purchased from any of the yards in the United Kingdom. In answer to the hon. member's question as to a comparison today between the price for a ship built in Canada and a similar ship built in England, the authority being cited of Sir George Hunter that there is only a difference of ten dollars a ton, it may be when I start negotiations with the Canadian yards we may be able to build ships in this country at as low a rate as they are able to in any of the yards of the United Kingdom. However, I do not want to be too optimistic, and I can assure my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that all business men are trained to be most cautious, especially when they have the responsibility of office, such as I have. In respect to whatever further outlays are required on shipbuilding, the money will be expended on a thoroughly conservative and business-like basis.

Mr. MYERS: I think there is one fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) has not taken into consideration in connection with shipments of wheat. It is that the United States have fixed a price for their crop of wheat this year of $2.26 per bushel. There is a great deal of apprehension and concern in Canada to-day, especially in the western part of the Dominion, in regard to the position we shall be in this year with respect to shipping our grain. In regard to those shipments in the past, as the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) stated, fifty or sixty per cent of our grain has gone through United States ports. There is no doubt in my mind of the necessity of some action on the part of this Government in regard to the fixation of the price of wheat, or in some manner controlling the situation, because I fear our wheat will not be allowed to go through United States ports this year. There will be an embargo placed on it, and the probability of that is greatly strengthened when we take into consideration that the United States will this year have the largest possible crop, according to the estimates made. The last one which I remember reading spoke of there being possibly a surplus of four hundred and fifty million bushels of wheat in the United States this year. When we consider that likelihood there will not be much opportunity for Canada to utilize United States ports for its wheat shipments. Therefore, when the minister states that he is going to take action with respect to a shipbuilding programme which will provide steamships for the Great Lakes and also facilitate the transportation of our wheat this year, I think that action should receive the earnest and hearty support of every member of the House.

Mr. JAMES R. WILSON: While on the subject of wheat transportation, I may say that I read a couple of days ago in a trade paper, a statement by Mr. A. E. Hunter, a member of the Wheat and Flour Millers' Control Commission of the United Kingdom. That gentleman told the National Association of British and Irish Millers that they were now up against a shortage of wheat imports, caused mainly through the diversion to India of a large amount of wheat from Australia, which was intended for the United Kingdom. India has usually exported wheat, but it is now a wheat importing country. As the previous speaker has mentioned, there is great apprehension among the farmers in Western Canada as to the possible profitable marketing of this year's wheat crop. The whole fabric of transportation, international finance, and exchange of commerce throughout the country, particularly with Overseas countries, has broken down as a result of the war, and the carrying on of commerce and transportation therefore becomes a Government undertaking. It is beyond the power of private individuals to cope with the situation as efficiently as can be done through Government agencies, and I think the policy which has been inaugurated by the Minister of Marine to develop our shipping

is a splendid one. We are a little late in undertaking it, but it is most necessary and it will be a source of great wealth to Canada to control its own shipping, particularly so now that we have gone into the business of operating railways. These railways can be used to supply the ships, and the ships can be used to a certain extent to furnish the railways with return cargoes, so that I think it is vitally in the interest of Canada to extend our shipbuilding facilities as much as possible. Most business men have been looking forward to the development of a large trade with Overseas countries, but it will not be possible to secure that development without ships. Therefore, I have much pleasure in supporting the programme which has been outlined by the minister.

Mr. DUFF: I asked the minister a question in reference to the American contract, but he had so many other questions to answer that he forgot to reply to me on that point. A few moments ago I asked him if we had to take delivery of the balance of the seventy-four thousand tons of steel plates which had been undelivered. While on my feet I desire to make one or two other observations. I would ask the minister first if we have to take delivery of the seventy-four thousand tons of steel plates at 3¼ cents per pound, or if we have to construct our ships of plates costing $4.15 per hundred pounds. In view of the fact that the price of plates in the United States has dropped from 3¼ to about 2½ cents per pound, the construction of ships in Canada is going to cost a great deal more money than the construction of ships in the United States. I do not see how we are going to do it and compete, when the construction of ships in Canada will cost $200 a ton as compared with $110 or $115 in the United States. We will have to pay the overhead charges on a $200 investment, whereas the United States will only have to pay those charges on a much smaller investment, consequently we will be unable to compete successfully with our neighbours to the South. The minister says he has information from the old country that at the present time the construction of ships there is costing three times as much as it did in normal times. I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a despatch from New York which appears in the Montreal Star of Wednesday, May 7th, and which is as follows:

New York, May 3.—"The average per ton cost to build ships in England now is about £23, or $115," said Lt.-Col. Claude Bryan, who is a director of the Palmer Shipbuilding Co., at Jarrow-on-Tyne, on his arrival here this week.

Then this gentleman goes on to say:

"All the shipyards of England are booked up for at least two years. Contracts are made 'time and line' or cost plus a profit of from 7½ per cent to 10 per cent to the builder. Labour conditions are unsettled and prices of materials unsteady. In this state of affairs there can be no fixed charge per ton, but the present cost will not exceed £23."

I am quite willing, Mr. Chairman, to do anything in the world to help shipbuilding in this country, but I cannot see if you are going to pay $200 a ton to build ships in this country from now on for the next few years—and to use up two hundred and fifty thousand tons of steel plates will take four or five years before the ships that those plates are going into are built—how you are going to compete with ships built in England or in the United States at about $115. We should face the issue squarely. This shipbuilding programme is said to be necessary in order to help the labouring people of this country over the hard times which it is thought are coming. I have more faith in this country than to think we are going to have hard times.

If necessary I would approve giving shipbuilding plants in this country a certain amount of encouragement, but not protect them in this way. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said we had to have protection. We are building ships in the Maritime Provinces and paying duty on the materials we import from England, anchors, chains, and everything else, and we are building those ships with private capital. We do not need protection from this or any other Government. I think there should be sufficient private capital in this country to invest in the shipbuilding industry without our having to take the people's money for the purpose. The Minister of Naval Affairs is asking for $30,000,000 in addition to the $20,000,000 which was voted last year; but while I am not going to object to this $30,000,000, I say that this thing should not go too far, and when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down I as one of the members of this House am going to protest that it is not fair to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I overlooked the hon. gentleman's inquiry in reference to the 80,000 tons of steel contracted for in the United States. I am happy to inform him that we do not need to take the balance of the contract unless we desire to. So that disposes of that part

of the hon. member's argument. I thought I made it abundantly clear in Committee yseterday that this country has nothing to fear in shipbuilding competition from our neighbours to the south. I made a very conservative statement yesterday when I said that the ships built by the Emergency Fleet Corporation cost at least $25 a ton more than the 45 ships which the Canadian Government have under construction at the present time. The hon. member talks about building ships at $200 per ton. In the plainest language possible I stated yesterday that our contracts ranged from $180 to $215 a ton. So far as we have gone with our shipbuilding programme, our prices compare favourably with those paid by the United States Government, which has built a vastly greater number of ships than we have contracted for. I have stated over and over again that when it comes to competition with the United Kingdom you cannot get a fixed price there, that everything is on a plus cost basis, as the hon. member has just mentioned. The information I obtained from England is that $150 a ton would be the cost, provided you could get your ships built there now; but it is quite impossible to get any built for a year and a half, and I have given as my authority the well-known shipbuilder, Sir George Hunter, of Swan and Hunter. Why the hon. gentleman wants to make it appear that the cost of a Canadian-built ship is so much more than that of a ship built in the United States, and is basing on that supposition his argument that we can get ships built in the United Kingdom at the present time, is more than I am able to follow.

Mr. DUFF: What about the gentleman I mentioned who said that contracts were made on the Tyne for ships at $115 a ton? That is not $200 a ton.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know anything about the gentleman you refer to.

Mr. DUFF: Neither do I.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I took the precaution of communicating with several of the leading shipbuilding firms in England before I came to this House to ask for approval of the $30,000,000 vote, and I submit that the information I gave to the Committee yesterday and to-day is certainly based on facts. I suppose the hon. member noticed in the press some weeks ago that the famous firm of Yarrow and Co., said that they were going to establish a shipyard in British Columbia, and they gave as their reason for leaving the Old Land, so famed for shipbuilding, that the cost of labour, material and everything else had gone up so high that they could build ships in British Columbia at a price to compete with the rest of the world.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In view of that statement from such eminent authority, I do not see why we should feel so very uneasy about Canadians being able to build ships in competition with the world when the competition gets keener than it is now.

Progress reported.

BANKRUPTCY ACT.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 18 respecting Bankruptcy.—Mr. Guthrie.

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee last considered this Bill we had reached section 43. Shall section 43 carry?

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) who left this afternoon, desired me to ask the Solicitor General to defer consideration of this Bill. He told me that a meeting of business men had appointed Mr. Lafleur and Mr. Geoffrion of Montreal to examine the Bill and consult with the Solicitor General about certain points. I told my hon. friend that I would submit his request to the Solicitor General when the Bill came up. He says there are important provisions which they want to discuss, not with the object of blocking the Bill, but in order to make it as faultless as possible.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I saw the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres at three o'clock to-day and discussed the matter with him. He asked that certain clauses be allowed to stand, to which I agreed, and I assume that before they are considered the representatives of the Quebec Bar will have an opportunity of discussing them. So I do not quite understand this request.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, I apologize. I did not know that the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) had seen the Solicitor General.

Section agreed to.

On section 45—proof of debts.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this the same as the English section?

Mr. GUTHRIE: With one or two modifications, yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the Solicitor General state briefly the method of proving the debt?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The ordinary method, which has been adopted in the various provinces of Canada, is that of proof by statutory declaration, and that is maintained in this Bill. A debt must be proved by the claimant sending to the trustee through the post, by registered letter, a statutory declaration verifying the debt made before an authorized person. The declaration shall contain a statement of the account, shall specify the vouchers, if any, held by the creditor, and shall state whether the creditor is or is not a secured creditor. That is the prima facie proof that is required.

Mr. McKENZIE: In the provincial Acts there is a provision by which a person disputing a claim can have it proven in court

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is in this Bill in a subsequent section.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is a very expensive procedure. A very simply provision, if there is not already one in the Bill, would be that a person filing a claim could, if it was so desired, be brought before the trustee or the judge who has charge of the estate for cross-examination on his account. I do not know that we have any provision of that kind. What I mean is something like the right that now exists of calling upon a man who files an affidavit in court. One can go to a judge and ask for leave to bring the man before the court for cross-examination. If the provision is simply that the claimant must file an account with a declaration on it, in many cases the declaration is a slipshod thing; very often the claimant does not make a declaration at all, but gets somebody to sign the paper as if it were sworn to, although it is not sworn to at all. Before the Bill is finally passed, the minister might consider some simple machinery of the kind I have mentioned by which a party could be brought before the trustee, the inspector or preferably the court, and cross-examined on his account. If parties knew that such a system was available, that would have the effect of making people careful as to the kind of account they would file.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Where it is thought by the creditors or the trustee that an account should be disputed, reduced or rejected altogether, proceedings are taken under section 53, but it is not contemplated that a creditor will have to bring an action.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

When a claim is disallowed the section provides that:

> Such disallowance shall be final and conclusive unless within thirty days after the service or mailing of the said notice or such further time as the court may on application made within thirty days allow, the claimant appeals to the court in accordance with General Rules from the trustee's decision.

It is proposed in these general rules to arrange procedure for a summary application to the court in order that a claim may be speedily and inexpensively dealt with. Just how that rule will be framed, I am not at present able to state as those rules will require a good deal of consideration. There may be something in the suggestion of my hon. friend that power should be given to the trustee or the creditors to cross-examine the claimant upon his declaration proving his claim. The result of such cross-examination might be that the claim might be rejected or accepted, and further proceedings might be avoided. I shall be glad to consider the question of an amendment for that purpose.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not think it would be wise to have any provision to the effect that a trustee or an inspector should cross-examine a claimant. That matter should be in the hands of the registrar of the court.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The claim does not go to the registrar of the court. The creditor proves his claim to the trustee; the trustee submits it to the creditors, and if they are not satisfied that the claim is a bona fide one, it might be wise to allow them to cross-examine him on the claim at a meeting of creditors.

Mr. JACOBS: The creditors have no right to examine a claimant on their own account. That should be the duty of the court. At the present time a claim of that kind is contested, and the trustee becomes the petitioning party to ask that it be disallowed and it is thereupon tested before the court. But to give the creditors the right to cross-examine is not the best method of procedure, nor is it according to the rule which we now have in the court.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend does not quite understand the practice that is laid down in this Bill. If a trustee rejects a claim he serves notice upon the claimant.

Mr. JACOBS: What right has the trustee to reject it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: He may have information that it is not a bona fide claim.

Mr. JACOBS: Then he should send it to the court.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The other process is the one adopted in England and in the provinces. Notice is served upon the claimant that the creditors are not satisfied with the claim and the creditor must establish his claim within thirty days after notice is served.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the affidavit not prima facie proof that a claim is correct?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is all it is, prima facie proof. That is the English law, and it has been the Ontario law for thirty years.

Mr. JACOBS: It is not the Quebec law. The opposite is the rule. In Quebec the trustee, or curator as he is called, is obliged to contest the claim and the matter is then brought before the court.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He contests it under this section, but merely by serving notice. Then the creditor must proceed.

Section agreed to.

On section 46—proof by secured creditors.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A representative of the Bankers' Association has made a suggestion that another subsection should be added to this section, to make it clear that a creditor by valuing a security does nothing to release his surety. I do not think under this section there would be any release of a surety, but I see no objection to making the matter clear. The amendment suggested is as subsection 12 in the following words:—

Anything done by a secured creditor in compliance with the provisions of this section shall in no way affect, prejudice or vary any right or remedy such creditor may have against any other person or under any security.

Mr. McMASTER: Is not that the ordinary law? Is it not a mistake to put in a clause like this, because it might give ground for the argument that in some other place where the clause is not inserted, the opposite was the effect? I think it is very dangerous to lay down a well known legal principle which follows as a matter of course in a clause of this kind.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I said I would mention the proposed amendment to the Committee. I quite agree that it is an unnecessary provision.

Amendment negatived.

Section agreed to.

On section 48—postponement of husband's claim:

Mr. JACOBS: This clause is somewhat contentious. Has the minister received a request that it stand for further consideration?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. JACOBS: May I request that it be allowed to stand?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is not retroactive in effect, applying only to future transactions. That is the only difference between this and the corresponding section in the English Act.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that the council of the bar of the province of Quebec desire to discuss this section further with the Solicitor General, as it infringes on the civil law of the province.

Section stands.

On section 50—debts payable at a future time:

Mr. McMASTER: Why do we say six per cent? Is not the legal rate five per cent?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We made it six because that is the provincial rate on debts and judgments.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it would be well for the sake of uniformity to have five per cent in all Dominion legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: Why not say the legal rate?

Mr. McMASTER: The Chairman has made a valuable suggestion. If we say the legal rate, then when the legal rate changes, this will change too.

Mr. McKENZIE: But in some of the provinces six per cent is the legal rate, and although this is in a general way Dominion legislation, in its operation it will be provincial. The legal rate in Nova Scotia on debts and judgments is six per cent. I think if we said five per cent, that would be more definite than saying the legal rate.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think it amounts to much one way or the other.

Section agreed to.

On section 51—priority of claims:

Mr. JACOBS: I would suggest that this and the following section stand for further consideration for the reason I gave with respect to section 48.

Section stands.

On section 55—arrest of debtors under certain circumstances:

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Paragraph (a) says that if there is reason for believing that the debtor has absconded or is about to abscond " with a view of avoiding payment of the debt in respect of which the bankruptcy petition was filed." Why limit it to the particular debt in respect of which the bankruptcy petition is filed? A bankruptcy petition may be filed for $200, and the debtor might abscond in order to evade another debt of $5,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: The provincial law allows you to arrest a debtor if he is about to abscond. You would have to fall back on that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The $200 debt would be the only one that was proved. I do not see why it should be limited to the particular debt in respect of which the bankruptcy proceedings are taken. If he owes several debts it is more likely that he will abscond to avoid payment of the largest. I think we should make it read: "With a view of avoiding payment of the debt in respect of which the bankruptcy petition was filed, or any other proved debt."

Mr. GUTHRIE: The creditor of the larger amount might not want the man to be arrested, he might desire to be lenient. There is nothing to deprive any other creditor from taking proceedings in respect of his debt but we have made this provision to give some particular individual a positive right to do so.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: He would not have the right to arrest him unless he absconded for the purpose of evading that particular debt.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not under this Act.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: That might be only one debt out of probably fifteen.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You have your own laws in each province. Under this Act only one creditor is entitled to do it.

Mr. JACOBS: There is nothing in the section to indicate that the trustee would have the right to cause the warrant to issue. Section 55 says:

> The court may, by warrant addressed to any constable or prescribed officer of the court, cause a debtor to be arrested.

It does not say whether the trustee would have that right.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The English Act does not limit it and I do not see why we should be too precise in the matter. The court will act on the application of some party interested. An ordinary stranger could not go to the court; it would have to be either a creditor or a trustee. They are the only two parties I know.

Mr. JACOBS: There ought to be some clearer expression as to the meaning of the word " absconding." Under our system at present in the law of capias it has to be declared in the affidavit that the debtor is about to leave the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. If it cannot be shown that he is about to leave Quebec and Ontario he could not be capiased. Suppose a man were leaving Quebec to go to Ontario, or Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, would he be considered to be absconding? Or does it mean leaving the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The word "absconding" has a very wide application. Hiding is absconding; so also is keeping house, under the English Act. The word in our Act is "absconding," going from his usual place of residence to some place of retirement unknown to his creditors. "Keeping house" is a term taken from the English Act in section 3, subsection (f): "If he departs from his dwelling house or otherwise absents himself, or begins to keep house." It means leaving his ordinary place of business and secreting or hiding himself.

Mr. JACOBS: Suppose a resident of Montreal did not leave Montreal at all but simply kept in hiding, would he be absconding when he really did not leave his domicile?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If he is in hiding, I think so.

Mr. McMASTER: To make it perfectly clear something should be added to this clause. In the jurisdiction in which I practise, absconding means clearing out of the country. As our law of capias comes from the time of the united provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, it means getting out of Quebec and Ontario. It would be wise and would avoid any possibility of useless litigation if the clause were made somewhat clearer in regard to the meaning of "absconding."

Mr. GUTHRIE: Would you say, absents himself from Canada, or from any particular province?

Mr. McMASTER: As this is a federal Act I should think "absconding" would mean leaving the Dominion.

Mr. JACOBS: If we say, absconding from the province in which he carries on his business that would be satisfactory.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Departs out of the province, or being out of the province remains out of it?

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, out of the province in which he had his domicile or carried on his business.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: That would not do, because it is not wrong for a man to depart from the province.

Mr. JACOBS: That is qualified by the words immediately following: "with a view of avoiding payment," etc.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Suppose a man owes $10,000 in debts and is insolvent and a creditor for $300 presents his petition, and the man skips out, not with a view to avoiding payment of the $300, but to get clear of the $9,700, and the only man that can prosecute him is the $300 creditor. That creditor might come to an arrangement with the debtor and say, "If you do not pay me I will prosecute you, and I am the only man that can
5 p.m. prosecute you." It seems to me that the provision is either good or bad, and it should be as good for one as for the other. I would suggest that there be added the words "or any proved debt."

Mr. JACOBS: Is that clause similar to the clause in the English Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, our section is drawn from the section in the English Act. The English law has been in force so long that every section has been judicially interpreted and if we start changing the wording we change the meaning of the authority. It has been so carefully reviewed, amended and interpreted that it would be wise for us to take the benefit of their experience rather than make changes. Unless there is some good reason for a change I would rather not make it.

Mr. JACOBS: I notice the reference at the end of section 55 says:

(Part Eng. Sec. 23 modified.)

What part of that has been modified?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have inserted here a provision about assignment that we have not in the English Act. Subsection (a) of the Act reads:

(a) If, after a bankruptcy notice has been issued under this Act, or after presentation of a bankruptcy petition by or against him, it appears to the court that there is probable reason for believing that he has absconded, or is about to abscond, with a view of avoiding payment of the debt in respect of which the bankruptcy notice was issued, or of avoiding service of a bankruptcy petition, or of avoiding appearance to any such petition, or of avoiding examination in respect of his affairs, or of otherwise avoiding delaying or embarrassing proceedings in bankruptcy against him.

(b) If, after presentation of a bankruptcy petition by or against him, it appears to the court that there is probable cause for believing that he is about to remove his goods with a view of preventing or delaying possession being taken of them by the official receiver or trustee, or that there is probable ground for believing that he has concealed or is about to conceal or destroy any of his goods, or any books, documents or writings which might be of use to his creditors in the course of his bankruptcy.

(c) If, after service of a bankurptcy petition on him, or after a receiving order is made against him, he removes any goods in his possession above the value of five pounds, without the leave of the official receiver or trustee.

(d) If, without good cause shown, he fails to attend any examination ordered by the court:

Mr. McMASTER: I see that "five pounds" is translated here as $20. That is the old Halifax currency. I think it would be better if we tried to specify something that would be more closely commensurate with £5. I would say $50.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We discussed that in the Committee and at the instance of the representative of the retail merchants it was fixed at $20. They thought that if a man took $10 or $15 to provide for his family he would not be committing very much of an offence. We might make it $25.

Mr. JACOBS: I suggest that we make it $25. Give the poor debtor a show. I move "to amend clause 55 by striking out the word "twenty" at the end of the thirty-second line of page forty-four and replacing the same with the words "twenty-five."

Mr. McMASTER: If you are going to make any change at all, make it $50.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: Have we settled what constitutes absconding?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not see in the interpretation of the clause any definition of the word "abscond."

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is a dictionary word and is not defined in the English Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: Absconding means going beyond the jurisdiction of the court. Absconding with a view to escape arrest must be going beyond the jurisidiction of the court. You cannot arrest a man unless

you have reason to believe that he is going beyond the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think that "abscond" has anything to do with the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. McKENZIE: If a man remains within the jurisdiction of the court, and is going to remain, you have no business under our law to arrest him. The moment he comes before the court and proves that he had no intention of going beyond the jurisdiction you must release him. There is no justification to arrest a man unless he is going beyond the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The word "abscond" has no reference to any court.

Mr. McKENZIE: It applies when a man is going to run away beyond the jurisdiction of the court where you cannot deal with him. How far must he run before you can arrest him? The idea of this is that he is going beyond the power of any process of the court. Therefore, you must arrest him and keep him within the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not see any reference to bail being given by the debtor after his arrest under section 55. If a debtor gives bail he ought to be permitted his provisional liberty.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will not that be a matter for the rules of practice?

Mr. JACOBS: That may be, but I suggest that it be kept in mind when these rules of practice are being framed because otherwise there is no provision to permit to the debtor his provisional liberty. He could not come before the criminal courts, and, as there is no provision for bail on going before the Federal judge, he would have to remain in jail until the matter was disposed of finally.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think that should not be left to the rule. In our civil and criminal procedure there is immediately, with the authority to arrest, provision to give bail. There should be power under this Act to grant bail.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The section says:—

> The court may by warrant addressed to any constable or prescribed officer of the court, cause a debtor to be arrested, and any books, papers, money and goods in his possession to be seized, and him and them to be safely kept as prescribed.

The word " prescribed " means, according to the interpretation clause " prescribed by general rules within the meaning of this Act." I would think that these rules would be the proper place to state as to where he should be kept and on what terms he should be released. I notice the English Act provides for no bail but bail is granted there by the court.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 63—Court's jurisdiction.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am going to move an amendment to this clause to meet an objection that has been urged by certain interested parties that it should be made clear that the Bankruptcy Court is a Federal Court. My own view is that the court becomes a Federal Court as soon as this Bill is passed, just as it is under the Winding-Up Act. But that view has been challenged, and therefore I have to ask that the following words be inserted in the clause at line 35:

> and such courts are hereby declared to be additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada, under section 101 of the British North America Act.

It has been suggested that a declaration of this kind will place it beyond peradventure that the Bankruptcy Court is a Federal Court. I therefore beg leave to move that the section be amended as stated.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the Solicitor General does not think it is necessary, unless the law officers of the Crown hold a contrary opinion, I do not think these words should be added to satisfy any fancy that somebody else might have. If you make a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia a Federal judge for the purposes of this Act he is a judge for British Columbia as well as for Nova Scotia, is he not? He is a Federal judge which means that he has jurisdiction all over Canada. That is not the general intent of legislation. Where you specify your courts you say, "The court shall be in Alberta the Supreme Court of Alberta;" you go through the different provinces specifying the courts in that way. Now if these courts are converted into Federal Courts I cannot understand how the jurisdiction would be limited, or as to how it would apply except as to the whole of the country, as in the case of the Exchequer Court. The Exchequer Court of Canada has jurisdiction as a Federal Court extending over every creek and corner of the country from coast to coast. But in the case of a Federal judge, which implies Federal jurisdiction, you must be very specific in your statement as to where he can act.

Mr. JACOBS: The section says so.

Mr. McKENZIE: But I am referring to the drafting of a law dealing with judges of the different provinces. Here we have a section being so understood as to deal with a judge that has Federal jurisdiction. I do not myself think there is anything in the objection, or any necessity for creating these judges Federal judges. For example, when the Scott Act was passed all that it said was that the magistrates in the different counties should have jurisdiction. The Scott Act was a Federal Act and violations of its provisions were heard by different magistrates; it was not necessary, or ever suggested, that those magistrates should have Federal jurisdiction. My own opinion—although I do not want anything to hinge upon it—is that the amendment is not necessary, and it is going to create endless confusion if you give a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia jurisdiction in Manitoba, and vice versa.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But we do that under this Bill, and that is the reason the amendment has been urged. I put a case of this kind to my hon. friend: An assignment takes place, or a bankruptcy petition is presented, in the province of Nova Scotia, and some assets of the debtor are in the province of Manitoba. The judge in Nova Scotia has jurisdiction over those assets in Manitoba.

Mr. McKENZIE: To some extent.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And to that extent it is argued that it is necessary to clothe him with Federal authority. When the Bill passed the special committee last year, I must say I thought this clause was correct, but some eminent legal authority in Toronto has pointed out that the objection might be raised that the judge had not been clothed with Federal authority to deal with the assets of a debtor in another province. I cannot see any objection to the proposed amendment. I do not altogether see that it is going to help the enactment, but I think it will remove some doubt that might otherwise be cast upon it.

Mr. JACOBS: It is not pretended, for instance, that a judge, sitting as a judge of bankruptcy in the province of Quebec would have power to sit in the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, his jurisdiction is limited by this section to the matters that are prescribed therein.

Mr. McKENZIE: What extra thing can he do by reason of the fact that he is declared to be a Federal judge? He is now clothed with jurisdiction to act within his province. A judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario has, under this Bill, jurisdiction within that province, without adding this amendment at all. What can he do by reason of the amendment that he could not otherwise do?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will repeat the illustration for my hon. friend's benefit. Suppose there is a petition in bankruptcy in Nova Scotia, and some of the assets of the debtor are in Manitoba. An order is made by a judge of the court in Nova Scotia. Has that judge any jurisdiction with respect of assets lying in the province of Manitoba? It is argued that unless the judge making such order is clothed with federal authority he has no such jurisdiction.

Mr. McKENZIE: The practice in this country, and in all countries has been that the judges are ancillary and auxiliary; and if a judge in the province of Nova Scotia makes an order in connection with goods in British Columbia, and if there is any difficulty about it, application is made to a judge in British Columbia and an order is obtained from him to enforce the directions of the Nova Scotia judge. That is why the courts have been made ancillary. Otherwise there is no sense in making all the courts of Canada ancillary or auxiliary one to the other.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not quite agree with my hon. friend's statement as to the practice. Suppose I got a judgment in a court of Nova Scotia and seek to enforce it in British Columbia?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is an entirely different thing. Under this Bill the moment an assignment is made the property is vested in the trustee absolutely, and what a judge will do with a part of that property in British Columbia is a mere detail. By the operation of this Bill the property is vested in the trustees. Some of it happens to be in the province in which the trustee resides, some of it happens to be in another province, but the title is vested in the trustee, and all that has to be done by a judge outside of that province is the necessary proceedings to get possession of that outside property or to sell it. A judge in Ontario could issue an order that property in Manitoba be sold; he has that jurisdiction. If there is any trouble about it you go with that order to a Manitoba judge, and he

confirms it and directs what is to be done. That is the function of a court ancillary to another. If the order of a judge in Ontario is absolute and final in British Columbia, why do we have ancillary judges?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has been suggested also as a reason for the amendment that section 71 relates to the enforcement of orders of courts throughout Canada and provides that courts are to be auxiliary to each other, and that we would not have power to enact section 71 unless we make the declaration which I now move as an amendment to section 63. I stated that as an additional reason.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have never heard it stated in any court that the judges could not act ancillary one to the other under the Receivership Act, and there is no language in the Winding-Up Act to the effect that the court dealing with property in different provinces in receivership proceedings must be a federal court. That is the practice and the legislation which is in point. A receiver in England immediately becomes vested with property in Canada. That has been decided in some bank case, the name of which I forget for the moment. It was thought that although a receiver was appointed in England the property here was still free, but the courts held that the moment the judge in England appointed a receiver under the English Act any property in Canada or elsewhere became vested in him; and all that our judges held on this side was that they were carrying out the order of the English judge in connection with the property. I suppose the language of this Act will be just as far reaching, and the analogy between the two situations is so strong and close that any cases they could find on receivership law would be regarded as authority in the enforcement of this Act. I think there is plenty of precedent to show that what I have stated has been the practice up to the present.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am quite free to confess that my view is the same as my hon. friend's, that this section as drawn is sufficient; but a very strong opinion has been offered against my view and the amendment has been suggested. I cannot see that any complication is likely to arise hereafter by reason of the amendment, and if it serves the purpose of clearing up doubts I think we should adopt it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Coming to hard and fast rules, we have no power to create a Federal court by this Bill. Under the British North America Act we can create only such Federal courts as are therein mentioned, the Exchequer Court and the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If my hon. friend's contention is correct, I certainly think the amendment is very much out of place. Is that a considered opinion of his?

Mr. McKENZIE: No, I am just giving it on the spot; the whole thing is new to me. I think my hon. friend will find that that is the law, that the only courts we can create are those specified in the British North America Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Section 101 of the British North America Act is so plain to me that I do not think an objection of that kind should be seriously taken into account in respect to a Bill of this kind. That section provides:

> The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time provide for the constitution, maintenance and organization of a general court of appeal for Canada and for the establishment of any additional courts—
>
> Additional courts
>
> —for the better administration of the laws of Canada.

If there is any ground for supposing that that is limited to the Exchequer Court of Canada, by all means let us know it now. But I thought the section was so plain that there could be no doubt about it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Very good; create all the confusion that is possible.

Mr. JACOBS: Under the Bankruptcy Act of 1875 the courts created were Federal courts.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There was some declaration of that kind in the Act, I am not sure what it was.

Section as amended carried.

On section 76—application to limited partnerships.

Mr. McMASTER: Has the minister considered the fact that in Quebec there is a certain type of limited partnership, where the limited partners have merely invested their money in the enterprise and have no dealings with the business of the enterprise at all, indeed, are precluded by law from having any?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have, I think, practically the same statute in Ontario.

Mr. JACOBS: I would suggest that this section be allowed to stand over with the others.

Section stands.

On section 88—bankruptcy offences.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That side-note is a mistake.

Mr. McMASTER: Perhaps it is not so improper. " Bankruptcy offences "—restricting the rights and privileges conferred on banks.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The heading should be " rights of banks."

Section agreed to.

On section 89—fraudulent debtors.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think all the clauses from clause 89 on are taken from the Criminal Code or the English Act. They have just been incorporated in this Bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 90—undischarged bankrupt obtaining credit.

Mr. McMASTER: Is it wise to say: " liable to a fine of $500 and to one year's imprisonment?" If there is such a heavy fine as that, will there not be a disposition on the part of the courts not to find a man guilty?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is a maximum.

Mr. McMASTER: It would be if the words " not exceeding " were inserted.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are a number of decisions on that point. That is a maximum amount and anything up to that amount is permitted. In the Criminal Code that is certainly the case. " To a term of two years ' means ' up to two years."

Mr. McMASTER: Is it the intention that a man shall be liable to a fine of $500 and to one year's imprisonment, or to a fine of $500 or one year's imprisonment?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Fine or imprisonment or both.

Mr. McMASTER: Then that ought to be so stated.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The word "liable" is what saves such people. This is drawn in accordance with the best draughtsmanship and is in exact accord with the English Act.

Mr. McMASTER: I remember having a principle of draughtsmanship once taught me, namely, that it was good draughtsmanship to draught a section in such English that only the intention intended to be conveyed would be conveyed.

Mr. JACOBS: As the section now stands, a party convicted would be liable to a fine plus imprisonment, if even for one hour. It has been held that he must be imprisoned for some particular time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The section says "liable to" not "must be."

Mr. JACOBS: "Liable to a fine of $500 and to one year's imprisonment." That would mean that the fine and the imprisonment must take place together. I have a case in mind where a party was fined $1,000 and one hour's imprisonment, because the court held it was obliged to impose a penalty of imprisonment. That was held by no less a judge than the Chief Justice of our Court of Appeal.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Section 89 reads:

Liable to a fine not exceeding $1,000 or to a term not exceeding two years' imprisonment or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I beg to move that section 89 after the word "and" in the twelfth line be amended to read:

Liable to a fine not exceeding $500 or to a term not exceeding one years' imprisonment, or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

That will make the language the same as that of section 89.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 92—false claim, etc.:

Mr. JACOBS: I notice that this section does not provide for a fine.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If he made a false declaration, he would be liable for perjury.

Mr. JACOBS: If he can be proceeded against under the Criminal Code, what is the necessity of this section?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We want to make it an offence under this Act as well.

Section agreed to.

On section 92—order by court for prosecution on report of trustee:

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this to take the place of the Grand Jury?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, the prosecution would come before the Grand Jury in the usual course.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understood that you could prosecute a criminal under the order of a judge or court. The minister seems

to regard any opinions I express as being of very little worth. I have not read the section, but if it means the usurping the functions of the Grand Jury I would be opposed to it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand the judge has always power to direct the Grand Jury to find a Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: Not at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He will not have power under this Act to do more than make that direction. The section says "the court shall, if it appears to the court that there is a reasonable probability that the debtor will be convicted, order that the debtor be prosecuted for such offence." That would be a matter that would come before the Grand Jury, who would decide whether to find a Bill or not.

Section agreed to.

On section 96—pretending to be trustee:

Mr. GUTHRIE: I beg to amend this section by adding after the word "Act," in the twenty-ninth line, the words "or who fails duly to observe or perform any act or duty which he may be ordered to do, observe or perform by the court pursuant to any of the provisions of this Act." There are certain sections of the Act under which the court may order the trustee to do certain things, failure to do which involves a penalty. It is for the purpose of imposing a penalty that this amendment is proposed.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 97—malicious proceedings:

Mr. JACOBS: I am opposed to the inclusion of this section in the Bill. It reads:

> Any person who maliciously institutes or carries on against any person who has not done or suffered any act of bankruptcy any proceeding in bankruptcy under this Act shall be guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars or to a term not exceeding two years' imprisonment, or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

Now the common law provides for that. Cases constantly come before our courts where parties are sued for maliciously instituting actions of this kind. The civil courts decide these cases and award damages where they think a case has been made out, or dismiss the case. I think this section would interfere with the jurisdiction of our civil courts, and I do not see why it should be included in the Act, which is a bankruptcy Act pure and simple for certain purposes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The origin of this section is this: Some of the members of the Retail Merchants' Association, representing a very large body of our traders, seem to fear that the wholesale or manufacturing associations or the larger financial interests will in some way take advantage of this Act and make it oppressive in its operation. They think that for the protection of the smaller dealer against malicious prosecution by some designing creditor this section is necessary.

I agree that the question of malicious proceedings is a matter which ordinarily should be dealt with by the civil courts, but the Committee, after hearing the case of the Retail Merchants Association, decided that it would afford them protection, and the association thought it would. So far as honest wholesalers or manufacturers are concerned, they need not be under any apprehension that they will be visited with the penalties of this section. If there be dishonest ones, they should take the consequences. I do not see any great objection to leaving the section as it is.

Mr. JACOBS: I have two reasons for objecting to it. First, it infringes upon our civil law, and secondly, it is an encroachment on the jurisdiction of other courts. We have courts regularly established to take care of just such cases as malicious prosecutions, etc., and I do not see why we should attempt to introduce further legislation. I would move that this section be struck out.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Committee took a very strong view on that question. There are offences which now come before both our civil and our criminal courts. In the case of libel, you have civil and criminal action. If a man maliciously institutes bankruptcy proceedings against another he certainly incurs civil liability, and is there any objection to adding a criminal liability for the same offence?

Mr. McMASTER: I think there is. I can arrest a man who has libeled me, or take civil action against him; both those recources are open to me. But if I fail in either of those, the man whom I have arrested for libel has no right to have me arrested because I improperly caused his arrest. If I lay an information that a man has committed murder, and do so maliciously, he has a civil action of damages

against me, but he has no right to arrest me. It is absurd that we should place upon the statute book, for the purpose of preventing malicious proceedings under this Act, a sanction which is not found in respect to other malicious proceedings of a much graver character.

Mr. JACOBS: I move that it be struck out.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have two or three pages of this Bill providing penalties against the unfortunate debtor, whom we have surrounded pretty well. If any one should maliciously impose upon him, we say: Go to the civil courts and get damages. But the man who imposes upon him may not be worth a dollar. No man in good standing will maliciously launch bankruptcy proceedings, although a man in bad standing might; and the smaller retail men of the country thought it was some protection to them to provide that no one should maliciously annoy or threaten them with bankruptcy proceedings, and the Committee thought it reasonable.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not say it is unreasonable, but the process of reasoning used by the Solicitor General in support of the retention of this clause could be used in respect to any similar unfounded or malicious proceedings taken in other spheres of action. A improperly and maliciously accuses B of theft. What is B's recourse? He can take a civil action against A for unjustifiable arrest. But under this law, if A, instead of laying an information against B for theft, says that B is a bankrupt, and puts him under bankruptcy proceedings, B will have the right to have A arrested and have him fined. I do not say that is an unfair provision, but I say it is illogical to give a man who suffers as a victim of malicious prosecution in bankruptcy a relief which, had he been maliciously arrested for theft, he would not have had.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This fact must be borne in mind: A man who maliciously files a bankruptcy petition against another may ruin the credit of that man and do him incalculable damage, and if—

Mr. McMASTER: The same is true if he has him arrested for theft.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If this will prevent such a condition it will justify its existence.

Mr. JACOBS: In the whole of the Criminal Code—

Mr. GUTHRIE: Whose rights is the hon. gentleman trying to protect—the man who will maliciously institute proceedings?

Mr. JACOBS: I am merely discussing the section before the Committee. I think it is subversive of all the rules of law to insert a clause of this kind in this Bill. Take the Criminal Code. There is not a single instance in which a provision of this kind in the way of relief is given to the party who has suffered at the hands of another. Consider the case of murder as suggested by my hon. friend from Brome. This serious charge is brought against a man at the instance of another who acts with malice. The accused is discharged and yet he has no recourse whatever against the accusing party except as to damages. In this case, however, you make an exception and say that the party who has maliciously instituted bankruptcy proceedings against another is liable to a fine of $1,000 and two years' imprisonment.

At six o'clock the House resumed and took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 83 (from the Senate) for the relief of Albert Greensward.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 84 (from the Senate) for the relief of Mary Jane Lyons.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 85 (from the Senate) for the relief of Rose Kent Miller.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate) for the relief of Elizabeth Winters.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 34, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Thomson (Qu'Appelle).

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate) for the relief of Martha Campbell.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 90 (from the Senate) for the relief of Rosa Hirst.—Mr. Fripp.

BANKRUPTCY ACT.

The House resumed consideration in Committee of Bill No. 18, respecting Bankruptcy, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 97—malicious proceedings.

Mr. McKENZIE: Some hon. members on this side of the House were trying to con-

vince the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) that this was an innovation and an unnecessary clause. If a person should institute proceedings against any merchant or trader with a view to bringing him under the operations of this Act, and do it in good faith, it is open to any person to lay an information against him for having done it maliciously, and have him arrested and tried. I suppose he would not be convicted if he could show that he had no malicious intent. But it subjects a person to be arrested the moment he institutes proceedings under this Act. The act of instituting a malicious prosecution has been known to the law for centuries, and the only punishment that could be inflicted for it was this one with damages, in the Supreme Court, but never before was it thought to constitute such a thing a criminal offence. The Solicitor General makes it an indictable offence under this Bill. It is thought that should not be done, but that the remedy of common law should be left as the only recourse for one who may think that a malicious prosecution has been brought against him. Malicious prosecution and malicious or wrongful arrest have always been left in the same category. They are pretty much akin and run into each other pretty much; it is difficult to distinguish between the one and the other; but in either case it was never thought to be a criminal offence. The Solicitor General says that in some parts of the country it is necessary to prevent such proceedings under this Bill. In this part of Canada, however, it is not known, and I think therefore it would be a pity to make a general law that is going to be troublesome and mischievous chiefly to meet circumstances that may possibly only take place in some section of the country. I would like to impress upon the Solicitor General the desirability of leaving the law as it is, and has been for so many years.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not wish to repeat what I said this afternoon, but I think the minister is trying to provide against the possible abuse of this Bill. Would it not be just as well to wait until the abuse occurs before providing against it? What you are doing here is providing safeguards against the abuse of this Bill different from those established by the ordinary law against similar abuses. It is a wrongful thing to start a malicious proceeding under this Bill. But it is also a wrongful thing to start a malicious proceeding for theft; it is a wrongful thing to accuse any person of doing anything wrong; a false accuser is a very undesirable citizen. But under our law as it is now the false accuser can be attacked in the civil courts, and that is the only remedy that is open. By this section you put malicious proceedings under this Bill in a different category from the malicious starting of any other proceedings; it appears to me it is not logical.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is just this difference in the case of a malicious prosecution: The accused is brought to trial and if innocent is acquitted and that is the end of it. In the case of a man who maliciously starts bankruptcy proceedings against another man, perhaps a competitor, the very institution of those proceedings getting into the lists of a mercantile agency and going throughout the country may bring on a real bankruptcy from some other quarter, which might not otherwise have taken place. It may injure the man's credit, it may do untold damage, and at the same time the person who instituted the proceedings may be a straw man against whom civil redress cannot be enforced. What is proposed is merely a safeguard against any proceedings of that kind. As I said before six o'clock, the demand for this clause came from the small trader, from the Retail Merchants' Association, and as a matter of fact from that branch of the association in the West. They seemed to fear that there might be something in this Bill which would permit an abuse to grow up whereby, for malicious reasons or purposes, proceedings might be started against some of them that might practically result in their ruin. The Committee who heard their representations thought there was reason in their request, and the result is the insertion of this clause. I cannot see that it will operate to the injury of anybody, and it may protect some person. Therefore, to my mind, it should not be removed.

Mr. MOWAT: I feel like supporting the clause on very much the same lines as the Solicitor General has indicated. The retail merchants appeared before the special committee on many occasions, and apparently they are looking forward to the passing of this Bill with a certain amount of trepidation. There is no doubt that the measure is chiefly supported by credit men, or the wholesale houses, and yet the retail merchants have been most reasonable in their requests, and, I think, will heartily support the Bill, although it is they who, perhaps, will feel its effects the most. Now, it seems to me, in view of the attitude of the retail merchants who were so reasonable,

it is a small thing to grant this request, and to guard against their names suddenly and improperly getting into Bradstreet's or Dun's at the instance of some spiteful person. The remedy in case of malicious arrest or malicious prosecution is one within the jurisdiction of the provincial law, and it consists in setting in motion the criminal law. But the going into insolvency does not relate to the criminal law, and I do not see that there would be any remedy against an aggrieved person under the provincial statute. Therefore, it seems proper to me that we should protect the person who is spitefully or maliciously brought into insolvency proceedings by enacting the clause proposed. It will do no harm, it will satisfy all classes that their rights have been looked after and protected, and it will start off this Bill, to whose provisions people have not been accustomed for many years, with the idea that it extends equal justice to, and protects the rights of, all concerned.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Mowat) has not given very much thought to this subject. If a person, in the very best of judgment and feeling, starts proceedings under this Bill to place under its operation a person who is a trader, there must be a hearing before a court somewhere at which it can be shown that the proceedings have been initiated without proper authority. The person bringing the proceedings must go before the court, must he not? He moves before a judge, and surely we can trust the judges not to give an order to any person, or put anybody into the insolvency court, without some satisfactory proof. I cannot conceive of any person coming before one of the judges of the Supreme Court, and on some haphazard affidavit, being able to endanger the business of a reputable citizen.

Suppose the other man, who ought to be put in insolvency, turns round and says, "I will teach my boy a lesson; I will go to Mr. Smith, the magistrate, and lay an information against him that he is doing this thing maliciously and will have him arrested." The man is lodged in jail, perhaps twenty-five or thirty miles away, awaiting a preliminary inquiry. That inquiry takes place within perhaps a week or ten days, and then the friendly magistrate sends him up to the Supreme Court for trial. In some parts of this country—in the city of Hull, for instance—the criminal court sits only once a year. It is quite possible that the man may not be able to get bail and may languish in jail for a year before trial, when it is open to him to prove there was no malice in his heart, and he gets off. That is the kind of practice this Bill is introducing. Such a procedure is absolutely new, it is entirely unknown to our law. It does not obtain in English law; and we are following the English Act. I am sure my hon. friend has great respect for English law and practice. Are we so much worse than the English people that while we can adopt every part of the English Act that is useful and good and that has stood the test of time, we must add this criminal clause to it? Is that showing very much respect for the people of this country? It is a civil law dealing with property and civil rights, but we are going to convert it into a criminal code because our people cannot be trusted to do things in a business and proper way. I have not drawn an imaginary picture; that is what can be done. We are getting along famously with criminal law this session. This is the third criminal Bill to be introduced. A few days ago we passed a Bill which subjects a woman to two years in the penitentiary if she happens to put too big a fire in her stove and her house is burned down; that is No. 1. I think yesterday the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his innocence and good nature, introduced a Bill imposing fine and imprisonment upon a person who happens to sell one of brother Loggie's lobster cans supposed to contain a pound of food, whereas in fact it may only contain fourteen ounces; that is No. 2. And the Solicitor General, not to be outdone in this criminal business, introduces this clause, whereby if a man institutes civil proceedings against a debtor, which he has a perfect right to do, without first examining himself—as it is presumed every one does before taking such a step,—he is subject to the fines and penalties prescribed. Why should we be doing these things? This is a free country and every man is presumed to be honest until the contrary is proved. There is no necessity for these innovations, and I must protest with all the energy that is in me against creating these criminal possibilities. I am not going to say anything further, I leave the entire responsibility not only upon the Solicitor General, but upon the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend, as usual, has very greatly exaggerated the facts. It is nothing unusual to have penal clauses in a Bill. During every session we pass Bills in which provision is made for fine and imprisonment for violations of the law, and my hon. friend could make pre-

cisely the same argument against those measures. What is the result of all such legislation? Are there cases of men languishing for weeks and months in jail? My hon. friend knows that nothing of the kind happens. In the first place, before a man can be consigned to jail and suffer in the manner my hon. friend has indicated, he is brought before a magistrate and there is a preliminary hearing. That in itself is a safeguard. If he elects to be tried by a jury at the next court of competent jurisdiction, he is able to obtain bail. My hon. friend has magnified the effect of criminal provisions in statutory enactments. I have not taken much interest in this Bill, but I happened to be in the House a little before six o'clock and I heard him putting forward an argument which on the face of it seems plausible. He says that there is no penalty under the Criminal Code for malicious laying of an information under that Code. That is true, I think. But, I submit, there is a real difference between the case of a malicious prosecution for an offence under the Criminal Code or common law, and malicious laying of an information under this Bankruptcy Bill. It would seldom happen that a man's business interest would be advantaged by laying an information under the Criminal Code for any offence contained therein. One could hardly imagine a retail dealer seeking to ruin a rival by laying an information against him maliciously for, let us say, theft. But in this case where a trader would have an interest in ruining a rival—and many cases of that kind occur almost daily—I can imagine his taking advantage of this law very successfully from his own standpoint.

The leader of the Opposition has dwelt upon the fact that a judge of the high court must give judgment upon the petition. But the damage is done before the judge gives his decision. The mere filing of a petition in bankruptcy against a solvent trader is ruinous to that man's credit, and that is the reason why some 25,000 small retail dealers throughout Canada desire, as I understand it, to be safeguarded under this Bill. In other words, a man may have a direct, immediate business interest in filing a petition in bankruptcy against a rival trader. In Toronto, I have frequently been in the civil courts as a spectator, and I have seen numerous cases of business disputes in which action had been taken, founded upon the most obviously malicious motives and declared by the judge to be so. If any one doubts me, let him go to a division court where the smaller cases are tried and where traders of a certain type sue and are sued, and he will realize the danger there is in allowing a small, irresponsible and malicious trader to file a petition in bankruptcy against a rival. What remedy has his rival in the civil courts? The leader of the Opposition says that for malicious prosecution there is the remedy in tort at common law, a civil remedy, for which the only penalty is damages. Let us take the case of a trader who is bailiff-proof and who determines to ruin a rival. He acquires a claim against his rival, or he has a straw man take an assignment of a claim and file a petition in bankruptcy against the man against whom his animosity and cupidity are directed. The petition is filed, and that man's credit is gone. He may be ruined if it proceeds no further; even if the judge, before whom the matter comes, decides in favour of the party against whom the proceedings are taken, the man's credit is gone.

My hon. friend has stated that the Government has been very free this year with legislation applying the criminal law. Does he realize what we are doing in this Bill? As regards the present situation, which we have had for many years in Canada and under which men have traded here, we have no provision whereby men may be thrown into bankruptcy under a proceeding such as is provided for by this Bill. This Bill changes all that; it provides that any creditor, no matter what his motives may be, may file a petition, the effect of which may be to ruin some solvent trader, because a man may be solvent although trading on a very small margin. Without some safeguard to such trader, there is nothing the Government has brought down this session more objectionable than this Bill if, as is the attitude of my hon. friend, it leaves traders without any safeguard against proceedings which may be taken by malicious creditors. That is the distinction between this case and the case put forward by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster),—that for malicious prosecution under the Criminal Code there is only civil remedy. It is almost impossible to imagine a case in which there is the direct element of personal advantage in laying a charge of theft. Not only that, a charge of theft has to be established by much stronger, much more clear, cogent and convincing evidence than the argument by which a man would seek to justify a petition in bankruptcy. Up to date, it has not been brought to my attention, although it may have happened,

that a business trader seeking to outrival a competitor has searched the Criminal Code to find upon what offence he can most conveniently lay an information against his rival. But this places the machinery right in his hand, and I have read of dozens of cases in the reports of division court hearings in Toronto where the element of malice was undoubtedly present for the purpose of injuring a trade rival. This machinery would be at once available in such a case. The remedy in damages cannot be adequate because the man who brings the proceedings or causes them to be brought may be in a position, so far as civil proceedings are concerned, to snap his fingers at a prosecutor, and yet as soon as he has filed the petition, he has practically ruined his competitor. If we are bringing into this House legislation that changes the situation under which business has been carried on in Canada for many years, it is incumbent upon the House to the utmost of its power to protect from abuse of proceedings under that measure those who are to be subjected to its provisions. I have not had an opportunity of listening to previous discussions on this Bill; but, listening to the arguments put forward here this afternoon, though feeling that I am not in many ways as competent to pronounce upon the merits of the provision as many who have spoken, I believe the House should lean towards protecting that man against whom proceedings may be taken under this measure.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Acting Prime Minister is, no doubt, a good financier, but he has made it abundantly clear that he is not a good criminal lawyer. He has told us that when a man comes up on a preliminary investigation before a magistrate, he may choose right off whether he is to be tried before a jury or not.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It depends on the legislation.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is absolutely wrong; there is no such precedent, law or power. Therefore, the Acting Prime Minister started out wrong with his criminal law, and the rest of his criminal law argument was of about the same value. He says that we find penal clauses in many statutes. That is perfectly correct, but in what kind of statutes? We find statutes imposing certain duties upon individuals who are told: If you do not do that, you are to be subjected to certain criminal responsibilities and results. If the Acting Prime Minister will point to a line in this Bill which says that if a man does not do such and such he is subject to some criminal offence and to be dealt with criminally, I will withdraw my objection. But there is not in this Bill one line which justifies this section. This is a sort of thing that is thrown out to prevent something that may possibly happen in another way altogether. I do not want any better argument than that we have nothing in this Bill but the old English law, and that the English people for years and years have found this law good enough without inserting this section which is new to the English law, new to the English courts and new to the Canadian people. The Acting Prime Minister waxes eloquent over a crime that was never committed in this country. There is no such thing known to any British country as ex post facto criminal law.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What is the application of the reference to ex post facto criminal law?

Mr. McKENZIE: Providing in advance for some crime hitherto unknown to the law.

Mr. MOWAT: That is not "post."

Mr. McKENZIE: I meant to say, legislation providing for some crime that is not known to the law. I challenge the Acting Prime Minister and the Solicitor General to produce a single case of the kind they are dealing with that ever happened in Canada. I have had a longer connection in Canada with legal proceedings in all their phases than either the Solicitor General or the Acting Prime Minister, and in all my experience I never heard of a merchant trying to ruin another by maliciously proceeding against him.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Why, then, are these retail men so desirous of being safeguarded against this very thing?

Mr. McKENZIE: Because they have some unfounded suspicion about something they had never any occasion to be afraid of. There has never been such a law in this country since 1875. I do not remember the days of 1875 and the few years before that during which the old Act was in force, but I challenge my hon. friend to produce a single case where anybody maliciously laid an information under that Act or took proceedings against his neighbour to ruin him. I never heard of such a thing.

I base my argument entirely upon this fact: When we made our Criminal Code in 1892 we simply took the English law as it then stood, and our own Statutes; we were

perfectly satisfied with the English criminal law as we found it, and with the judicial interpretations by the courts of Great Britain. Here we are not taking the English law, but are adding new provisions to it, creating a condition that will put in the hands of one person the power of putting his neighbour in jail, without any justification whatever, and keeping him there indefinitely when there may be no more malice in his heart than there is in the heart of the Acting Prime Minister. We are putting this power in the hands of somebody who may or may not use it. Would it not be time enough to provide such a law when a case of this kind arises? I promise the Acting Prime Minister and the Solicitor General that if advantage is taken of this Act to do anything improper within three or six months after it passes this House, I shall hasten to their side to pass legislation preventing any such thing. But I am not in favour of putting unnecessary criminal laws on the statute book under which a man may, without any justification, send his neighbour to jail while his children are left to suffer cold and hunger. But the responsibility is not mine, the responsibility rests with the Government, more particularly as I have presented my views and, I think, those of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. McMASTER: I would not impose on the time of the Committee had not the Acting Prime Minister directed some of his remarks to answering an argument I had brought forward. His argument was this: We are introducing new legislation, unusual legislation; this unusual legislation is open to the possibility of abuse; in order to discourage the possibility of abuse, we are going to make it a penal offence to abuse the Act.

First of all, let me say that the province of Quebec has had laws upon its statute book for many decades past, whereby any creditor who had a claim of $200 against a man who had generally stopped making payments, could file what amounted to a petition of bankruptcy against him; that is, he could make what we call a demand of abandonment, which would be supported by affidavit and then filed in court. This is a very summary way of bringing a man into insolvency and forcing him to distribute his property among his creditors. I have not been practicing for a great number of years, but I have never in the course of my experience known of an action instituted by a man who had been put into insolvency by a competitor in which the insolvent claimed that his competitor had wilfully and maliciously used the machinery of the law for the purpose of damaging him. Therefore, I think the Government in placing this section 97 on the statute book are trying to guard against something which is not likely to happen. It has not happened, as far as my experience goes, in a province in which for a generation and a half, creditors have had the powers which are given under this Bill.

The second argument of the Acting Prime Minister was this: He first of all said: I admit that generally the abuse of legal process of a criminal nature is guarded against merely by the right of the injured innocent party to take an action in damages either for false arrest or for the laying of false information against him; but, he added, under this Act, there will be greater opportunities given to a man in commercial life to do something wrongful against his neighbour. I do not agree with my hon. friend. Take this case for instance: An information is laid against a high-class solicitor for embezzling the funds of his clients. Now that would enormously hurt the solicitor, even if the charge were dismissed. Or again, suppose a false and malicious accusation is made against a man occupying a high professional position, or a respectable merchant, charging him with some hideous crime. His reputation may be hurt, his business may be damaged, and financial loss may be sustained just the same as in a case of malicious proceedings under this Bankruptcy Act in regard to an ordinary merchant. That being so, why put upon the statute book this ususual provision. Why has the English law given to the wronged party merely an action in damages in all these cases? There is some good reason, and it is this, that the policy of the law has not been to frighten the innocent and legitimate complainant. It is often difficult enough for a complainant who has a perfectly justified complaint against a fellow citizen to urge that complaint before the court; the tradition of the British law has been that the courts are open to him, and if he uses them maliciously he is liable in damages. I believe that our laws should proceed on broad general principles and that we should have as few exceptions as possible. For these reasons I believe that this legislation is unsound and unnecessary. It is difficult for me, having glanced at section 4 of the Act, to see how a malicious institution of proceedings can take place. The man who has a claim against a debtor is not able

to put that debtor into bankruptcy before he goes before a court and justifies that claim as a proper and well-founded one. On the whole I believe that this proposed legislation is both unnecessary and undesirable.

Section agreed to.

On Section 98—Commencement.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move that this clause as printed be struck out and the following substituted:

This Act shall come into force at a date to be named by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

It will be necessary after the Act is passed to prepare rules and forms and to see that a suitable number of trustees are appointed throughout the country, all of which will take time. It is a new experience and nobody knows exactly how long it will take. I think, therefore, the Act should not come into force until proclamation is made by the Governor in Council.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is sometimes difficult for a country barrister to know when a proclamation of this kind goes forth, and it would be very much better, I think, if the Solicitor General would take plenty of time so that he would be sure to have these regulations made, and to say that at such a definite date the Act shall come into force. It is only in the Official Gazette that these proclamations appear and only a few people get the Official Gazette. Though I can hardly call myself a country practioner—I live in a town where there are available statutes of the kind—often I am at a great disadvantage to know whether a certain measure has come into force or not. There should be some provision by which everybody who has to do with the law, magistrates and lawyers, would know positively without any difficulty when a statute came into force.

9 p.m.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On Section 55—Arrest of debtors under certain circumstances.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would like the Committee to return to section 55 which we discussed this afternoon. Under clause (a) of that section the question came up as to the meaning of the word "abscond," and whether our clause was appropriate, notwithstanding that it is copied from the English Act. On looking at the dictionary, I find that one of the definitions given by the leader of the Opposition is exact. To abscond is given as "to leave the jurisdiction of the court, or to hide from one's creditors." In the English Act they simply use the broad term "abscond," which in Great Britain, would mean to go beyond the United Kingdom; but I think we should have a more limited definition of the term in this country. I am going to move that clause (a) of section 55 be amended by inserting after the word "abscond," in the tenth line, the following words: "from the province in which he had his ordinary domicile."

Mr. McMASTER: Do you not think "his ordinary place of business" would be better?

Mr. GUTHRIE: A man might have his domicile in one province and his place of business in another.

Mr. McMASTER: Suppose a man carries on his business in Ottawa and lives in Hull, and getting into difficulties he makes for the wilds of Saguenay in order to evade his creditors. According to your definition "from the province where he had his domicile," he would not have absconded. If, however, we make it "where he has his place of business," where his creditors would look to find him to get their accounts settled, then he would have absconded.

Mr. MORPHY: Why not use both—domicile or place of business?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It might be different provinces.

Mr. MORPHY: Well, if you put both in you would get him under either.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Why not use the technical word "locality?" The locality of a debtor is described in the Bill as:

the place within a bankruptcy division or district whereat the debtor has carried on business for the longest period during the six months immediately preceding the date of the presentation against him of a bankruptcy petition,—

I would suggest that we say "from the province in which the locality of the debtor is situate."

Mr. McMASTER: That is not nice English.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The word "locality" is used in the Bill in the interpretation section.

Mr. PROULX: I prefer the general term. It may be just as difficult for a man's creditors to get at him when he hides in the province in which he does business as

when he departs from the province. As the Solicitor General says, the dictionary meaning is plain, that he absconds from the jurisdiction of the court. I understand that the different provinces will have jurisdiction, and if a man in Ontario absconds it will mean that he leaves the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think there is a good deal of force in what my hon. friend says. Perhaps it might be as well to leave the section as it was. With the leave of the Committee I will withdraw my amendment and let the section stand. If, when the Bill comes up in the future, there should be a further amendment, we can consider it then.

Mr. McKENZIE: This arises in connection with the right of arrest, does it not?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: That arrest will not take place until proceedings in bankruptcy are commenced?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Until after the presentation of the bankruptcy petition.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think you could well say "abscond from the province after the proceedings of bankruptcy are taken." That would cover the ground.

Amendment of Mr. Guthrie withdrawn.

On section 8—application of part one.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move that the following words be added to the section:

That the provisions of this part of the Act shall not apply in respect to any act or omission of a debtor, nor in respect to any debt contracted by a debtor, or judgment covered, or execution or other process issued against the debtor, prior to the passage of this Act.

Mr. McMASTER: Prior to the coming in force of this Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: "Prior to the coming in force of this Act," we will make it. The object of this amendment is that the Act may have no retroactive effect in so far as part one is concerned, part one being the part of the Act which contains the provisions for involuntary bankruptcy. In other words a man cannot be placed in bankruptcy for any debt heretofore contracted, or any judgment heretofore recovered or execution heretofore issued.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are one or two clerical errors that I would like to correct.

[Mr. Proulx.]

On section 2—interpretation.

Mr. GUTHRIE moved to change the word "debtor" in subsection (g), line 22, to "assignor."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2—paragraph N—debtor.

Mr. GUTHRIE moved:

That the word "definition" in line 41, be struck out and the word "paragraph" be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2—paragraph (gg)—secured creditor.

Mr. GUTHRIE moved:

That the word "pledge" be inserted before the word "charged" in line three.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GUTHRIE moved:

That after the word "due" in line 5, the words "or accruing due"

be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4, subsection 5—proof of debt, etc.

Mr. GUTHRIE moved:

That the word "or", in the eleventh line, be struck out and the word "of" substituted.

Amendment agreed to.

Progress reported.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill 52, to amend the Immigration Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—Prohibited classes, and the following amendment proposed by Mr. Cronyn:

That section 3 be amended by adding thereto the following as subsection (u):

3. (u) the following persons, unless otherwise permitted by existing treaties, shall also be prohibited, for a period of five years from the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, from entering or landing in Canada:—

(i) Aliens from the Continent of Europe whose domicile is situate south or east of a line drawn from the Atlantic Ocean east along the forty-second parallel of latitude to the fifteenth meridian of longitude thence north along said fifteenth meridian to the fifty-fifth parallel thence east along said fifty-fifth parallel to the twentieth meridian thence north along said twentieth meridian to the sixtieth parallel thence east along said sixtieth parallel to the thirtieth meridian and thence north along said thirtieth meridian to the Arctic Ocean.

(ii) Aliens from the North American Continent of European birth who are not citizens of the United States of America and whose domicile in Europe was situate south or east of the above described line.

Mr. CALDER: At the last sitting of the Committee when this proposal of the member for London (Mr. Cronyn) was submitted I asked that it should stand over until I had time to consider it. In the meantime I have taken the resolution up with the officials of the department and they are inclined to the view that if it were adopted it would give rise to a good deal of trouble and difficulty. Therefore, unless the hon. gentleman is anxious to press his amendment, I would suggest that he withdraw it.

Mr. CRONYN: I have no special desire to press the amendment at this session. It was perhaps too drastic a step to take now involving as it does so marked a change in what has been the accepted policy of the country ever since the question of immigration was first considered. I shall therefore ask leave of the Committee to withdraw the resolution.

Might I, before resuming my seat, express the hope that after due reflection the department may see fit at another session to adopt some plan whereby we may escape the ungracious and delicate duty of refusing admission to our country to some particular race or nation. Something has been said of contemplated legislation by the United States which will greatly restrict, if it does not wholly prohibit, immigration into that country for a period of years. At least two Bills proposing such action were introduced at the last sitting of Congress and were referred to the Select Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Immigration and Colonization. Those hon. members who have read the evidence adduced before that Committee, and the report presented on the 29th of January last to the House of Representatives, cannot fail to be struck by the strong and wide-spread opinion which exists throughout the United States in favour of some such measure. If I may be permitted I should like to read a part of the final clause of the report of the majority of that Committee expressing their view of this matter:

> The far-famed melting pot has proven to a great degree a delusion and a snare. We feel that it is now time that we were beginning to look after those of our own household, rather than to open our ports to many who know nothing of our laws, our customs, our standards of living, and never intend to learn of them.

It is true there was also a minority report presented to the House by two members thereof, Representatives A. J. Sabath, of Illinois, and Isaac Siegel, of New York. The minority report, as was only natural, dwelt with pride upon the record on the field of battle of many who had been immigrants, or the descendants of immigrants, but despite the eloquent character of that minority report, a general opinion prevailed that the House would have passed a Bill to further restrict immigration had the opportunity been afforded. It is a matter of record, however, and is known doubtless to many of the members of this House, that there was an almost continuous filibuster maintained during the session, and these Bills, with many others, fell by the wayside as unfinished business. Now, if the United States does, in the immediate future, pass any such law—and undoubtedly the attempt will be made at the next session of Congress—it will result in increasing pressure on Canada by immigrants from the south-eastern part of Europe to obtain entry to this country. It therefore seems to me to be the duty of this House to safeguard our country in such way as we can to prevent too great a flood of those who may not prove best fitted to become future citizens.

I have to confess to a want of faith in the efficacy of section 13 of this Bill, to which the minister has made reference. It is an extension, and, perhaps, a wise extension, of the powers contained in section 38 of the old Act, and undoubtedly under those powers the Government of the day could exclude any person, any race, any nationality. But let us assume for a moment—a violent assumption perhaps—that this Government goes out of power and that a Government of the ordinary type which formerly administered the affairs of Canada is in control. If the then Minister of Immigration undertook, under the powers conferred by this section, to bar the people of some particular nation from entering into Canada, imagine what would result. In the first place we would have all the families in Canada from that nation protesting against the refusal to allow their relatives to join them. Indeed, we would have every member of that interdicted nation in Canada making common cause against the ruling; because it is a striking feature of the immigration movement that a successful immigrant is the keenest person to have his fellow-countryman, whether related or not, share in his good fortune. It is an exceedingly difficult matter to persuade him that too free a movement of this kind may

eventually result in damage to himself and others. In the second place, if the proposed immigrants were a good type of untrained labour you would have the large employers of the country protesting, and they would bring weighty arguments against the enforcement of an Order in Council calling for exclusion. A few nights ago I had a short talk with one of the largest employers of this class of labour in Canada. We were discussing one of the nations in Southeastern Europe—I prefer not to be more definite in that regard—when he said quite frankly: "Yes, they are excellent workmen, they are vigorous, they are untiring, but you will never make citizens of them. In truth, their ideal is against such a destiny; they are at best but temporary sojourners in this country."

Added to the pressure from immigrants and employers, you would have, of course, great clamour from steamship and transportation companies, and labour agencies. I do not believe any Government would withstand the pressure thus brought to bear. We would then be back again in exactly the position in which we have always been, and subject perhaps to a flood of less desirable people, a flood which, by its very volume, would divert the lesser currents from Northern Europe, the record of whose people, as I have tried to point out, is that they become tillers of our soil and assimilate with the present population.

Some comment has been made as to the purport of the proposed amendment, the suggestion being made that it was aimed to exclude certain nationalities or religions. As one witty member of the press gallery remarked, I was apparently trying to exclude the Pope and include the Kaiser. I do not think I need assure the House that no such idea entered my head. As I explained, the lines suggested were rough-and-ready boundaries, not intended to be accepted as final; indeed they were only used to try to illustrate the principles that I was endeavouring to bring before the House. These principles were based on the results disclosed by official records. If those records can be attacked—and they have not as yet been assailed—much of my argument would go for naught. The restrictions suggested are thus founded on what is known of certain ethnic and sociological characteristics, largely due to racial origin and climatic conditions and indelibly fixed during the course of many centuries.

Perhaps I owe a word of apology to the Committee for again occupying its attention. As was natural, hon. members from Western Canada were more particularly interested in this question, and they were able to bring to the problem the great value of their personal experience. I come from old Ontario where, although there are many thousands of acres ready for intensive cultivation, we could not expect to get any large proportion of new immigration. As a matter of fact, I approached the problem with a feeling that nothing should be done to bar any immigrant. All reasons, financial and otherwise, pointed that way. It was only after making such study as I could of what had happened in the neighbouring Republic, and to a lesser extent in our own country, that I came to the conclusion that we should take a very strong stand, for a time at any rate, against allowing too free an entry.

Perhaps some explanation of the interest I have in this subject is due to the fact that for the past twelve years it has been my duty and my privilege to make an annual visit to the Western Provinces, and the result of those trips has been to confirm my optimistic belief in our country; in fact, to raise it almost to a state of religious fervour. Do I need, then, any excuse for striving to the poor best of my ability to so shape the future of our race in this one particular that it may prove worthy of a great heritage?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am certainly in favour of the very best class of immigrants we can get. But can we very logically compare ourselves to-day with the United States? We have the same area of habitable land, but while they have 120,000,000 of people we have scarcely 8,000,000. Does the hon. member (Mr. Cronyn) think that we are in a position to apply the same rigid laws to immigration as the United States are applying, situated as they are?

Mr. CRONYN: I think, Mr. Chairman, financially, and, perhaps, from the point of view of the need of population, we are hardly in a position to do so. If we did apply as rigid rules as I suggest it would undoubtedly delay the material progress of the country. But I think there is something greater than mere material progress, and I am one of those who fear the United States may have built up its wonderful prosperity at the risk of the future well-being of the race. We are not yet able to judge what the result of the "melting pot" will be. I suppose there is none living to-day who will see the full fruition of the policy adopted by that country. I would

rather that we bent our backs further and sweated more freely in the effort to carry our present burden than imperil what future generations should inherit.

Amendment (Mr. Cronyn) withdrawn.

Mr. CALDER: I have three amendments to submit to the Committee. The first has reference to the carrying of concealed weapons by immigrants seeking to enter Canada. I would suggest that a new section be added to the Bill as 43 (A) to this effect:

16 (a). The said Act is amended by inserting the following heading and section immediately after section forty-three:—

"Concealed Weapons."

"43A. No immigrant shall bring into Canada any pistol, sheath knife, dagger, stiletto, or other offensive weapon that can be concealed upon the person, and any officer who has reason to suspect that any immigrant has any such weapon in his possession may search the person and baggage of such immigrant, and may seize any such weapon, which shall thereupon be confiscated to His Majesty, and disposed of as the minister may direct; provided, that in any such case the immigrant may appeal to the minister, and the minister may give such directions for the return or other disposal of such weapon, as he deems just and proper."

The officers of the department think it very desirable that there should be a provision of this kind in the Bill. As a matter of fact, they have been acting without this authority for several years, and the number of weapons they have collected from certain classes of immigrants is very large.

Mr. JACOBS: I would point out that this clause is already covered by the section of the Criminal Code which says that no one shall carry on his person concealed weapons.

Mr. CALDER: No person in Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Mr. CALDER: We meet the immigrants at the border.

Mr. JACOBS: That is supposed to be Canada. If they come into the country with these weapons they have already committed an offence; and that being so, it seems to me there is no utility in having this section in the Bill.

Mr. CALDER: It cannot do any harm.

Mr. McMASTER: That is a bad principle.

Mr. JACOBS: I wish to point out that it is already covered.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why say that "weapon that can be concealed upon the person?" Immigrants may have weapons in their trunks or travelling bags that they could not conceal upon their persons. Why not say that they are not to bring them in, any way?

Mr. CALDER: I do not suppose there would be any objection. Take immigrants coming in as settlers, they very often bring their shot guns and rifles, there is no particular objection to those weapons. What we are aiming at is concealed weapons.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister wishes to say to an immigrant that he may bring in his arms, his gun or his musket or his rifle, it would be better to state so, because guns are now made that can be taken apart into pieces not more than a foot in length, and if one wants to conceal them on one's person he can do so; and so a thing that is not intended to be made a crime might be made a crime under this Bill. I suppose it is no offence for a man to bring a gun into this country, but the moment he tries to conceal it under his coat he becomes a criminal.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CALDER: I move to insert as a new section after section 14 of the present Bill the following:

14. (A) Section forty-one of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

"41. Whenever any person other than a Canadian citizen advocates in Canada the overthrow by force or violence of the government of Great Britain or Canada, or other British dominion, colony, possession or dependency, or the overthrow by force or violence of constituted law and authority, or the assassination of any official of the Government of Great Britain or Canada or other British dominion, colony, possession or dependency, or of any foreign government, or advocates or teaches the unlawful destruction of property, or shall by word or act create or attempt to create riot or public disorder in Canada, or shall by common repute belong to or be suspected of belonging to any secret society or organization which extorts money from, or in any way attempts to control any resident of Canada by force or threat of bodily harm, or by blackmail, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization extertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government; such person for the purposes of this Act shall be considered as belonging to the prohibited or undesirable classes, and shall be liable to deportation, and it shall be the duty of any officer becoming cognizant thereof, and the duty of the clerk, secretary or other official of any municipality in Canada wherein such person may be, to forthwith send a written complaint thereof to the minister giving full particulars."

This section is practically the same as the section in the old law, with this exception, that we have included in the prohibited

class, such persons as those who advocate the overthrow of government by force or violence and the unlawful destruction of property. We have amended this section merely to bring it into conformity with the other section in the Bill.

Mr. JACOBS: I should like to have some information from the minister with respect to this passage in the section:

Or shall by common repute belong to or be suspected of belonging to any secret society or organization which extorts money from, or in any way attempts to control any resident of Canada by force or threat of bodily harm, or by blackmail.

Mr. CALDER: That is part of the old law. I understand that there were in Canada some years ago certain societies constituted of foreign-born people who carried on a good deal of work of that kind, and the department at that time found it necessary to put this provision in the Bill. I think one of them was a Chinese society called the "Black Hand Society" which operated in that direction.

Mr. JACOBS: The section says further that among those prohibited from coming into Canada are those who are members of or affiliated with "any organization entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government." We know that Great Britain has been a harbour of refuge to all classes of people who teach all kinds of political beliefs. They knew they would have sanctuary in England, and were always permitted by law to come there. As I understand it, Scotland Yard and other institutions of that kind were able to keep proper tab on them by knowing just where they were to be found in England. If I remember aright, the famous Russian nihilist, Stepniak and several of his followers lived in England for many years and taught their doctrines with more or less success, always under the protection of the British authorities. If we adopt this section, we shall be restricting the right of residence in this country to a greater degree than is done in England, which surely ought to be the country that we should follow in matters of this knid.

Mr. CALDER: I am not so sure, but that on account of conditions that have existed during the last year or two, we shall find the English Government changing its law in this regard.

Mr. JACOBS: By Order in Council, and only for the period of the war.

Mr. CALDER: I am not so certain of that; I think we shall find some very stringent provisions placed by the British Parliament before very long. The question is whether or not we should permit to enter Canada or to remain in Canada people who openly and violently advocate the overthrow of constitutional government as we understand it. This suggests that we should not do so, and I think we should have a provision of this kind in our law.

Mr. JACOBS: Might I point out this instance to the minister? The Bolshevist Government is the de facto Government in Russia to-day, and for various reasons, which I need not relate to the Committee, the Bolshevist Government is not very popular in this country and in some other countries. Supposing a society was formed for the purpose of overthrowing, by violence, the Government of Messrs. Lenine and Trotsky, do I understand that any person who advocates a view of that kind would be prohibited from entering Canada or if here would he be ordered to be deported from this country?

Mr. CALDER: I think the hon. member would have to take the whole section. The first part of the section reads:

Whenever any person other than a Canadian citizen advocates in Canada the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of Great Britain or Canada, or other British Dominion, colony, possession or dependency or the overthrow by force or violence of constituted law and authority.

I would think that would be in Canada. We are not particularly concerned with what the people do, say in the heart of Russia.

Mr. JACOBS: I am referring to Canada. If any person in Canada advocates the overthrow of the Bolshevik Government, what would happen?

Mr. CALDER: I doubt very much if that person would come within the scope of this section, and it is not intended that he should. It is intended to cover only those who would advocate the violent overthrow of constituted Government in this country.

Mr. JACOBS: I think the clause says otherwise:

Or the overthrow by force or violence of constituted law and authority, or the assassination of any official of the Government of Great Britain or Canada or other British Dominion, colony, possession or dependency, or of any foreign Government.

That is the part I object to.

Mr. CALDER: It is taken from the old Act, the corresponding section of which reads:—

Whenever any person other than a Canadian citizen advocates in Canada the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of Great Britain or Canada or other British dominion, colony, possession or dependency, or the overthrow by force or violence of constituted law and authority, or the assassination of any official of the Government of Great Britain or Canada or other British dominion, colony, possession or dependency or of any foreign government—

The draftsman has simply included the provisions of the old law. I cannot see any very great necessity for retaining the words "or of any foreign government."

Mr. JACOBS: No. I think that ought to be struck out. We should not forget Tennyson's words that England is a land "where girt by friend or foe a man may speak the thing he will." He ought to be satisfied if we safeguard the British Empire. Foreign governments ought to look after themselves.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not think my hon. friend's quotation was a very happy one with regard to England. It is quite understandable that England can afford to be fairly lax and fairly generous in regard to the shelter of any particular class of people even if they go to violent extremes in speech, for the reason that the British are a homogeneous people and the foreign born are not in sufficient numbers to constitute any real danger to the state. But the situation in this country, especially in Western Canada, is fundamentally different. We have immense numbers of foreigners here who are easily misled, and it is quite manifest that the doctrines of those who openly preach sedition and advocate the overthrow of organized governments by force exercise a much more dangerous influence in an atmosphere such as ours than they would in England. Therefore, I think that the first part of the section is absolutely necessary. With regard to the other part, my hon. friend asked whether it would apply to a man, for instance, who advocated the overthrow of the Lenine and Trotsky government—whether he would be allowed to come into this country. I read all through the section the words "constituted government" and I maintain, and I think my hon. friend will be compelled to agree with me, that the Lenine and Trotsky Government is not a constituted government because they obtained power by refusing to let the constituent assembly meet, and took the country by force.

Mr. JACOBS: That is the way most governments obtain power.

Mr. BURRELL: Not by force of arms—brute force—but by moral force. In this case the constituent assembly was on the point of meeting, but Lenine and Trotsky absolutely refused to let it meet, and they seized power by force of arms. I would not regard that as a constitutional form of government.

Mr. JACOBS: It is the de facto government.

Mr. BURRELL: De facto by sheer force of arms, but certainly not de jure.

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend consider that Oliver Cromwell's government was a constitutional government, when Cromwell seized power?

Mr. BURRELL: Whatever opinions I may hold in regard to Oliver Cromwell—and I cherish pretty strong ones—I think he is a long way ahead of Lenine and Trotsky.

Mr. JACOBS: As regards the manner in which he seized power, his case was on all fours with Lenine and Trotsky's.

Mr. CALDER: The suggestion of my hon. friend, as I understand it, is this: That we should not pay any attention to any person who in this country advocates the assassination of an official in South America, let us say. I am quite willing to leave it to the judgment of the Committee whether we should allow such a man to remain in Canada or not.

Mr. McMASTER: I think the minister did not quite understand what my hon. friend intended to convey. His idea, as I understood it, was that there might be some persons living in Canada, inhabitants, say, of a South American republic, who had been displaced from power perhaps by a revolution and, while in Canada, were plotting a counter-revolution to regain power.

Mr. CALDER: My hon. friend will pardon me. The section explains itself. It reads: "Whenever any person other than a Canadian citizen advocates in Canada. . . the assassination of any official of the Government of Great Britain or Canada. . . or of any foreign Government." That is, any person in Canada shall be liable to deportation who advocates the assassination of any official of any foreign Government.

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps I might give the Secretary of State another instance: One of our Allies, King Peter of Serbia, obtained power by the murder of his predecessor,

King Alexander. I have no doubt that if King Peter came to Canada he would be received in the way in which all high dignitaries are received here.

New section as proposed agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Calder, the Committee reverted to the consideration of section 2—domicile:

Mr. CALDER: I beg to move that clause 2 be amended by inserting the following proviso after paragraph (1):

Provided further that no person who belongs to the prohibited or undesirable classes within the meaning of section forty-one of this Act shall be capable of acquiring Canadian domicile.

The effect of the amendment will be briefly this: The persons we have just been speaking of, who advocate the destruction of property and the violent overthrow of constitutional governments, if they are not Canadian citizens, will not be allowed to acquire Canadian domicile so far as our right to deport them is concerned. Under the law as it now stands, once a man lives in Canada for a period of five years and acquires a domicile, whether or not he becomes a Canadian citizen, he cannot be deported.

The effect of this will be that as regards this class they shall be deportable whenever they are found, so long as they have not become Canadian citizens. If they became Canadian citizens in the ordinary way by naturalization, the only way they could be got at afterwards would be under the Criminal Code.

Bill as amended reported.

FERTILIZERS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce) Bill No. 74, to amend the Fertilizers Act, 1909, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1, subsection (c)—fertilizer.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move that the words "or lime, as carbonate, hydrate or oxide" be struck out. It has been represented by those who manufacture lime for treatment of the soil that this amendment should be made on the ground that lime is not a fertilizer, and the technical officers of the department so instruct me.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How does the minister class slag?

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Slag contains fertilizing ingredients while lime does not. Lime is used for treating certain soils, such as acid soil and what is termed "sour" land, but it furnishes no fertilizing ingredients to the soil. Slag, of course, contains phosphorous which is released and enriches the soil.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it intended that slag shall be subject to inspection and analysis under this Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. I have some further amendments to offer. In the last line of subsection (c) I move to insert after the word "ordinary" the word "untreated," so that it will read "ordinary untreated stable manure."

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I think this Act is hardly applicable to fertilizer like slag, which is not put up in factories but is carried in shiploads and in large quantities in carloads to various parts of the country. This Bill provides that every package of manure shall be subject to a stamp tax. I do not see how it can apply to material that is sold in the way slag is sold.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Slag is a fertilizer. The purchasing public must have some protection and must be assured that the slag is worth purchasing, and it is not within the power of the ordinary consumer of fertilizer to ascertain for himself whether certain slag contains fertilizing ingredients. It must be inspected. In this Bill, while it is provided that a label must be attached, it is also provided that when the fertilizer is sold in bulk the information which would ordinarily be attached to the label shall be given in the invoice.

10 p.m.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Will the definition given here of fertilizer include such fertilizers as mussel mud and shell mud, which are both used largely in eastern Canada?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: The clause, as I read it, seems to indicate that it would.

Mr. DUFF: Will it include sea manure and kelp? A good deal of that is used in my county for manure, and it would be very cumbrous and inconvenient to have to put stamps on an ox load of sea manure or kelp going from the seashore to the farm.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Fish offal and lobster shells are other material commonly used for manure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It will be found that this can only refer to fertilizer which is manufactured. If natural manure were sold in any form it would not be manufactured and the requirements of the Act would not apply. I think the section should remain as it is because the purpose of the Act is to protect the consumer or the producer. If a dealer presumes to sell fertilizer in the ordinary way it would be necessary to have it examined or inspected so that the public would know what they were getting. Kelp or any natural fertilizer might be very easily imitated and the public should be protected.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Would it not be absurd to have an analyst inspect kelp, or lobster shells which were being sold by some person to a neighbour to put on his land? The difficulty does not come in there. It has reference to the manufactured manures. It does not apply to these natural manures like mussel mud, lobster shells, fish offal and various other things that are used by the farmers. Fraud takes place where manures are manufactured.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As a matter of fact these things are not sold.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: They are sometimes.

Mr. DUFF: I know of a number of cases where men who own ox teams go to the shore, load up with kelp or sea manure, and sell it to poor widows. It would be a foolish thing to stop a man half way to his destination and weigh his load. I think the insertion of the word "manufactured" would cover it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not differ from hon. gentlemen opposite but I want the section to be effective. The suggestion made is really unnecessary as the commodities to which they refer are not dealt in.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Why not strike out the word "natural" and substitute the word "manufactured"?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would rather insert after the word "natural" the word "manufactured."

Mr. McMASTER: How could you have a natural manufactured manure?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It might be very easily manufactured by the application of some chemical. The process of manufacture might be so slight that it would hardly be recognized.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: I agree with the minister in regard to the need of the inspection of fertilizers to protect the farmers and consumers. But in this definition of fertilizer you would include mussel mud which is a natural fertilizer and we have many people in Prince Edward Island who take it out of rivers and sell it to farmers in lots of from a ton to a carload. Unless the word "manufactured" were inserted it would include all fertilizers of this kind. While it may be necessary to have manufactured fertilizers inspected to see if they are up to the standard, it is going very far to say that this sea manure shall be made subject to the provisions of this Act. It contains all the ingredients, phosphoric acid, nitrogen and potash, and if you have to put a stamp on every hundred pounds sold by the vendor to the consumer it would be simply ridiculous. I would like the minister to consider that point.

Mr. McMASTER: I would suggest that the word "natural" be struck out and the word "manufactured" substituted.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If you struck out the word "natural," that would be sufficient in itself, because the word "artificial" implies manufacture. I would therefore move that the words "natural or" be struck out; that the words "or lime as carbonate, hydrate or oxide" in the seventeenth line be struck out, and that there be inserted, after the word "ordinary" in the eighteenth line, the word "untreated." The paragraph will now read:

(c) "fertilizer" includes every artificial manure containing phosphoric acid or nitrogen or potash, except ordinary, untreated stable manure.

Mr. DUFF: Now that you are going to cut out the words "natural or" in the fifteenth line, to make the paragraph read correctly, you will have to cut out the words "except ordinary untreated stable manure."

Mr. McMASTER: If treated it becomes artificial.

Mr. DUFF: Cut that out altogether.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, that is correct. I beg to move:

That the words "except ordinary stable manure" be struck out.

The clause will now read:

The word "fertilizer" includes every artificial manure containing phosphoric acid or nitrogen or potash.

Paragraph as amended, agreed to.

On paragraph (d)—guaranteed analysis:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move:

That paragraph (d) be amended by striking out the word "nitrogen" at the end of the twenty-first line and inserting the words "ammonia and"; also by striking out the words "and lime."

The paragraph will then read:

—must be stated in terms of phosphoric acid, ammonia and potash.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Why is "nitrogen" removed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: "Ammonia" is a better known term.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is not nitrogen an important ingredient?

Mr. CHISHOLM: You do not mean to say that ammonia and nitrogen are similar?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is the same thing, and to speak of ammonia is another way of speaking of nitrogen.

Mr. McMASTER: It is a long time since I studied chemistry, but what the minister says has a strange sound in my ears.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am giving the hon. gentleman the information the officer gives me.

Paragraph as amended, agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I wish to add as subsection (h) a definition of the word "available:"

"Available" as applied to the phosphoric acid, the ammonia, or the potash stated in the guaranteed analysis, means that quantum of the total phosphoric acid, or ammonia, or potash present which is available for plant use within one year of its application to the soil.

Mr. McMASTER: Would not the word "content" be better than the word "present" in the second to last line?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the word "present" is the one ordinarily used. You may have a great deal of phosphoric acid in a fertilizer which would not be released for a long time, consequently the fertilizer would have no immediate value. The value of the fertilizer largely depends upon the rapidity with which the fertilizing ingredients are released, and it was considered desirable to have this definition.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it not very difficult to tell the time within which the ingredients, or the fertilizing properties, of any manure will be communicated to the soil? Do not the release of the fertilizing ingredients depend largely upon weather conditions—the amount of moisture, and so on?

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It has to be determined by experiments conducted by scientific men.

Mr. McMASTER: I notice that in the next clause the word "content" is used. Does that mean the same thing as "present" in the clause under consideration? If it does it is always wiser, as matter of drafting to employ the same terms.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 2—How phosphoric acid contents to be stated.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I propose to amend this section and I have sent to hon. gentlemen opposite two copies of the contemplated amendment. Since the first reading of this Bill the officers of the department have been in communication with the manufacturers of fertilizer and the representatives of farmers, and they have gone over the different clauses. I move that section 2A of the present Bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Every person before selling or offering for sale in Canada any fertilizer, shall either mark upon each package of fertilizer, the following particulars, or attach a label to each such package containing such particulars, or when the fertilizer is sold in bulk shall set out such particulars on the invoice, namely:—

1. Brand name and trade mark, if any.
2. Registration number.
3. Guaranteed analysis, stating separately: Minimum percentage only.
   (a) The percentage of ammonia.
   (b) The percentage of available phosphoric acid and the total phosphoric acid.
   (c) The percentage of potash soluble in water.
4. The name and address of the manufacturer or seller.

In the case of bone meal, tankage or other organic products, and basic slag, the phosphoric acid shall be stated as total phosphoric acid also. When leather in any form, wool, waste, hair, or any inert organic nitrogenous material, forms part of any fertilizer, the percentage of such ingredients must be mentioned in the guaranteed analysis, unless by processing the nitrogen has been made available in such materials. When potash is derived from sulphate of potash or carbonate of potash it may be so stated in the guaranteed analysis.

Mr. DUFF: Where will the manufacturer obtain the registered number?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: From the department.

Mr. DUFF: Every time he has a new brand he must send it to Ottawa to have it registered?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. I should like to have the assistance of the Committee in suitably wording this amend-

ment. For instance, I am not too well satisfied with the wording of the first part:

Every person before selling or offering for sale in Canada any fertilizer—

—shall do so and so. In many places fertilizer is frequently sold, particularly to owners of gardens, in very small packages. It is not intended that the Bill shall apply to such sales, and possibly there might in the present wording of the amendment be some limitation.

Mr. DUFF: Should not the word "manufactured" be inserted in the second line after the word "any." That is to say:

Every person before selling or offering for sale in Canada any manufactured fertilizer—

and so on.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Fertilizer is already properly defined.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: In sub-paragraph 4 of the amendment the expression "manufacturer or seller" occurs. Does "seller" have the same meaning as "agent," which is referred to in paragraph (a) of section 1, or has it the same meaning as the word "vendor" in section 9?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move to substitute the word "agent" for the word "seller" in sub-paragraph 4 of the amendment.

Mr. McMASTER: It seems to me that the word "agent" hardly connotes the idea that is intended to be conveyed. I would imagine that there are a number of merchants who deal in fertilizers but who are not agents for any special manufacturer. Is it the intention to call all such merchants agents?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The word "agent" there really has a definition in this Act.

Mr. McMASTER: I know. That is just what I am finding fault with, if I may do so without disrespect.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is so.

Mr. McMASTER: It does seem to me a great mistake to give to a word a meaning that is different from its ordinary meaning. It is bad draftsmanship, I think, to call a man an agent who is trading on his own account.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was going to suggest that the first part of that clause be amended to say:

Every manufacturer, importer or dealer.

I should like to have the sense of the committee on that amendment. It might protect a very small seller of fertilizers in the event of some violation of the Act by him.

Mr. DUFF: I do not see why you want the word "dealer" there. A dealer is a retailer.

Mr. McMASTER: I suppose the idea is that the ultimate consumer shall have protection of real value.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. I hesitate to amend the section. I am satisfied that it will be all right. I know the objection, which I suggested myself, can very validly be raised. On the whole I would prefer leaving the section as it is.

Mr. McMASTER: Could not a covering clause be put at the end, saying that this shall not have application to sales of, say, 25 lb. and under? That would cover the case where the owner of a garden went to his florist or grocer and bought some of this stuff; he would then be relying upon the reputation of the person from whom he was buying.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: After all, the administration of the Act is in the hands of officials of the department, and any prosecutions would have to be conducted by them. I would ask the Committee to let the section stand.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Departmental officials are sometimes very meddlesome. I know that prosecutions are going on in my constituency at the present time at the instance of an official who is going through the little stores and inducing people to sell a twenty-five cent package of talcum powder, or something of that kind, without affixing the necessary stamp. A case occurred the other day where a constable went into a small country store and induced the little girl who was in charge to sell him a package of talcum powder without the stamp on it. The proprietor was not present. The first he knew of it was through a summons. This is the way the Inland Revenue Department is prosecuting people through officials whose sense of duty is aroused by the prospect of pocketing a portion of the fines that may be imposed on unwitting offenders.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think revenue laws must be rigidly enforced. The cases are not analogous.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The law should be enforced by responsible officers.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. McMASTER: May I ask the minister if he has many more amendments?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are several.

Mr. McMASTER: Really I feel that I have not done justice to the clause that has just been passed. I am not satisfied with it; neither, I think, is the minister. If we have to consider a number of clauses of the same nature I do not think we should attempt it to-night. We want to pass a Bill which satisfies us, and I do not like the principle that we can pass more or less slip-shod legislation and depend upon the good sense of the officers of the Crown to use with discretion the weapon placed in their hands. As a rule I presume they do use discretion, but not always; they are frail men like ourselves. It is our duty to pass the best legislation we can, and it is the duty of the officers of the Crown to put that into effect to the best of their ability. It seems to me that it would be better to have this Bill reprinted and distributed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I must confess that I feel it is in a sense unfair to the Committee to offer so many lengthy amendments without their having had an opportunity to consider them. That was my feeling at the beginning, and as the hon. gentleman has expressed a desire that the Bill be reprinted before proceeding further, I do not feel that I can refuse his request. So I move that we rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order: Third reading of Bill No. 42, to amend the Weights and Measures Act:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Chairman, this Bill, it will be remembered, was considered yesterday and we had quite a lengthy discussion on section 7, which provides a money penalty for short weight delivery. The leader of the Opposition suggested the possibility or probability of malicious proceedings being taken against merchants or dealers selling short weight. As I explained yesterday, it is not possible to secure a conviction except through officers of the department being in a store and establishing, right at the moment of sale or immediately afterwards, the fact of the article being short in weight. If an article is purchased and is taken home, and then brought back to the store, and the purchaser asks to be relieved of his purchase upon the ground of short weight, it could never be established in any court. However, after hearing the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition and the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow), I concluded that possibly the Act might be open to abuse, and I wish to amend the clause by adding these words:—

No proceedings shall be taken under the provisions of this section except with the consent of the minister.

The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) yesterday amended this clause by providing penalties for second and subsequent offences, and in the drafting of it he used figures, and I should like to have those expressed in extenso. I move:

That the order for the third reading of Bill No. 42, to amend the Weights and Measures Act, be now discharged and that the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with power to amend the same by striking out clause 7 of the said Bill and substituting therefor the following clause:

"7. The following section is inserted immediately after section sixty-one of the said Act:—

"61. (a) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the Criminal Code, any person who sells, delivers or causes to be sold or delivered, anything by weight, measure or number, short of the quantity ordered purchased, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding twenty-five dollars for the first offence and to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars for any subsequent offence. No proceedings shall be taken under the provisions of this section except with the consent of the minister."

Motion agreed to, and the House thereupon went into Committee, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move to amend clause 7 of the Bill by striking out all the words after the word "Act" in the second line of the said clause and substituting the following:

61. (a) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the Criminal Code, any person who sells, delivers or causes to be sold or delivered, anything by weight, measure or number, short of the quantity ordered purchased, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding twenty-five dollars for the first offence and to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars for any subsequent offence. No proceedings shall be taken under the provisions of this section except with the consent of the minister.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish further to support my objection to this Bill. I am very glad that the minister is making it considerably better by throwing this safeguard around it, that a responsible minister will have to give his consent; and I suppose he will be satisfied with nothing short of substantial evidence before he will give his authority to the proceedings. The minister

states that the person who gets the short weight is expected to come back to the store and deliver up the goods and say that they are short weight. There is nothing in the Bill to that effect.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: What would happen in many cases is an entirely different proceeding. The minister is measuring the capacity of some magistrates of this country by his own honest idea of things and thinks that what he would not do himself will not be done by a magistrate. Magistrates will do the most extraordinary things. Let me point out to the minister what might happen in many cases and what will happen under this Bill if magistrates get the authority. Mr. A is dealing with a grocery where he gets his groceries from day to day, and he has a little scale in his house with which he weighs everything he buys. He runs into debt to the merchant, and one day his little girl goes to the store for, say, ten pounds of sugar and a pound of tea and the merchant says: I will not give it to you because I am tired of giving your father goods, as he is not paying for what he gets. She goes home and immediately they discover that the last pound of tea and the last pound of sugar were short in weight, and they at once proceed to lay an information against that man before some stupid magistrate who is quite willing to accept their evidence as against that of the merchant. The merchant will say: I do not remember, but according to the custom of the trade and my custom I believe I gave that girl one pound of tea and one pound of sugar; but they will swear positively with spite and malice against that man who refused to give them goods. Even if the magistrate were fairly disposed to be honest, as I will give him credit for being, what has he before him? He has the sworn testimony, perhaps of a whole family, that the weight was short, while the merchant can do nothing except depend upon the custom of the trade and his custom in dealing with people. That is the position into which this section is putting every honest man who is doing business.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I hope my amendment will prevent that.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended reported and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand that the rules of the House compel us to go back into Supply. I do not purpose asking the Committee to pass any Supply tonight.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Monday, May 12, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Return of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents in connection with the application of the Shell Transport and Trading Company for the grant of certain oil lands.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Report of Overseas Military Forces of Canada for the year 1918.—Sir Edward Kemp.

DOMINION WATER-POWERS.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 94, respecting Dominion Water-powers. He said:

The purpose of this Bill is to make a statutory foundation for the administration of Canadian water-powers in so far as those water-powers are the assets of the Dominion, and for co-operation with the provinces in the administration of water-powers that belong to them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SETTLEMENT OF RETURNED SOLDIERS UPON THE LAND.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 95, to assist returned soldiers in settling upon the land. He said:

This proposed legislation, as its name implies, is designed to assist returned soldiers in becoming settlers on land in Canada. In 1917 the Dominion Parliament passed the Soldiers' Settlement Act of that year which had the same general object in view, but the scope of whose operations was confined to lands owned by the Dominion. That is to say, the Bill did not make provision for the assistance of land settlement by soldiers, save to the extent that it provided an additional quarter-section for

each soldier, as a soldier's grant over and above his homestead rights, and to the further extent that it enabled assistance to be given to soldiers owning land by way of a loan upon those lands on the ordinary loan basis. The main purpose of the present legislation, in so far as it is additional to and beyond the Bill of 1917, is to provide a means of acquiring lands now held privately or by corporations, or indeed by governments, for the purpose of disposing of those lands to returned soldiers. A foundation for the work we are now doing under the Soldiers' Settlement Board was first laid on the 11th February last by an Order in Council which in its provisions is similar to the corresponding provisions of the Bill now introduced. However, beyond the powers which were taken by the Order in Council referred to, this Bill provides a system and machinery whereby lands may be acquired other than by agreement or purchase, viz: compulsorily and by expropriation. These expropriatory clauses contain means whereby, under a settlement area scheme, the lands that are being retarded from cultivation are set aside as settlement areas, and are thereby made subject to the compulsory provisions of the Bill. I have gone far enough to show that the measure is most comprehensive, and indeed progressive, in its character. It is, I think, the most extended and progressive federal land settlement scheme that has yet been brought to my attention. It is a Bill of considerable length and will demand much of the attention of Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SS. AQUITANIA'S PORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): I desire to call the attention of the Government, and of the Minister of Marine in particular, to a piece of news which appeared in the press last week to the effect that the SS. Aquitania would land troops in Halifax, but would not go up the St. Lawrence river as far as Quebec on account of the very heavy marine insurance rates. I would like to know if the Government intend taking any measures to remedy such a condition of things?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): I have not seen anything in the press of what the hon. member has just referred to, nor has the matter been brought to my attention. I will be very glad to look into it, and let my hon. friend know as soon as possible. I am under the impression that the Aquitania draws too much water to go to Quebec, but I am not certain of that until I have made inquiry.

RE-CLASSIFICATION OF CIVIL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CHARLES SHEARD (Toronto South): Is the Government in a position to state definitely to the House when the report of the Civil Service Commission on the subject on the re-classification of the service will be laid upon the Table?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: I am glad the hon. gentleman has asked the question, as I intended to make a very brief statement upon the matter. I received this morning a telegram from the Secretary of the Postal Letter Carriers' Association, Mr. A. McMordie, of Toronto. I shall read that telegram and my reply thereto, which I think is quite comprehensive and fully covers the ground.

I might say that rumours have lately appeared in the press to the effect that a promise was given that the re-classification would be laid upon the table of the House, or introduced into Parliament, about the first of May. That is probably true; I think I made a statement myself to that effect. When I made that statement I was firmly of the opinion that the work of the Civil Service Commission would have been so far advanced that the classification report would be in the hands of Parliament by this time. However, that work up to the present moment was not fully completed, and it was therefore an utter impossibility for the Government to present the classification report to Parliament. Other statements have appeared in the press during the week to the effect that the classification would not be presented to Parliament during the present session of Parliament, but that it would be taken up at an adjourned session in the coming autumn, or at another session. This rumour, of course, is not correct; it is proposed that the classification shall be proceeded with during the present session. The telegram from Mr. McMordie to which I referred a moment ago reads as follows:

> Much dissatisfaction amongst letter carriers, that the expectations of the Government as to Civil Service Commission report not materializing during the first week in May as promised. It is important that you give us definite statement now as to when this report will be submitted to the House of Commons.

To which I replied on May 12, as follows:

Your telegram eleventh received to-day. The work of classification by the Civil Service Commission is proceeding as rapidly as is humanly possible and nothing is being neglected to expedite this work. Classification work has taken a long time but it involved a stupendous task. The actual work is now about completed and a substantial proportion of schedules is printed. The printing is in two languages which involves also a translation but I think the printing will be wholly completed within fourteen days. On completion of printing a Bill to enact the classification will promptly be introduced into Parliament and advanced with all possible speed. I beg to assure your association that the work has been carried out with great earnestness since August last and it was not possible by any means to have had the work further advanced than it is although I was hopeful of its completion before this but I am satisfied no one is to blame for any delay. I hope your association will realize the importance and comprehensiveness of the task and await the completion of the work which is now so nearly in sight.

I would like to say further, Mr. Speaker, that at the present moment the schedules are completed in the sense that all the preliminary work is done, and all that remains to be done prior to the introduction of the measure which will enact the classification, is the translation of the schedules and the printing. As a matter of fact, a very substantial proportion of the English translation is in print now, and also a very substantial proportion of the French translation is completed; and I am hopeful, as I have already stated, that within two weeks from to-day I shall be able to introduce a Bill providing for some amendments to the Civil Service Act and for the validation of the schedules.

Now, I wish to point out to the House—because this is a subject of recent comment in the press and in some sections of the Civil Service—that the classification of the Inside and Outside Services is in all respects a stupendous task. It is the most comprehensive work of its character ever attempted by any country, and when it is finished it may well be regarded as the greatest accomplishment in this direction by any country.

The personnel of our Civil Service amounts to at least 50,000, and that is without taking into consideration the army and navy, our railway employees, the judiciary and some other branches of the public service. The classification work involved the making of 1,600 schedules, in the printing each page will take on the average about two and one half schedules, and when wholly printed it will mean a publication of six or seven hundred pages, which is quite a substantial volume. I wish also to point out that a limited staff only could be employed in this work. I think it will be quite obvious that this work could not have been assigned to an unlimited number of men without substantial variations in principle being incorporated in the work, which would be very undesirable in settling the classification.

By way of comparison I might point out that some time ago the city of New York made a classification of its Civil Service. The number of its employees was 60,000, slightly more than that of the Government of Canada, but I would imagine the work would be less complicated than our own. It took four years to complete that work, and it cost the city a great deal of money. As a further comparison I might mention the fact that a short time ago the state of New York made a classification of its Civil Service, which comprises 17,000 persons, and that took over two years. The Civil Service Commission of Canada have been employed since the first of August last in carrying out the directions given by Parliament in the Civil Service Act of last year, and I am sure every possible effort has been made and is being made to complete the work at an early date, and present it to Parliament for its consideration and, I hope, approval. With some slight knowledge of the vast deal of work which the commission has had to perform in connection with the classification I can confidently say that no complaint can fairly be made by the public or by any section of the Civil Service in regard to the time taken by the commission. However, as I stated a moment ago, I do expect that within two weeks I shall be able to present the report upon the classification of the Civil Service to Parliament and ask for approval of the same.

Before I sit down let me further point this out: When the classification with the schedules of salaries is approved by Parliament it will relate back to the beginning of the fiscal year; and if it happens that any members of the service are entitled under that classification to promotion in rank or in salary, the same will date back to the 1st of April last, and in that way no substantial wrong can be done to the personnel of the Civil Service in the monetary sense by reason of an unexpected delay of a few weeks in the completion of the work.

MILITARY SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I notice that Bill No. 91, respecting the disqualifica-

tion of military defaulters, is marked on the Orders of the Day as printed in English and French, but on sending out for the Bill I find it is not available. I wish to bring to the notice of the Acting Minister of Justice that it is desirable to have the Bill distributed as early as possible.

There is another matter I wish to draw the minister's attention to. I understand that the Military Service Act has been amended to some extent by Orders in Council. Those orders may be available to hon. members, but at all events I have not got any of them, and in considering this Bill it would be well to have the amendments so made printed and distributed for the use of members.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no desire to go on with the Bill in question until hon. members have an ample opportunity to study it. I will see that it is printed and distributed before we go on. Furthermore, the Orders in Council to which the hon. member refers are already bound with the Military Service Act, and I do not think there will be any difficulty in having them, as bound, distributed.

QUEBEC OFFICER CHARGED WITH EMBEZZLEMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): I should like to know from the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) whether a certain officer in Quebec, who was charged with embezzling about five or six thousand dollars of the public money, was prosecuted and what disposition was made of the case?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to put his question on the Order Paper. It is not a question involving policy nor affecting the country at large.

Mr. MORPHY: I might have prefaced my remark by saying that the matter is one of extreme urgent importance and one affecting the country at large, as I believe it to be.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman should put his question on the Order Paper.

OVERSEAS FORCES.

FORTHCOMING STATEMENT BY SIR EDWARD KEMP.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Overseas Military Forces): I have had the honour of laying on the table of the House to-day a report of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada for the year 1918. The report is available in the post office for members, and it is also, I believe, available for senators. I should like to absent myself from the House for about ten days or a little longer, more particularly for personal reasons, but on my return I shall be prepared to make a statement to the House with reference to the administration and operations of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada, and to touch upon those points which are of greatest public interest at the present moment.

LT.-COL. JENKINS' REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Might I ask the Overseas Minister of Militia if the Jenkins report will be laid on the table of the House?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I do not know to what my hon. friend refers. I have no such report.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did not Col. Jenkins, Medical Officer, submit to the Overseas Minister of Militia a report on the medical service overseas, and did he not go over one of the copies with the minister himself?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I would say "No" to both questions. Now that a little more light has been thrown on the matter, I might say that I appointed a committee to look into the accounting and other systems employed in the different branches of the service overseas. This committee was to advise me regarding the economies which might be introduced as regards system in the pay office, record office and various other branches of the service. The committee contemplated looking into the accounting system, etc., in connection with the medical services, and for that purpose it employed a young medical officer to make certain preliminary investigations on its behalf. Col. Jenkins, to whom reference is made by my hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), was not a member of the committee. The committee spoke to me of different matters which it had under its consideration as regards different branches of the service, and about the month of December the members of the committee informed me that they found it impossible to look into the accounting system, etc., in connection with the medical service, because one of its members was leaving for Canada at that time, and also more particularly because the war was over and the hospitals were being demobilized. And consequently no report was made by the committee.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CANADIAN WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 45, to incorporate the National Wholesale Grocers' Association, and recommending that the title of said Bill be changed to "An Act to incorporate the Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association."—(Mr. Sheard)—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 12—Committees of Inquiry:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that when the Bill was last before the Committee, the leader of the Opposition called attention to clause 11 as being undesirable, and suggested it should not have been allowed to pass by the Department of Justice. He also objected to certain features of clause 12. Upon inquiry, I find that clause 11 was struck out before the Private Bills Committee, and clause 12 was amended by striking out the words:

Upon oath (which oath any member of said committee is hereby empowered to administer).

—in the 37th and 38th lines. With that omission, which was made at the suggestion of the parliamentary counsel of the Private Bills Committee, I see no objection to the Bill from the standpoint of the Department of Justice.

Mr. McKENZIE: The objection which I took when the Bill previously was before the Committee was that it was an unusual departure to permit any private corporation doing business to establish a roving committee to travel through Canada with power to put people on oath and inquire about the particular business the corporation is concerned in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is taken out. The Committee cannot take evidence on oath at all. Not only is the portion in brackets struck out, but the words "upon oath" which precede that are also struck out.

Mr. McKENZIE: How will the section read as amended?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will read:

Such committees may examine any party who appears before them, and the evidence so taken may be used to assist the association in arriving at a decision with reference to the matter under consideration.

As the evidence is not taken upon oath, I see very little value in the clause, because any body of men in Canada may ask questions and make notes of the evidence they get on asking the questions. As long as power to take evidence upon oath is not given, they are not accorded any power beyond that which the ordinary citizen of Canada has.

Mr. McKENZIE: What struck me as unusual was that a roving committee of that kind should have the right to put people on oath and then examine them. But if this does not give them any power to swear a witness, I suppose they could send a committee around and get statutory evidence without any power at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE: With that power taken out, I suppose there is no objection to the clause.

Mr. SHEARD: As the Bill stands in my name, I might say that, according to my advice, the idea of this clause was only for the association to secure information regarding the trade, and in asking that the information be sworn to, they simply desired that it should be reliable. I have no objection to the amendment announced by the Acting Minister of Justice. The purpose will, I think, be solved by the association getting the information, their desire being only to secure reliable and accurate information.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MR. C. E. MAHON.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. What remuneration did C. E. Mahon, of Vancouver, receive as returning officer for Burrard in connection with the last general election?
2. What did he draw for expenses?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. $600.
2. None.

BUST OF THE PRIME MINISTER.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Has the Government purchased a marble bust of the Right Honourable Sir R. L. Borden? If so, what was the urgency or necessity of the expenditure therefor, during war time?
2. (a) What has been done with the said bust, and (b) how much did it cost?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. On request of the Honourable the Speaker of the Senate, Mr. A. Laliberte, sculptor, of Montreal, was authorized on June 15th, 1914, to execute a marble bust of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister

to match the marble bust of the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier already purchased by the Senate, but payment therefor was not made until delivery of the bust in October, 1915.

2. (a) Stored away for safe keeping until the Senate Chamber in the Parliament Buildings is made ready to receive it; (b) $1,500.

CHARLOTTETOWN CONVALESCENT HOME.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's):

1. What was the total cost of building, repairing, equipping and purchasing the Convalescent Home in Charlottetown, P.E.I.?
2. Was the contract let by tender?
3. If not, what did the labour cost?
4. What did the material cost?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. $261,778.66.
2. Yes.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Answered by No. 1.

NATIONAL SERVICE REGISTRATION.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. What was the total Government expenditure in connection with National Service Registration for the month of June, 1918?
2. What was the amount paid for each province?
3. What was the amount paid for each county in the several provinces of Canada?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: 1, 2 and 3. Answered by the report of the Canada Registration Board which was tabled in the House of Commons, 9th April, 1919.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Why have the accounts of Mr. D. A. Leonard, notary, the Misses Rolande Dutrissac, Clementine Dutrissac, Ninette Dion, Laure Charbonneau, Anita Lagarde, Germaine Senecal, Bernadette Dupre, Antoinette Langelier, Clara Watters, Juliette Thibault and Rose Brouillet, in connection with National Service Registration, not been paid?
2. Why have Dr. Laporte and M. Laurin not been paid for the rental of their premises in connection with the same work?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: These questions are insufficiently stated. The Canada Registration Board cannot trace names.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. When does the Government propose to pay the assistant registrars in the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm for the work which they performed in connection with National Service Registration, in the month of June, 1918?
2. Why are these accounts still unpaid?

Mr. ROWELL:

1. All unpaid accounts will be settled immediately.

[Mr. Burrell.]

2. The funds to pay these accounts were remitted registrar who failed to carry out instructions.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—SALARIES.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What increases in salary, if any, have the Government provided for the Inspectors of Weights and Measures at Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, for the fiscal year 1919-20?
2. Does the Government intend to grant the said inspectors a sufficiently substantial increase to enable them to live more comfortably.

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. The matter of increases for the present fiscal year is temporarily held over, pending the re-classification of the whole Weights and Measures Inspection Service by the Civil Service Commission.

2. The matter is now in the hands of the Civil Service Commission.

INCOME TAX ACT.

Mr. ROBB:

1. What is the gross taxable income under the Income Tax Act, exclusive of exemption for the years ending March 31, 1918, and March 31, 1919, as shown by the Income Tax Receipts?
2. What is the gross taxable income under the Income Tax Act, inclusive of exemption for the years ending March 31, 1918, and March 31, 1919, as shown by the Income Tax Receipts?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1 and 2. The information cannot be supplied as returns are filed for the calendar year and not the fiscal year of the Dominion. Income tax returns for 1918 have recently been filed and are now being examined for assessment purposes, while those for 1919 need not be filed until the 28th of February, 1920.

ALLEGED MILITARY ESCORT OF ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP.

*Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Has the Government knowledge of the fact that about fifteen soldiers under an officer armed with a revolver escorted a Roman Catholic Bishop in Toronto into a Greek Catholic Church on Sunday last week?
2. By what authority were soldiers sent on such a mission?
3. Why were soldiers sent instead of policemen?
4. What explanation can be given for the use of soldiers under such circumstances?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. I am informed that the men who followed the Ruthenian priest into the church were returned demobilized men. Therefore, the military authorities had no control over them.

DRAFTEES AND ENLISTED MEN.

Mr. EULER:

1. How many drafted men went overseas?
2. How many men volunteered for service after the Military Service Act was passed?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. 47,509.

2. The number of men who volunteered for service after the Military Service Act was passed, other than Class 1 men who came under provisions of such Act, 29,007.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Who is the Deputy Minister of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?
2. When was he appointed?
3. What salary does he draw?
4. Is he a returned soldier?
5. If not, was any attempt made to obtain the services of a returned soldier?
6. Has the present deputy minister any special qualifications which would fit him to deal with returned men and their problems?
7. What educational experience has the present deputy minister?
8. Is he familiar with principles of education?
9. Why did Mr. Sedgeworth resign from the position of Director of Vocational Training?
10. Did Mr. Sedgeworth have any disagreement with the minister or deputy minister on matters of policy affecting the welfare of returned men?
11. How many people are employed on the Publicity Staff of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and what salary is paid to each?
12. What amount has been expended by this department during the past six months for publicity purposes?
13. Is it true that only returned officers are offered the higher positions in this department?
14. Were the previous appointments held by Mr. Sedgeworth and Mr. Robinson made through the Civil Service Commission?
15. Has the position of Secretary of the Pension Board been advertised?

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. How many actions were taken against cold storage firms, companies or proprietors, for contravention of the food laws, since 1914?
2. How many complaints were made against said companies or proprietors?
3. What were the names of the firms against whom action was taken?
4. What were the punishments, fines or reprimands imposed on such firms or persons?
5. What are the details of the actions, warnings or punishments imposed on cold storage plants in Montreal, Quebec and Three Rivers during these years?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Were prosecutions authorized by the Government against parties in the Province of Nova Scotia for neglecting to place War Revenue Stamps upon packages of Proprietary or Patent Medicine before the sale thereof, as required by the War Revenue Act, 1915?
2. What person or persons were appointed to institute these prosecutions?
3. How many prosecutions, if any, were brought?
4. What solicitors were designated by the Government to conduct them?
5. What are the terms of said solicitor's appointment?
6. What was the gross amount of fines imposed?
7. In what counties in Nova Scotia were such prosecutions brought?
8. Who recommended the appointment of such prosecutors and solicitors?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

For a copy of all reports, letters, memoranda, telegrams, plans and estimates in connection with the construction of a bridge over the River Batiscan, in the parish of St. Francois-Xavier de Batiscan, Champlain County.

Mr. ROBB:

For a copy of the lease or leases granting the use of some 10,000 acres of land of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve for a term of five years from the first of May, 1918, to Charles Bird and Jacob Jonnason, of St. Peters, and Rufus Stephen Benson and Rufus Henrickson, of Selkirk.

DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 79, to amend The Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

On section 1—Ss. 2 of s. 15 amended by making outfit and equipment subject to forfeiture, and giving magistrates power to forfeit:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have redrafted this section so as to repeal the original section. I think this is a better system of drafting where the amendment is so extensive. The amendment I beg to move is as follows:—

That section 1 be rescinded and that the following be substituted therefor:

"1. Subsection two of section fifteen of the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, chapter ten of the Statutes of 1911, is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

"2. Any forest officer may seize, whether within a reserve or elsewhere, all timber, trees and hay cut or removed, all mineral or other products removed, all animals, birds and fish captured or killed, and within a reserve may seize all firearms, ammunition, explosives, spears, traps, nets, rods, lines, tackle and appliances used or found in the possession of any person without lawful authority or in contravention of any provision of this Act or of any regulation made thereunder, and may seize the outfit and all equipment used or found in the possession of any person or persons arrested for capturing or killing any animal, bird or fish."

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose that any prosecutions under this Act would be summary?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would merely suggest that in case of an appeal—and there is always the possibility, and, indeed, strong probability of an appeal from a summary conviction—although the appellant may win his case he may find his boat or his nets or fishing gear destroyed, unless we make some provision that in the event of an appeal no destruction of property shall take place until the case is finally disposed of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act as it formerly stood placed the power of confiscation in the hands of the game official. That is deemed too wide a power to be placed in his hands, and the amendment places it in the hands of a justice of the peace. Now, inasmuch as he has the power over the goods confiscated, he could, if notified of an appeal on the day of trial or at any time before actual confiscation took place, defer the disposition of the goods until the appeal was taken and heard. There are many clauses in various Acts similar to this as it will be when amended, and the head of the branch having to do with this has never encountered the difficulty the hon. member suggests. I would not like to delay the Bill. If I could consider the question without delaying the Bill I would be glad to do so.

Section agreed to.

On Section 2—Amendment to authorize granting of surface rights in certain cases in connection with mineral claims.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that subsection 3 of section 2 be amended by rescinding the words "in the holders thereof" in lines 21 and 22, and substituting therefor the following: "in the Crown in the right of the Province of British Columbia." In justice to the Committee I think the clause might be explained. As every one knows, the Privy Council decided many years ago that the royal minerals, that is gold and silver, belonged to the province of British Columbia, while the baser metals belonged to the Dominion. An arrangement was arrived at by Order in Council for the working of the baser metals by means of sale to the province of those metals. The Order in Council of 1890—for Orders in Council are as old as that—provided that the baser metals might be sold, and that any one entering, in accordance with the law of the province for mining rights in the railway belt, would have a right to a lease of sufficient of the surface to enable his mine to be worked. Then, when the forest reserves and parks were established, the difficulty immediately arose that if surface rights were alienated there, it would mean a very considerable interference with the use of the forest reserves and parks. Consequently it was provided that in the case of forest reserves and parks only a lease should be given subject to terms and conditions set down. This Bill provides for the continuance of that system, but provides also that wherever men acquired rights from the province of British Columbia prior to the establishment of the forest reserves and parks, then they might get a sale, because they would, under the previous law, be entitled to that sale of the surface rights and of the subsoil rights. Certain cases arose and were dealt with by Order in Council referred to in subsection 3, where men entered for mining rights prior to the establishment of forest reserves and at a time when they were entitled to the subsoil and surface rights by sale. This amendment enables us to do the same in future wherever men acquired their rights prior to the establishment of reserves, and ratifies the action taken in the three individual cases.

Mr. McKENZIE: What minerals are now vested in the right of the province, and what minerals are vested in the right of the Dominion? It might make the matter a little clearer if we knew what we were dealing with by these Orders in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The precious metals are the property of the province, and the baser meals belong to the Dominion. I cannot name in detail the precious metals, but undoubtedly they comprise gold, silver and copper. The main mineral that is ours is the coal, with which this Bill has to do chiefly. I am not certain as to iron, but I am of opinion that iron is a baser metal.

Mr. VIEN: Why was Order in Council No. 2156 passed vesting the mineral rights in the owners of the I. O. U., the O. K. and the Apex Mineral Claims, and what were the conditions of that vesting?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The owners of those claims, had it not been for the establishment of the forest reserves, would have been entitled under the legislation of 1890 to surface rights granted by Order in Council. But after the forest reserves were established the Justice Department decided that the legislation of 1890 applied only to lands that were held by the Crown in the right of Canada, and not the lands reserved for sale. These lands were held for sale at the time the rights were acquired,—the

time the entries were made in accordance with the legislation of British Columbia,—and consequently it was only right that men who had acquired such rights should not be dispossessed of them by the subsequent establishment of forest reserves. The legislation does not apply to any one acquiring rights after that. Circumstances arose that made it necessary to take action. I do not remember the exact circumstances, but I think there was an issue of bonds or something of that nature. The hon. member for Caribou (Mr. Fulton) could tell more definitely about that than I. It was necessary that the rights of these people to which they were entitled at the time of acquirement, should be confirmed, and this legislation confirms the action taken.

Mr. VIEN: Why is it necessary to have that Order in Council ratified by Act of Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is legally necessary at all, but it is good constitutional practice to come to Parliament and say what was necessary to be done and have Parliament confirm it.

Mr. VIEN: Order in Council No. 2156 must have been passed under some provision of the law authorizing the Governor in Council to pass it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. VIEN: That being so, I fail to see why it should be necessary to ratify it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Order in Council appointing the receiver for the Grand Trunk Pacific was passed under statutory legislation. The Governor in Council had authority to pass it; nevertheless—

Mr. McKENZIE: That is a question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —as soon as it was passed it came back to Parliament for ratification as a matter of constitutional practice. This Order in Council is in exactly the same position. It is not a legal necessity at all. Any continuing effect of the Order in Council passed under the War Measures Act has practically in law to cease upon the termination of the Act, which is upon the termination of the war. In order that its continuing effect may exist, it should be ratified by legislation. But in this case, as the effect is not in the nature of a continuing effect but rather something done, I do not think there is any legal necessity. It however is well to do it as a matter of constitutional practice.

Mr. VIEN: If I understand the minister, that Order in Council, No. 2156, was passed in virtue of the War Measures Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not quite certain of the Act. It is usual to name as many Acts as you can when you pass an Order in Council. It is very probable that it was passed under the Dominion Lands Act or the War Measures Act and any other which would be opportune. That is good practice that I commend to my hon. friend when he becomes a member of a Government.

Mr. VIEN: I think that is an eventuality that may never materialize, but before that time comes I would like to go into this matter a little farther. If, for the enactment of this Order in Council a basis had to be found in the provisions of the War Measures Act, I think this House should go more carefully into it and ascertain what is the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to the right of the owners of these mineral claims. I would like, before we pass this clause, that the opinion of the Minister of Justice on the rights of these owners be laid on the table of the House so that we may examine the matter more carefully.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There has been no written opinion given, but I have no hesitation in giving the opinion, which will now go on Hansard, that their rights are quite secure.

Mr. VIEN: The opinion of the Acting Minister of Justice that the rights of the owners of these claims are quite secure is not an answer to my question. I am now asking whether these claimants had really a right to receive from the Crown the grant of the title to these mineral claims. The minister said that they had some vested rights, and that it was only just and fair that the Crown should remit those vested rights in the surface and the minerals in the claims. It not having been provided by law that the Government should have such a right, the minister tells us now that it had probably been found necessary—without being absolutely sure of the point—to revert to the War Measures Act to find authority to pass an Order in Council with reference to the rights of the owners of these claims. I believe we should very carefully go into the question and ascertain what their rights are. The minister said that they had a right to these claims but I would like to see what their title is. I would like to know if they had a clear title to these claims and in what way their title takes priority to the title of the Government.

4 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought I explained that. These people entered their claims prior to the establishment of the reserve.

Mr. VIEN: When?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Prior to the establishment of the reserve. That is the only point of any importance. When the law of 1890 applied, it gave to the entrant of these claims, who complied with the British Columbia regulations, the right to the acquirement of the surface to the extent necessary to work the claims. That right was intact. But it had not been granted as they had not made proof and we knew nothing about it. Subsequently this Parliament establishes a reserve; that statute takes away the right, in the opinion of the Justice Department, because the law of 1890 did not apply to land unless it was held for sale. These claimants find themselves in that position when they come to apply. I do not think anything could be clearer than that it is our duty to put them in the position they were in prior to the establishment of the reserve. Is that clear to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. VIEN: Was there any provision in the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act to give to the Government authority so to do?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, that is why this legislation is necessary. It was not known at the time that there were any rights there. It only becomes known afterwards when these people apply and say that they come under the British Columbia law.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the point made by my hon. friend (Mr. Vien) as to the passage of this Order in Council is about right. The Acting Minister of Justice is usually very strong and clear in his reasoning on matters of law but I did not think he was very strong in saying that he could get a little authority here and a little there, go back to as many statutes as he liked and get an accumulation of authority, in order to pass an Order in Council. I do not think that is good law or reasoning. That is something that the courts guard against in this country. They say that your authority must be absolutely good before an Order in Council stands. It is not good in itself unless it is based on the authority of some statute. When a statute is passed giving the Governor in Council authority to pass an Order in Council in order to implement that statute, that authority is clear and is the mind of Parliament as expressed in that statute. An Order in Council cannot issue under another statute. I am sure that the Acting Minister of Justice would not say that you could travel from that statute to some other statute and get supplementary authority from it to authorize the issue of an Order in Council. Every Order in Council must be based on some statutory authority and upon that statutory authority alone. I think we should all understand that the courts and constitution of the country, as well as the English courts for as far back as we have any records, have zealously protected the rights of Parliament and the people as against overreaching authority by Order in Council. The courts have always quashed proceedings under an Order in Council unless it was solidly based upon some parliamentary authority as expressed in the statute. If the minister says that these Orders in Council in connection with the coal and mineral lands in the Northwest were based upon the War Measures Act, I would certainly say tnat the authority was not good, and that it was straining the Act beyond any conceivable understanding Parliament had when it passed it to say that it was good enough to use as a basis for making Orders in Council with respect to mineral lands in the Northwest. I hope there is some other and better authority which enabled the minister to pass that Order in Council. If he is entirely without authority, it would be better to come here with a clause in this Bill enabling the Government to pass this title to the people who have a right to get it than to tell us that there is an Order in Council to confirm something that we know nothing about. I suppose this is all right. At the same time the minister must not presume too much upon our confidence in him, and in the Government, in seeking to pass legislation without giving the proper information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend's doctrine is thoroughly sound an Order in Council is without value unless rooted, and very clearly rooted, in the authority of a statute. I hope the hon. gentleman will continue to preach that doctrine to his followers from all parts of the country. But what I said was this: That an Order might rest upon one statute, or, indeed, might rest upon two, and if, to make the Order, in the body of it two statutes are invoked, then if either one is found to authorize it the Order stands; that is all I said. Consequently, those entrusted with the responsibility of drafting recommendations and Orders in Council usually adopt the practice of in-

voking any authority that may be of assistance to support the Order intended. Therefore, it is possible that more than one statute was invoked in this case. The material before me, however, does not indicate that the War Measures Act was used, but would rather denote that it was passed under the regulatory power of the Forest Reserves and Parks Act. The War Measures Act might have been used; if it were I fancy it would be held to be a valid statute. But anyway the question does not arise now because the question before Parliament is, should these rights be granted, and should they be granted in a future case of a like character, because this legislation will confirm in any event?

Mr. VIEN: The minister told us that the Order in Council had not been passed under the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think so.

Mr. VIEN: I understood him to say so a minute ago. If the minister now corrects me on that point I am ready to accept his correction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. gentleman is wrong.

Mr. VIEN: I asked the minister whether the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act gave the Government authority to pass the Order in Council of which we are now speaking. He answered me in the negative, and that is why, it seems, legislation is now required.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Forest Reserves and Parks Act does not provide at all for the class of cases—this is what I have in mind and maybe the hon. gentleman misunderstood me—covered by this section. That is a class of cases that have arisen since the passing of the Act, viz: It has been discovered that there are certain other rights acquired before the passing of the Act which were not known to exist. The Bill does not exempt them from the provisions of the Bill providing for the creation of a park, but it is quite possible that the power of regulation comprised in the measure would enable the Governor in Council to do so. I do not say that it does not—it is quite possible it does—but whether it does or does not this legislation confirms what was done. And Parliament should consider is this: Is it proper that men who, prior to the establishment of the park, had acquired certain definite rights, should have those rights now confirmed? I do not know whether there are any other cases than the three already dealt with, but there may be others, and in my humble judgment, there is no question about the propriety of confirming the rights in those cases. It seems to me that it would be simply legislating rights away to refuse to do so.

Mr. VIEN: I quite agree, if the facts are as stated, that the owners of the mineral rights in these claims should receive back those rights. But outside of that question of fact there is a question of principle of which the leader of the Opposition was speaking a minute ago, and that is the question of the Government passing an Order in Council with no legal authority to do so, except that embodied in the War Measures Act. It is customary for the Government, when it passes an Order in Council, to recite in that Order the legislation on which it is based. Has the minister the Order in Council in this case before him?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. I have a memorandum with respect to it, but it is not definite in its terms.

Mr. VIEN: The minister has not the Order in Council before him? Then it might be enlightening to read that Order in Council in order to determine on what authority it is based. If there is no statutory authority outside of the War Measures Act to justify such an Order in Council I think it is proper for hon. gentlemen on this side to bring to the attention of the Government the fact that it should not pass an Order in Council before having the necessary legislation. The remedy which was sought by the passing of Order in Council No. 2156, could easily have waited until the Government had submitted the necessary legislation to Parliament. I think it is a sound principle of British government to say that instead of passing an Order in Council without authority under the law, the Government should apply to Parliament for that authority. The Order in Council in this case is not valid, if it is not based on statutory authority, until it is ratified by Parliament. It seems to me that instead of passing an Order in Council, without any authority for so doing, it would be a more logical policy for the Government to come to the House and ask for an enactment that would provide the necessary remedy. In that way they would avoid having recourse to an illegal Order in Council. Surely, those who consented to the War Measures Act never thought that it would

be taken advantage of for the passing of such an Order in Council as the one we are now called upon to ratify.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 3—power given to expropriate lands for park purposes:

Mr. HAY: With respect to the expropriation of Indian lands. As I understand it, the Indians hold these lands at the present time by virtue of a treaty with the Government, and under the present Bill the minister is taking the right to expropriate Indian lands for park purposes, or other purposes if necessary. I would like to ask if the Government has a right to do that without the consent of the Indians?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There could be no question, I think, as to the right of Parliament to do that generally speaking. As to the expediency of such a course, I should give an opinion in the negative. That is to say, Parliament would be very careful indeed not to adopt any general policy of expropriation as to Indian reserves. Under the present law it is necessary to establish expropriatory powers for Indian reserves. For railroad or public works purposes, or even for roads, that power exists to-day; the only question that arises is, should the power be extended to cover the case of necessary additions to parks? There is a case in point at the present time: An island in the St. Lawrence near the town of Morrisburg in which a certain Indian tribe acquired rights about a hundred years ago. My information may be wrong and I hope the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Casselman) is present, but I understand that no one has been living on that island for years; it has been used by some company, although I do not wish to speak with too great certainty. However, it is very desirable in the public interest that it be acquired for park purposes. I think I am safe in saying that any title the Indians may have is rather cloudy, but whatever interest they may have they will be amply compensated for and there will be no loss to the tribe. There is a very strong desire on the part of the Parks Branch and on the part of the public most nearly concerned that this island be acquired and made a bird sanctuary and park. That is most clearly the purpose it should be used for, but unless the amendment is made wide enough to cover it no action can be taken to that end.

I wish to assure the hon. member and the House generally that in my judgment

Parliament should be very cautious, indeed, in passing expropriatory legislation applicable to Indian Reserves. I have had occasion to give some thought to the question in relation to another measure, and where the expropriation is for merely general purposes—farming and the like—I question very much whether Parliament should pass such legislation; but inasmuch as this is not of a general character, and cannot be said to be an invasion of Indian Reserves in any substantial sense at all, I do not think we should hesitate to enact the legislation.

Mr. CANNON: How many Dominion parks are there now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not prepared to say how many there are. There are a considerable number in the various provinces, and there is an intention to increase the number. The value to the country of these parks is becoming more and more obvious as years go by. The amount of money left in the country because of their existence runs now into millions of dollars annually.

Mr. VIEN: The Government is now asking for power to expropriate. Has the Government any definite policy as to the lands that it will expropriate in the near future?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only case touching Indian lands is this island. It is a small island in the St. Lawrence—I do not know just the size of it. That is the only case we have in mind at the present time.

Mr. VIEN: Would it not be better for the Government to specify the land and to come before Parliament each time it wants to expropriate? The matter is never of such an urgent character that we could not wait until the next session of Parliament before such power is granted, and then the House and the country at large would have an opportunity to give their reasons why such expropriation should not take place in the ordinary course.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Parliament will have that opportunity. If the power is right, that is a question of principle; but the particular appropriation would be decided when the Estimate for it is before the House. Even though this Bill pass, the question of expropriating this particular island will come up when the item for its expropriation is before the Committee in the Estimates. Therefore each individual case must necessarily come before Parliament.

Mr. VIEN: I submit that the remedy would be insufficient. We give the minister, by this section, the right to expropriate. As soon as he takes the land it will come under the Expropriation Act. What are the provisions of the Expropriation Act? As soon as the Government has deposited a plan of the land it is desired to expropriate, the title becomes vested in the Crown. It is not a question of payment; that question comes up later on. It is true that when the time shall have come to pay for such expropriation the minister will introduce his Estimates and will ask for the necessary amount; but the expropriation will have taken place in virtue of the present section. I do not believe that the Committee should agree to give the Government the power to expropriate right and left any land that it may desire for the purpose of Dominion parks, particularly Indian reserves and the Crown lands of the various provinces. This section gives expropriatory powers over lands in the possession of His Majesty in the right of the provinces. I do not think that such wide jurisdiction should be given to the Government, but rather that it should submit at every session its programme for park development. Hon. members will then have an opportunity to state their objections against such a policy, and I hope that on many occasions they will be able to convince the Government of the inadvisability of many of these expropriations. For my part I would strike that clause out.

Mr. CANNON: For what purpose are those Dominion parks established?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For Dominion parks.

Mr. CANNON: What is the purpose of a Dominion park?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that any words could do other than obscure the very plain meaning of the term "Dominion parks."

Mr. CANNON: We have a Dominion Park in Montreal, for instance; that is for amusement purposes. I suppose the minister is not establishing parks for amusement purposes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really think the hon. member understands what a park is for as well as I do. I hope he does not question me as if I were the father of something that is improper. These Dominion parks were established many years ago, virtually all that are established now, under a Government to which the hon. member was not at all unfriendly. But our Dominion parks are for the purpose of instruction, amusement and recreation, for the purpose of attracting tourists, for sightseeing, and all such purposes. For example, we have one park where there are now between three and four thousand buffalo—the only herd of wild buffalo in the world. I do not know that one could say that it is purely an amusement to watch our wild buffalo; it is instructive and highly interesting.

Mr. CANNON: It is also dangerous.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then we have our Rocky Mountain parks where tourists gather. A golf course has been established and is being very much improved. A vast amount of money is being collected from those best able to pay it. With reference to what the hon. member has said, every expropriation is just on the same footing as this. For instance, under our Expropriation Act now, for any building we wish to erect, we can expropriate, but no one would ever suggest that we must come to Parliament and have a Bill passed enabling us to expropriate each lot that we may want in each town in Canada. No one knows better than the hon. member how much time is taken in getting Bills through Parliament and how much time is wasted. I do not think Parliament would ever get through its work if for every piece of land the Government wanted, it had to come to Parliament with a Bill. We take the general power and then each case must be passed upon by Parliament in the Estimates. That has been the practice for decades, and there is no variation here.

Mr. PARENT: Are there any such parks in Quebec, or Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I am safe in saying that there are Dominion parks in all of the provinces named. I cannot say that I am familiar with each case. I know that at present we have in contemplation the establishment of a park at Annapolis Royal in Nova Scotia. I think that last session a Bill was brought down that had to do with the establishment of a bird sanctuary on the St. Lawrence in Quebec. That is of course, a park.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On Bonaventure Island.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The park at Annapolis Royal is a very small one; it is just a bit of historic ground near the town of Annapolis. If the minister is going into the park business, there are in Nova Scotia places where it would be of great advantage to have a public reservation of

land for that purpose. These lands in western Nova Scotia and also in eastern Nova Scotia belong to the provincial Government. There is not very much timber on some of them, but there are lakes and streams and many beautiful spots are to be found. I do not see why Nova Scotia should not, as well as the Western Provinces, participate to some extent in this expenditure on parks. I could show my hon. friend a place in western Nova Scotia where a large block of land could be expropriated from the province at a very small price, for a Dominion park. In my constituency, there is a tract of 20,000 acres of hardwood, such as birch, maple and beech, not valuable as timber at all, but the whole area is dotted with lakes and streams and would be a magnificent place for recreation and fishing and for the preservation of game. I should like the minister to look into this matter. I am in favour of public parks. I think the reservations we have made at Banff and other places in Western Canada are an advantage to us all, and we are very proud of them. At the same time, I think Eastern Canada should, to some extent, participate in that expenditure, and as the minister has taken power to expropriate lands belonging to the provinces, it would be quite possible to take this strip under this Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member is quite right that it would be to the advantage, not only of Nova Scotia, but of the Dominion, if in his province any property more suitable for park purposes than any other were made a park. I just happened to mention Annapolis Royal because only this afternoon the subject was brought to my attention. This, however, must be kept in mind, that while the establishment of parks has gone on with to a considerable degree in the West, that is attributable chiefly to the fact that the Dominion owned these lands in the West and did not need to acquire them. Consequently, the cost of establishment of parks was not so great. My province of Manitoba, although we owned the lands, has no Dominion parks, nor, I believe, has Saskatchewan. Alberta has, and quite a large area of that province is set aside, and very properly so, for Dominion parks. British Columbia, which owns its resources, has acquired property for a park on Vancouver island, and a provincial Government which owns its own resources could give great assistance to the establishment of parks by making provision for the land. I do not attach very great importance to the clause giving us power to expropriate provincial Crown lands. I presume it is intended for small pieces of land perhaps essential as an addition to a present park. Certainly, I would hesitate before utilizing this power as applied to provincial Crown lands.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I suggest to the minister that this clause appears more drastic than it is in reality after the explanation given by him? As regards bird sanctuaries, I have a personal knowledge of what took place during last year regarding legislation on that subject which was brought down at a former session. In that case, the Dominion Government sent one of the officers of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Hewitt, to Quebec, and by making arrangements with the Department of Crown Lands, he obtained, without any expropriation taking place, the control of Bird Rock and part of Bonaventure Island and also Perce Rock, as bird sanctuaries. If the minister leaves in the Bill this expropriatory power he may create the impression that he may really expropriate what belongs to a province, when it is a matter of arrangement between this Government and the provincial Government. The minister should, therefore, find other phraseology which would cover the point. I understand that, as regards the Indians, the Government proceeds by way of expropriation, and in that case the Government is proceeding against its own wards, but with the provinces the matter is different. I am not referring to the western provinces, where the lands belong to the Dominion, but to the provinces where the lands belong to the provinces, as with the Crown lands in Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. CANNON: The Federal Government has no right to expropriate provincial property. In the British North America Act property belonging to the Federal Government is enumerated, and property belonging to the provincial governments is enumerated. His Majesty, as representing the provinces, owns what is enumerated in that list. and I do not think the Federal Government could take expropriation proceedings against the provinces. I think the minister will admit that the Federal Government, in the name of His Majesty, certainly could not take proceedings against His Majesty as represented by a provincial Government. The minister said he did not want to be suspected of any evil designs or of being the father of a very bad scheme. Personally I have never suspected him of anything of that kind, for he is above suspicion, and always has been. He has never

given the Opposition any reason to suspect him. This Bill is very important in a way. In the province of Quebec, for instance, parks have already been established by the Provincial Government; there is the park in the county of Charlevoix. Suppose that under this section the Federal Government decided to establish a national park where this provincial park now is, would the minister claim that this section gave him the right to expropriate? It would lead at once to a clash between the Federal and Provincial Governments. I have noticed a general tendency in all legislation brought down by the minister to infringe upon provincial rights, and this certainly would be such an infringement. I submit, this section is absolutely unconstitutional, because it gives the Federal Government the right to expropriate the property of the provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not like to subscribe to the hon. gentleman's law. It seems to me that expropriatory power now exists with regard to provincial lands, with relation to a railway, for instance. But as a matter of general principle, not of law, but of practice, I am in accord with the hon. member. My attention had not been specially drawn to these words in the Bill previously. I rather apprehend that the province of Ontario may also have some interest in the island in the St. Lawrence to which I referred, that interest being mixed with or added to the interest of the Indians, and it is likely that that was in the mind of the draftsman of the Bill. I would not like to exercise the power of expropriation so far as the interests of the province are concerned, but I do not think it could be said to be interfering with provincial rights to the alarming extent the hon. member would have us believe; for you may depend upon it that any province in the Dominion would be very glad for us to expropriate lands in the province for the purpose of a Dominion park. At the same time, I do not think we are going to suffer by leaving out the clause providing for the expropriation of provincial lands, and I therefore move in amendment:

That the words "whether it be that of His Majesty in the right of any province, or of the Indians" be deleted and the words "including the lands of Indians" be substituted therefor.

Then, if we cannot make an arrangement with the province there will be no park.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You can always make an arrangement with a province in a matter of public interest. The minister has referred to an island that is in dispute as between the Indian reserve and the province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Indians have some right in it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We have a similar case in the province of Quebec. There is a small island in front of the Caughnawaga reserve which is claimed by the Indians as part of the reserve, and which is claimed also by the provincial Government. There has been quite a dispute over it, and I am not quite sure but that a judgment concerning it was given recently.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT. SEXUAL OFFENCES.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Acting Minister of Justice) Bill No. 78, to amend the Criminal Code (Sexual offences) was read the third time and passed.

MIGRATORY BIRDS CONVENTION ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 88 (from the Senate), to amend the Migratory Birds Convention Act, was read the third time and passed.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. J. A. Calder (Minister of Immigration and Colonization) Bill No. 52, to amend the Immigration Act, was read the third time and passed.

JUDGES' ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Acting Minister of Justice), the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Judges' Act to provide for the salary of an additional judge of the County Courts of British Columbia at $3,000 per annum.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to bring to the attention of the minister and the Government the altogether inadequate salaries paid to judges not only of the County Court but also of the Supreme Court of British Columbia. Speaking at present particularly in reference to the County Court judges, this is a matter that has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice on many occasions, and we have

frequently had promises of consideration and expressions of much sympathy, but very little action. I should be pleased to have an expression of opinion from the Acting Minister of Justice on the subject, and also a statement as to the possibility before the conclusion of the session of an increase in salary of the County Court judges. The County Court judges in the city of Vancouver sit constantly and do considerable work, and I remember having given to the Minister of Justice a statement showing that 365 cases were being handled by two judges in the course of a Fall session. That is an exceptionally heavy list, including some highly important cases, the money involved in some cases amounting to a good many thousand dollars and much higher than in cases tried in some of the other courts in Canada. A salary of $3,000 is not sufficient for a County Court judge, and I would like the minister to give us some idea as to the intention of the Government in this regard.

Mr. McISAAC: I wish to say a word on this point with regard to the judges of Prince Edward Island. The Supreme Court judges there are receiving $300 a year less than similar judges in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The duties of a judge in Prince Edward Island are just as important and require just as much intelligence, application, and every other qualification demanded of like judges in the other provinces. In Prince Edward Island there are only three judges while in the other provinces there is a much larger number, and because there are fewer judges in the Island they have just as much work and probably more. At the same time there exists this anomaly, that the County Court judges are receiving the same amount of salary in Prince Edward Island as those in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and other provinces. Why should the Supreme Court judges be penalized? I just wish to bring this matter to the attention of the minister as perhaps he might consider an increase in the salaries of these judges.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: The hon. member (Mr. Stevens) spoke of 365 cases. That is an exception and might not occur again in several years. The question is, what is the average? As regards the proposal to increase these judges salaries, I understand the judges pay no income tax. Surely a judge receiving $5,000 to $7,000 should have sufficient interest in the State to pay an income tax.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), supported by the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., (Mr. McIsaac) urges the wisdom of increasing the salaries of County Court judges. The necessity of an increase of salary to County Court judges has been impressed upon the Government ever since I assumed the office of Acting Minister of Justice, and doubtless some time before that event, which is now six months old. The question is not confined to County Court judges. If there is any class of judges in Canada for whose cause there are not ardent advocates for an increase of salary, I have yet to learn what bench it is. Every bench in the Dominion, I think, has had its case advanced and urged, deputation after deputation having waited upon myself and other ministers, and the subject generally has been canvassed most thoroughly in recent months. There are several features of the problem that might be brought to the attention of the Committee. In the case of County Court judges the income now received for their duties is not uniform by any means. The senior judge is entitled to certain emoluments and the junior judge also in a somewhat lesser scale. So that while $3,000 is the nominal salary, there are cases where even that salary is increased, those cases being chiefly in large cities.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think that applies to the County Court of British Columbia. That is the peculiar position they are in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are cases where that is not the nominal salary, but in nearly all cases, I think in all, the emolument is raised above the nominal salary by Surrogate Court and other fees.

Mr. STEVENS: Not in Vancouver.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is. That is worth inquiry on the part of the hon. member. Perhaps I am wrong. But generally, if not universally speaking, it is, and the total emolument is brought to something within the range of $4,000, and in some cases even somewhat beyond that. When I considered the question this fact presented itself to my mind, that by reason of the system which the British North America Act laid down—constitution of the office by the province, and appointment and salary made and paid by the Dominion—there had grown up a condition by which there were far too many judges, particularly of our county courts and district courts. I addressed a communication to the Attorneys General of the several provinces, intimating that such was the case and asking that they

give attention to the question of so rearranging the judiciary as to provide for an ultimate reduction of the number of County Court judges. The province of Ontario has responded, and I believe a statute is now in force by which the junior judges will be almost entirely done away with upon retirement or death of the present holders of those offices.

Other provinces have now under consideration—whether it will be favourable or not I cannot say—something along the same line. I am in hopes that the process will become more and more all Canadian before it ceases, because, if it becomes general enough, the problem of judicial salaries will be more easily solved. As a consequence of my convicion that there were too many judges, particularly on that bench, I have not felt it my duty as acting minister to recommend the filling of certain vacancies that now exist. Furthermore, coming to the other bench, the King's Bench, as it is usually called, the Supreme and superior courts in other provinces, a condition of affairs obtains that has caused considerable irritation. In the Maritime and Western Provinces the salaries of judges in these courts are something less than they are in Ontario and Quebec. That condition is accentuated in the province of Prince Edward Island. Whether or not there was originally justification for that discrimination may be open to question. It would appear to be arguable that there was. But, at all events, the reason for that discrimination has, in my opinion, become progressively less as these other provinces have developed and as the litigation that comes before the judges of these provinces has become more and more technical, more considerable in amount and more varied as to the questions of law presented. That is a matter that hon. members will have to keep in mind in discussing the problem. It appeared to me to be my duty to collect all the facts available, to put them into presentable, terse and tangible form, and to leave the problem in general for the consideration of the minister of the department (Mr. Doherty) upon his return. It has not been known until now—it is not known now—when that return will be possible, but there is no reason to fear that it will be so long deferred as to put it out of his power to deal with this question favourably or unfavourably this session. If his opinion on his return is that he cannot deal with the question this session, as he may be advised, then I do not think I should enter upon its consideration in a practical way because it seems to me to be one that eminently is for the consideration of the minister himself. Should it transpire that he will not be able to return for the subsequent portion of this session, then it will be for the Government to decide whether or not the problem should be dealt with on the recommendation of the acting minister.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Do not the county judges, in addition to their salaries, earn considerable emoluments from commissions and special investigations which would in themselves average a pretty good salary?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I referred to in my remarks. I do not think much is made out of commissions or investigations. The extra amount which I referred to was that which they actually received from Surrogate Court fees. The hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) says that that does not apply in his province. He may be correct but, generally speaking, it does apply.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Do they not act as commissioners, or conduct special investigations, and do they not earn something in that way?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There have been Superior and county court judges, I suppose, who have acted in that way, but the earnings of a single judge from that source would not do very much for the other men who had not been favoured with these investigations.

Mr. ARGUE: Will this resolution apply to the appointment of judges in Saskatchewan? There are several vacancies, and some of them should be filled.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, this resolution refers only to the province of British Columbia and follows the provincial enactment which constitutes the judicial district of Nanaimo. It appears that the extent of territory there is such that it cannot be attended to by one judge, particularly in view of the very great increase in population and the development of coal mining in the northern part of the district. This resolution does not refer to Saskatchwan. Letters were addressed to the various provinces asking them to consider the question of reduction. I am in hopes that these letters will still be fruitful in the case of Saskatchewan to enable the present judges appointed to be so distributed as to take care

5 p.m.

of the vacancies to which the hon. member refers.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I would like to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Justice to the discrepancy between the salaries paid to Superior Court judges in the western provinces and those paid in the East. Whatever ground there may have been for that distinction when it was created I cannot see that there is any reason for it now. The western provinces are provinces. The standard of the legal profession in the West will compare very favourably with that of the other provinces. It seems to me that the questions involved in litigation are just as important in the West as they are elsewhere. It is not altogether a question of the amount of time that the judges devote to the performance of their duties in the various provinces. Once these men are appointed they cannot or should not engage in any other business. They are absolutely deprived of the right of practising their profession. In short, the whole of their time must be devoted to carrying on the business of their positions as justices of the Superior court. On behalf of the western bench, I submit that this difference in salary which has existed for some time should be straightened out at once and that all the judges of the superior court throughout the Dominion of Canada, irrespective of province, should be placed upon the same footing. I would like very much if the acting minister would take this matter into his earnest and careful consideration this session and see if he cannot remedy that discrimination and put all these judges on an equal footing. I am sure that all the members of this House would be very glad to have the acting minister review the situation in regard to judges' salaries throughout Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish once more to bring to the notice of the acting minister what we have been advocating here for a number of years. I remember in the old days of the Laurier Government we used to talk about this subject just as much as we do now, and we used to advocate an increase, particularly in the salaries of the county court judges. Within the last few years we have often brought this matter to the attention of the present Minister of Justice.

I can readily understand that the Acting Minister of Justice would hesitate before starting a new policy as to the increase of salaries; but I think the minister himself (Mr. Doherty) was several times inclined seriously to the advancement of the salaries of the County Court judges, and I think last year he was very much disposed to augment those salaries. The reason now given by the acting minister for not adopting such a course is that there is a tendency to a re-organization of the districts and of the courts, and to have a smaller number of judges. That re-organization may come about, but it may be a very slow process, and it may result in great hardship to those judges who have been struggling along for a great many years on small salaries. The high cost of living affects a judge just as much as anybody else. Civil servants have been granted an increase, those engaged in the ordinary industries of the country are getting their salaries raised; nearly everybody in fact has had his stipend raised. Ordinarily speaking, men can engage in other branches of work in order to add to their salaries; but under our laws the judge is told that he cannot and must not engage in any other pursuit. He is not even allowed to be a director of a board where he can be paid $20 a month, or something of that kind; he is not allowed to engage in anything except the administration of the law. That is as it should be, but when we cut off every other source of supply to a man and demand his entire attention and the whole of his powers in the administration of the law, the responsibility devolves upon us of giving him a sufficient salary, we should see to it that he is placed beyond necessity and beyond poverty. Now we have not added a cent to the salary of the judge, although the purchasing power of a dollar has been cut in two. It is therefore a matter of serious consideration for the Government, and particularly for the Minister of Justice, to see that these judges are properly provided for. I need not tell the Acting Minister of Justice, or the Committee, what a serious and important thing it is that our judges should be put beyond covetousness, or the temptation of looking for money elsewhere. We can say the same thing for our judges in every part of Canada that we can say about our own judges in Nova Scotia, that not a shadow of impropriety has crept in in connection with the administration of justice. We have always been proud of our judges in Nova Scotia, who are absolutely beyond suspicion, and I am sure the same thing is true of the judges of every other province. We should provide for the continu-

ance of that condition as far as we can, by giving a proper salary. Would it not be possible for the Department of Justice for the present to relieve the situation by adding to the salaries of these judges, and then, under any policy of re-construction those Judges who are superfluous might go out, such arrangements being made for them as might meet the necessities of the case? If we wait for re-organization too long a period may elapse before a remedy is provided, and a great deal of unnecessary hardship may have been suffered by these gentlemen. I trust that the department—when the minister returns to this country, or even before that— will be able to meet the need in these very important cases.

As regards my own province it contains eighteen counties and there are only seven county court judges, so that I do not think there would be very much chance for reducing the number of judges in Nova Scotia. There may be, but I think all the judges are pretty well employed. The county court judge in my own locality, that is district No. 7, is a very busy man, working continuously and without any let-up at all. Every day there is some case being tried before him, and yet he only receives the very meagre salary of $3,000. He is obliged to live in the city of Sydney, where living is just as expensive as in Toronto, Montreal, or any of the large centres, and hon. gentlemen can readily understand how difficult it is for a man to live in a city where everything is dear on a salary of $3,000, and yet be obliged to live in the style, and with the surroundings for himself and his family that a judge must maintain in order to do credit to the position which he occupies. I do not know very much about the conditions in other provinces, but as to the Nova Scotia judges supplementing their earnings from any other source, that is not possible; they get nothing out of probate business, and no other income besides their bare salaries. The Acting Minister of Justice is aware that there is an agitation in respect of the Supreme Court judges as well as the County Court judges in Nova Scotia. We in Nova Scotia pride ourselves on being a very old province, and one which has been noted for the very high status of the judges in our Supreme Court. They are men very highly versed in the science of the law, and we have a Bench to-day that is the equal, man for man, with any other set of judges in the country. I say that without the desire to cast the slightest reflection on any other court.

I am sorry to know that the judges of Nova Scotia are not paid the same salaries, for example, as the judges of Manitoba. Now we are a very much older province and of equal importance in every respect—not any more, but just as important—and I cannot very well see why a judge of the Supreme Court of Manitoba should be receiving a larger salary than a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the judges in the Maritime Provinces and in the Western Provinces should receive the same salary.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Chief Justice of Manitoba receives $8,000 a year—

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal.

Mr. McKENZIE:—and the puisne judges receive $7,000 a year. Of course, there are two courts in Manitoba, whereas in Nova Scotia there is but one. That is to say our Supreme Court in Nova Scotia does the work which two courts do in Manitoba; we have only the one set of judges for the Court of Appeal and for the Circuit Court. In New Brunswick, and in the other provinces, there is a Circuit Court and a Court of Appeal; in Nova Scotia the judges do the Circuit Court work, and also constitute themselves a Court of Appeal. I think that is a reason why they should be paid a higher salary. The minister will see, if he compares Manitoba with Nova Scotia, that the population is about the same; I think ours is a little more; and if he will inquire into the amount of legal business, I think he will find that there is more of it in Nova Scotia. As to the expense of the administration of justice, the minister will find that if he makes inquiry that the same work is costing at least about thirty per cent more in Manitoba than it is costing in Nova Scotia. I think our judges should be put upon the same footing as the judges of the Superior Court of Quebec and the Superior Court of Ontario, and be paid the same salary. I know of no justification at all for the difference. The laws are about the same throughout the whole Dominion —certainly the criminal laws are exactly the same, and commercial law is about the same—and if the amount involved in the cases that come into court is to be taken into consideration the biggest case that was ever tried in Canada was heard in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. That was the famous lawsuit between the Dominion Steel Company and the Dominion Coal Company before they amalgamated. I do

not know how many millions of money were involved in the suit, but it is the largest case that was ever tried in the Dominion. Large cases of that kind come up all the time and require the very best legal talent that we can produce in the province.

I think the minister will approve my statement that the province of Nova Scotia has produced some very excellent lawyers—in fact, this House will bear me out. Sir John Thompson, at one time Minister of Justice and Prime Minister, was one of our judges of whom we have good reason to be proud, and our present Prime Minister, who is a very excellent lawyer, is also a native of Nova Scotia. The judges of our Supreme Court are men of the highest possible eminence in their profession, and I do not think they should look upon themselves as being inferior to other judges serving the same Government and doing similar work in the other provinces. There is no other way of looking at it—the clear implication is that the Government thinks they are not deserving of the same salary, otherwise they would receive it. I am not aware if the minister has any scheme in view for dealing with the salaries of Supreme Court judges throughout the country as well as with those of the County Court judges, but I think he should hasten to see that there is no disparity in their salaries and so remove any ground for complaint in that regard. I am sure that as long as our people find the administration of justice as pure and capable as it is now they will not begrudge the payment of proper salaries to their Supreme Court judges.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to correct a mistaken impression of the Acting Minister of Justice. The County Court judges of British Columbia—in fact, all the judges—receive no Surrogate Court fees. Their position is not only unfair in comparison with the salaries paid to judges in other provinces, but the difference is accentuated, and I desire to impress it as strongly as possible upon the attention of the minister. I would also remind him of the fact that the benchers of the Law Society of British Columbia recently filed a very strong indorsement of the suggested increase of salary, and I hope the matter will not be left over another session, even if the Minister of Justice should not return during this session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Committee should not get the impression that because the judges in certain provinces do not get surrogate court fees there is on that account discrimination against them; that is far from the case. The Dominion fees are the same everywhere. But if the province of Ontario decides, for example, that instead of having other officials appointed at salary to do surrogate court work they will appoint a Supreme Court judge to do it and pay him a thousand dollars a year, that adds that much to his salary; if British Columbia, as against that decides to appoint separate officials, that is British Columbia's own affair.

Mr. STEVENS: That is scarcely a good argument. For this reason: The Dominion pays the Supreme Court judges for services rendered; the time of those judges is fully occupied in their court work and they have no time for outside work now, if one of those judges gives a portion of his time to the province in return for a salary provided by the province, and the rest of his time to the Dominion, the minister cannot argue that the other judges have only themselves to blame if they do not receive additional pay. Their time is fully occupied in court work—more than occupied in many cases. But in Ontario and some of the other provinces the Supreme Court judges give a portion of their time to other duties.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Surrogate court work is court work just the same as any other similar work is court work. No case has been brought to my attention where the Dominion has refused to appoint sufficient judges to take care of the work. It is the province's own affair if it gives to other people work that is properly judges' work; and that province cannot be heard then to complain that its judges are not treated fairly by the Dominion because we do not give more salary to them, for the same salary is paid to all Supreme Court judges.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend still argues that they get surrogate court fees, we must not run away with the idea that they are getting more than $3,000. I say that our British Columbia judges get $3,000 and no more, and that that salary is inadequate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be, but that is entirely aside from the point of discrimination. There is no discrimination whatsoever; we pay all our Supreme Court judges the same salary.

Mr. STEVENS: It is not discrimination if the Dominion gives them a good salary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is another ground altogether. We pay them all the same sal-

ary. If the province does not add to their salaries for additional court work, but appoints other persons for the purpose, then that province cannot be heard to complain against the Dominion that we discriminate against its judges. There is no ground for any allegation of discrimination. I am not saying that there is no ground for an allegation of inadequate salary.

Mr. VIEN: Does the minister think it sound policy to allow Federal judges to discharge other duties than those the law has fixed for them, such as surrogate work on account of the province? It seems to me that the judges appointed by the Federal Government should be limited in their functions as described by the statute, and should not be allowed to exercise any other functions and receive therefor emoluments from the provinces. As a policy it seems to me it should commend itself to the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A judge is appointed to do such work, necessarily of a legal or judicial character, as may be assigned to him by the Dominion or by the province. If the province assigns to him certain work, it is his duty under the Act to perform it. To say that he should not do anything except what the Dominion gives him to do—I scarcely understand those terms.

Mr. VIEN: I will explain them. Jurisdiction in the organization of the various tribunals is vested in the local legislatures. When the organization of a tribunal is effected by a provincial Act, the Federal Government appoints the judges. We fix the salary and we pay it. We should pay judges such salaries as will make them independent of any other influence and allow them to live without having to exercise any other functions for which they would receive pay from the provinces.

Mr. PROULX: My hon. friend is not familiar with the practice in Ontario. In Ontario, the judges are well qualified to deal with Surrogate Court work, and in most counties the fees would not be large enough to warrant the appointment of a separate judge for that particular work. As the Acting Minister of Justice said, Ontario amended the County Court Judges' Act last year, and in future County Court judges will receive $1,000 from the province as compensation for their services in doing Surrogate Court work and work under other statutes. There are certain large counties, such as York, Carleton and Wentworth, in which the judges will receive more than $1,000. I am not familiar with the position of County Court judges in other provinces, but in Ontario, after the junior judges are done away with, County Court judges will receive from the province at least $1,000, which will increase their salary by so much.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Making $4,000 all together.

Mr. ARGUE: If the minister finds it impossible to make an arrangement with the Saskatchewan Government to redistribute the judges to cover the vacancies, will he recommend the appointment of judges for those vacancies? There are, in the southwestern part of the province, two new districts, and Cypress, which is the seat of a district a hundred miles square, has only two terms of the court per annum. People are compelled to come into the town and stay for weeks waiting for trials, and on the other hand Judge Smith, who goes over from Swift Current, has more than ninety miles to travel by auto, and if the roads are bad in the winter, he has to travel 270 miles to get around by train. Therefore, I do not think the Government are saving any money and these people are being greatly inconvenienced by not having a resident judge in that district.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be useless on my part to make a promise, because it is probable I shall not be acting in this capacity at the time for its fulfilment. I am not sure, at all events, whether Saskatchewan will be able to make the redistribution which has been suggested to me, although I have some reason to hope it will. But if it should not, there is an alternative. A subjudicial district might be named which would give the district affected, if in an outlying part, such an organization, with perhaps only one officer, as would enable it to secure a more prompt and less expensive service of process and so on. That has been suggested as likely to take place in at least one province, thereby overcoming much of the difficulty. If that should be done in Saskatchewan, the hon. member's point will be met, but if no other way—and this Government is not by any means sole dictator of the situation—is opened up by the province whereby this can be taken care of without appointing new judges, and if a district needs a judge, certainly a recommendation will be made. I understand there is very considerable inconvenience now which might be avoided by a better redistribution of the judges by the creation of a subjudicial district, but if that is not done, then it seems that a recommendation will have to be made.

Mr. McKENZIE: Have the districts to which the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Argue) refers been created by the local legislature?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: This year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There have been two vacancies for a year or two which we have not filled because we felt there were sufficient judges.

Mr. PROULX: Has a new district been created in British Columbia?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The district is created already by the province.

Mr. MOWAT: I am glad to hear the Acting Minister of Justice say that one province at least has responded to his suggestion that there should be co-ordination with a view of getting more efficiency in judicial work, and I am glad that province is Ontario, of the Bar of which I am a member. I think I can say on behalf of the members of the Bar that they entirely approve of the new Act of the Ontario Legislature by which junior judges are to be absorbed as vacancies occur. As the case stands now, the two judges in a county, senior and junior, get $6,000, and it would be far better if the senior judge were paid $5,000 so as to give him a decent income rather than that the work should be divided as it is now, because in many counties, we all know, there is not enough work to keep one man, who is industrious and has any system, thoroughly busy, much less is there sufficient for two judges to do. When the minister is considering the whole question, I would ask him to make a further suggestion that districts should be made for the smaller counties so that one judge could attend to one or two, or perhaps three counties. I know of three counties which one judge could very well attend to, and he could be given a large proportion of the remuneration of the three judges who are now supposed to do that work. It is essential, if the laws are to be well administered, that judges have the respect of the people, and they should be paid adequate salaries, or else the best members of the Bar will not be willing to accept such positions. The County Court judges have very important work to do. In Ontario, a County Court judge, on account of increased jurisdiction given him by the province, can deal with many cases which formerly took up the time of a Supreme Court judge travelling at assizes. Even with all this extra work, many of them would be better off and happier if they had more work to do, but they should be paid far more than they receive at present, and I hope an ascending scale will be adopted so that these judges will not feel the high cost of living as acutely as they do now. They cannot keep up their position with the merchants and wealthy men of the towns in which they live, and that should not be the case. The idea of judicial remuneration is that a judge should not be thought to be inferior to the best class of citizens in the town in which he is. That is impossible at present with a judge getting only $3,000 a year, even if he gets something more for surrogate court work. The surrogate judge is not appointed by the Dominion but by the province, and the whole judicial work is distributed by the province. Therefore, the Dominion, apart from its good offices here, in asking for co-ordination, has nothing to do with the particular work of a judge, because, according to the British North America Act, all the Dominion Government has to deal with in this regard is the appointment of the judge; the rest is left to the province. I am glad Ontario is leading as regards the work of co-ordination and the saving of judicial effort, and I hope the other provinces will follow suit.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I agree that these judges are underpaid and that they should receive a substantial increase in salary, but under this resolution I do not see that we can get very much relief for them. I should like to inquire whether, in the event of legislation being introduced in regard to the judges of the superior, county, and district courts, an increase in their salaries will be one of the matters taken into consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it certainly will be.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should like to say a word for the judges of the rural districts of the province of Quebec, who occupy a similar position to that of the county court judges in the province of Ontario, except that they have a little higher salary. A rural district judge in the province of Quebec receives $5,000 a year. Under the new system which has been adopted, these judges are called to Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, and even Sherbrooke, to help in the administration of justice in those congested districts, and I do not see why they should not be put on a footing of equality with the judges of the superior court of Montreal and Quebec. These judges are certainly handicapped by the

high cost of living. I am glad to hear that the acting minister has considered the whole question and that it will be dealt with on the return of the minister (Mr. Doherty) from Europe. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) has spoken of the legislation recently adopted by the Ontario Legislature. He might have added that many years ago, under the Mowat government, I think, the Ontario government finding the salaries of the judges of the higher courts in Ontario to be inadequate, supplemented their salaries by a yearly vote of $1,000. This vote is still taken yearly, so that a superior court judge in the province of Ontario receives $1,000 more than he would receive in the province of Quebec. This shows that the people of Ontario have been more liberal to the judiciary than other provinces, and it seems to me the Dominion Government should do what this one province has done. This additional $1,000 was granted under the pretext—because it was only a pretext—that in addition to their official functions they had to administer the Controverted Elections Act. The real reason was that the salaries of the judges were inadequate. I have not seen the memorandum addressed to the Acting Minister of Justice by the judiciary, but I know that it has been in circulation of late, and in view of the position the judges occupy in society, and having regard also to the independence of the judiciary, for my part I would look favourably upon a reasonable increase in their salaries.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Meighen thereupon moved to introduce Bill No. 104, founded on the resolution.

Resolution agreed to and Bill read a first time.

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 81, to amend the Interpretation Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Since the Interpretation Act was passed the names of certain courts have been changed by the Provincial Legislatures, and this Bill merely changes the definition to correspond with the names now given to these courts.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Royal Northwest Mounted Police—Salaries, including Deputy Minister and Comptroller at $6,000, and Assistant Comptroller and Accountant at $3,300—$26,625.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is an item dealing with salaries. There may not be an item before the House at any time that will go specifically to the point I wish to bring to the notice of the President of the Council, and I may mention the matter now. This is part of the Civil Service Estimates and these men, I suppose, are within the zone of the Civil Service. For that reason I do not think I transgress any rule in referring to another branch of the service in connection with this item. The question of a bonus to civil servants has been before the House once or twice this session, and I understand that the bonus was given by way of an increase in salary pending the legislation about which the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Maclean) spoke to-day. I suppose that that legislation of the Civil Service, will possibly end in an increase of salaries to at least the inside service, and I hope it will cover all servants, whether inside or outside as far as may be necessary. This bonus, as I am informed, was paid to keep matters in equilibrium until the general Act was passed, and if one person gets the benefit of it I submit that all in the service should get it. We have officers in this House working around the different parts of the building who must be here during the session. It is true that during a few months of the year they are not here, but they are men who have been in attendance here for several years, as long as twenty and twenty-five years, and who have become in every way adapted to this sort of work. They have no other employment and I submit that this bonus that was paid to other civil servants should also be paid to them. There are not very many of them and they should be fairly dealt with. I think the President of the Council should immediately take steps to ascertain who they are and what should fall to them, and gladden their hearts by giving them what they should receive. There should be no discrimination or distinction simply because these persons are sessional clerks or people who attend during the session. They are to all intents and purposes civil servants, who have been here for many years and who will, I sup-

pose, be here for the rest of their natural lives.

Mr. ROWELL: The point raised by the hon. member hardly arises upon the estimate now before the committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: I admit that.

Mr. ROWELL: But out of respect to my hon. friend's suggestion I may say that the bonuses were granted under two limitations, one being that they applied only to those receiving salaries of $1,800 or less, because—and I am speaking now of the bonus given by Order in Council—it was felt that the high cost of living bore more severely on those receiving smaller salaries than on those who were in receipt of higher salaries. Another limitation was that it applied only to those continually in the service. I presume that is the point my hon. friend has in mind in referring to the sessional clerks, who are not paid on a basis of yearly allowance. I do not know whether they were in view when the form of Order in Council was determined upon. I shall bring my hon. friend's representation in this matter to the attention of my colleagues. It was considered that those who worked for the Government two or three months in the year but were not in Government employ longer should hardly be paid a bonus on the same basis as those in the Government employ the whole time. I may say that the whole matter, so far as the future is concerned, will come up for review when the re-classification of which the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke to-day, comes before the House for consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not bringing this matter up for the mere sake of talking about it. I want something done for these people, and hope the President of the Council will take it seriously into consideration and bring it before his colleagues. I trust that no mere lack of covering this point by Order in Council will stand in the way of doing justice to these people who are very excellent servants of the Government, because the Order in Council can be amended, or extended, or a new Order in Council passed. It would not take long to do it. My hon. friend has a very expert knowledge of how these things are done, and can just put his foot on the wheel at any time and grind one out in very short order. So that the lack of power to do it through want of legislation is no excuse for the President of the Council or the Government.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. CANNON: There is an increase of fifteen hundred odd dollars. What does it consist of?

Mr. ROWELL: It consists of $1,000 additional amount payable to deputy minister and comptroller, just the same increase as is given to all other deputies. The other increases, I believe, are statutory increases.

Mr. McKENZIE: What relations, if any, exist between provincial governments and this Government in regard to the services of the Mounted Police? I understood there was to be a change by which in some provinces they were to come within the jurisdiction of the province, more especially since governments have been established in different parts of the West and the jurisdiction of ordinary civil and criminal administration of justice has come largely within the purview of the provinces. Are we keeping up the same staff or number of Mounted Police as in the old days, for instance, before 1906, when autonomy was granted to Saskatchewan and Alberta? It was thought then that we would not require as many mounted police after that as we had had before.

Mr. ROWELL: It is only right that the committee should have a statement showing the present position of the Mounted Police and their relation to the different provinces. I shall be glad to make such a statement after recess.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROWELL: When the Committee rose at six o'clock I promised the leader of the Opposition that I would make a statement with reference to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and the relation of that Force to the Western Provinces. I had intended to speak on this particular aspect of the matter when we came to the next item, but probably it is just as well to give the information on this item relating to civil government, as any matter connected with the Force can properly be discussed under it.

As my hon. friend will recall, Parliament established the Force in 1873. Up to the creation of the Western Provinces the Mounted Police had exercised police jurisdiction in Western Canada, other than British Columbia, and had been the only police force performing general police duty in that western land. When the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were formed,

agreements were entered into between the Federal Government and these Provincial Governments under which the Royal Northwest Mounted Police continued to perform police duties within these provinces, the provinces paying a certain annual subvention to the Federal Government in return for such services. That situation continued without change, the agreement being renewed from time to time until the autumn of 1916, when, owing to the conditions which had developed through the war, it was considered desirable by the Federal Government that the Mounted Police should be relieved from further ordinary police duties in the provinces. I should have added that the Mounted Police were performing certain police duties in Manitoba also under an agreement with the Government of that province. In the fall of 1916, as I say, the Federal Government came to the conclusion that it was in the public interest that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police should be relieved of further duties under these agreements with the Provincial Governments so that they might be free to devote themselves wholly to their duties under the Dominion authorities. One of the main reasons which led to that conclusion was the situation which existed in the United States at that time, the country to the south not having entered the war and a great deal of unrest existing there. Certain investigations had been conducted by the American police which showed a good deal of pro-German activity in certain sections of the United States. We had a large alien population in Western Canada, and it was deemed necessary that the Mounted Police should be free to carefully patrol the international boundary and protect us against such pro-German activities; to supervise all matters connected with the administration of the law relating to aliens in Western Canada, and generally to exercise police supervision in those matters over which the Federal Government had jurisdiction throughout the western provinces. Therefore on the 29th of November, 1916, after a conference with each of the provincial governments, an understanding was arrived at, whereby the then existing agreements were terminated, and from that date the Royal Northwest Mounted Police have not been performing any police duties under any general agreement with the provincial governments. When the United States entered the war, the situation in reference to pro-German activities in the United States, and possible troubles in Canada arising therefrom, was completely changed, and the Royal Northwest Mounted Police expressed a desire to be allowed to serve overseas—in fact from the very outbreak of the war they had been desirous of going to the front as a unit, but owing to the view which the Government entertained as to the importance of maintaining a strong force in Western Canada, it did not feel free to grant their request. That request was renewed in 1917, and again in 1918. In the summer of 1917 an offer was made to the Imperial Government of a cavalry unit from the Mounted Police, but at that time the authorities in England did not desire such a unit. The offer was renewed in the following winter or the spring of 1918, with practically the same result. However, in the great German offensive of March and April, 1918, our Canadian cavalry brigade suffered very serious casualties, and in the month of April the Overseas Minister of Militia cabled out to Canada for a substantial number of cavalry reinforcements. Knowing that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police had been anxious to serve at the front as a cavalry regiment, the offer was made to them to provide the necessary reinforcements to be sent overseas to strengthen our cavalry brigade. Subsequently the plans were changed so as to provide reinforcements for the cavalry brigade, and at the same time furnish a squadron of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police to add to the existing corps cavalry. I am glad to say that when the announcement was made to the Police that they could volunteer for overseas service, notwithstanding the critical condition that then existed on the Western Front and the serious casualties that our cavalry brigade had sustained, every man of military age in the force, and many not of military age, volunteered for service overseas. Only those that were physically fit could be taken, but although only some five hundred men were asked for we secured reinforcements at that time to the number of twelve officers and seven hundred and thirty-six of other ranks, including ex-members of the force and other volunteers, and they proceeded overseas on the 14th of June. The force completed their training at Shorncliffe, where I had the opportunity of inspecting them, and I have never seen a finer body of men. At Shorncliffe they divided, one squadron proceeding to France in the month of October where they were first attached to the Canadian Light Horse. Subsequently they were at-

tached to and formed part of the corps cavalry, and acted as despatch riders and patrols for the several divisions. As soon as the armistice was signed a squadron was pushed over to Namur, Belgium, and one troop under Lieutenant Acland, was sent into Germany with the Army of Occupation. The others who formed the balance of the force that went overseas, were divided and seven non-commissioned officers and two hundred and thirty-six of other ranks were formed part of a tank unit for service in France. The balance of the original force were utilized as reinforcements for our cavalry brigade in France. The majority of those that went overseas have already returned or are now returning. Major Jennings, who was in command of the unit, is, I believe, now on the ocean on his way back with some one hundred and seventy-five men, and when they have reached Canada the greater number of those who went overseas will have returned.

While on this subject, let me add that, when the Government decided to send certain troops to Siberia, the Royal Northwest Mounted Police was asked to provide a cavalry squadron. The request came on the 17th of August, 1918. We immediately complied and the squadron was completely mobilized on the 9th September, consisting of six officers and one hundred and eighty-one of other ranks, and proceeded overseas to Siberia. As the members of the Committee are aware, those troops are now being returned from that country; a few of the Mounted Police are back, but the majority have not yet returned.

I mention these details in connection with the service overseas, because I think it is only fair to the force that one should point out how anxious they were to serve during the whole period of the war, and how quickly they responded when the opportunity was afforded them. Although those who went to France did not see much of the actual fighting, except as despatch riders, and serving in a similar capacity, it was not because they were not anxious to do so. In speaking of their services overseas, I think I should mention the fact that, while the Government was not able to let the force go over as a unit, large numbers of the Police resigned their positions, or purchased their discharge as they were entitled to do in order that they might proceed to Europe and serve at the front.

I am advised by the commissioner that during the period from the outbreak of the war up to the time we mobilized the seven or eight hundred men for service in France, probably not less than 1,000 men had resigned from the Northwest Mounted Police in order to serve overseas, and those men have won distinction on all the fields where they fought. I wish I had time to tell the House of some of the deeds of those gallant men. I will only mention two. The famous Michael O'Leary, V.C., was one of the Northwest Mounted Police, and he set a standard for courage and bravery during the early days of the war which many other gallant soldiers have since emulated. The other, a constable in the ranks for two years—Constable Parkes, a young man now twenty-seven years of age. In 1915 he purchased his discharge to go to the front; he rose to the command of the 116th Battalion, C.E.F., and won the V. C., the D. S. O., and La Croix de Guerre. He proved himself an officer of the highest efficiency, and has been selected by the Canadian Corps to attend the staff college. I might mention other members of the force and the gallant service they have rendered, but time does not permit. I should also mention that ex-members of the force—that is men who had served in the force—provided our Canadian army overseas with two major generals, four brigadier generals, and colonels, majors and captains by the score. It shows the type of men who are serving in our Royal Northwest Mounted Police. All the sons, of military age, of the present and past officers have served overseas, and no less than ten officers' sons died on the battlefield. The son of the first man who joined the force in 1873 is an hon. and gallant member of this House—Brigadier-General Griesbach, who has rendered such distinguished service in this war. He is one of the many gallant officers' sons of members of the force who have served overseas.

Now, my hon. friend has asked about the relations of the force to the provinces, and what is the future of the force? The agreements with the provinces having expired, and the provinces having established their own police forces, and so large a percentage of the force having enlisted for overseas service, the question very naturally arose in the minds of the members of the force and of the people of Western Canada: What is to be the future of the force? Has it served its purpose? Shall we let the provinces look after their own police duties and discontinue the force which has existed for so many years? One of the principal reasons why I visited Western Canada last year was to look into the situation on the ground in order to decide as to the future of the Northwest Mounted Police.

And I must say that wherever I went I found but one opinion—the force should be continued, that it would be a calamity to discontinue this magnificent force, which rendered such conspicuous service to Western Canada ever since it was organized in 1873.

If it was to be continued what should be its future? There were two possible courses open: Either that it should form the nucleus of a permanent Federal police force for the Dominion; or that it should constitute one of the cavalry units in our permanent military force. That was a question which we felt we were not in a position to decide at the time, and therefore we deemed it advisable to continue the force as a police force in the meantime, leaving the question of what its final character should be to be determined according to circumstances at a later date. But we did determine, and it was necessary we should determine in order to preserve the morale of the force, that the force should not be discontinued, but that the force with its splendid record should be preserved as a national asset for the Dominion.

We concluded that for the time being, at least, there were many important duties which a Federal mounted police force should continue to discharge, and that it was our duty to maintain it for the performance of those duties. Therefore when my hon. friend asks about the relations of the provinces to the Northwest Mounted Police, I would say that this force at the present time does not take the place of the provincial or municipal police in any of the provinces in the ordinary administration of the law. It does not supersede them; it supplements their work when required. But its primary duties are in connection with the enforcement of legislation in which the Federal Government is particularly interested. It will appear in the Estimates—the next item to which I referred in opening—that we are proposing that the force should be recruited up to the full authorized strength of 1,200. As the force was only some 600 strong last year, I only presented estimates for its then existing strength, and as it has been decided to recruit it up to the full authorized strength, the estimates this year are necessarily correspondingly increased.

For some time past the force has been responsible for the enforcement of the Military Service Act; and the various Acts in reference to aliens; the policing of the Dominion Government parks—that is done under an arrangement with the provincial governments, whereby the force looks after the whole police work in those parks;—it is performing certain duties for the Department of Immigration in administering the immigration laws; in fact, it has, throughout the war been performing very important duties in seeing that men of undesirable character should not cross the international boundary contrary to the provisions of the immigration laws. It is also performing certain important duties in connection with the Department of Indian Affairs; it is looking after the patrol of the international boundary and the enforcement of the customs laws; it is also looking after the enforcement of the inland revenue laws in these Western Provinces—all matters in which the Federal Government is particularly interested ; and in addition it provides an important force, available at the call of the provincial governments, for the maintenance of law and order throughout those western territories. In addition it has important duties to perform in the Northwest Territories which I shall mention in a minute or two. I should add that when we decided to continue the force we also decided to extend its jurisdiction to British Columbia and to certain portions of Ontario. It will come to the easterly limit of Military District No. 10, the headquarters of which is in the city of Winnipeg. The distribution of the proposed force of 1,200 men is as follows:—

	Men.
For Manitoba, including that portion of Western Ontario	250
For Saskatchewan	370
For Alberta	250
For British Columbia	250
For the Yukon Territory	50
For the Northwest Territories	30
Total	1,200

Let me say a word or two with reference to the Northwest Territories. The Royal Northwest Mounted Police is the only police force looking after the administration of justice and the preservation of law and order in the Northwest Territories, and it has similar duties in the Yukon. Probably there is nothing finer in the whole history of the force than the work it is doing in those extreme northern portions of the continent. There are three posts within the Arctic circle, Herschell Island, in the Arctic ocean, Fort McPherson and Barnard Harbour, which is right on the Arctic ocean. When the report of the Mounted Police for this year is printed and particularly when the Supplementary Report which gives an account of the Baker Lake patrol is printed, I hope the members of the House will read both these documents, because the

latter records one of the finest incidents in the whole history of the force. I stop to mention it because it is just such a fine example of courage and achievement as is disclosed in that report which gives the Royal Northwest Mounted Police its splendid reputation and which makes it such a powerful factor in the preservation of law and order. It shows the respect which the people of the country have for the men who compose the force and it illustrates the manner in which law is enforced and justice administered under the British Crown.

In 1913, two American explorers, Messrs. Street and Radford were murdered by some Eskimo tribes at Bathurst inlet on the Arctic ocean, and this was reported to the Mounted Police. It became their duty to endeavour to hunt up the murderers. It was not possible to send the Mounted Police in 1913 as we had none in that district in 1913. A patrol had to be carefully organized and properly equipped, and that was done in 1914. This patrol set out from Halifax on July 31, 1914, for Chesterfield Inlet on the Northwest side of Hudson's Bay. The intention was to establish a base at the east end of Baker lake lying west of Chesterfield Inlet but owing to adverse weather conditions it was not possible to reach Baker lake in 1914 and so the expedition proceeded to Port Nelson. In 1915 the base was established at Baker Lake and during the winter 1915-16 threw out an advance depot on Thelon river. They had to put in caches ahead to provide provisions and supplies. In 1917 Inspector French took charge and the patrol set out in March, Sergeant-Major Caulkin accompanying Inspector French. They travelled, to go in, 2,483 miles and almost a corresponding distance to come out, the total patrol being not less than 4,500 miles over a territory hitherto untrodden by white men, with the possible exception of one explorer. They had to carry a certain amount of provisions, and for the rest they had to depend upon shooting musk ox and other animals of the country. On their way out their provisions were exhausted; their dogs were impoverished, and they had to keep some of their dogs alive by killing the others and feeding the meat to the dogs. Inspector French and his companions were compelled for three days to live on soup made partially by boiling their moccasins, and then they had to tramp on hour after hour in order to reach their goal. They reached their objective; they made the investigation; they ascertained the facts; they brought back and presented a full and complete report. It is such courage and devotion to duty upon the part of our Northwest Mounted Police that give them their unique place in the hearts and affections of the people of Western Canada—a place that nothing can imperil or destroy.

Let me mention one other incident before I leave this point. An Eskimo woman was murdered at Bathurst inlet, and the report of this murder reached the Mounted Police in 1917. One Mounted Policeman, Corporal Conway, started out in August, 1917, to travel across country into the Arctic circle to endeavour to locate the murderers. That one Mounted Policeman went into the Arctic circle, hunted up the murderers and he arrested them though he was surrounded by hostile Eskimo, and brought them out, and they were tried at Fort McPherson in December, 1918. He was absent from August, 1917 to December, 1918, in those Arctic wilds—one man amongst all the Eskimo people. This shows the respect in which the Mounted Police are held by all people in that north country. The people know that if a crime is committed, the Mounted Police will hunt it out, follow up the criminal, and that those who are guilty will be punished. It is because we have such a splendid force so valuable for the preservation of law and order that the Dominion Government has decided for the time being that the force should be maintained to the full authorized strength of 1,200 men, for the purposes I have mentioned

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I am sure all the Western members and, indeed, all members, were pleased to hear the tribute paid to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police by the President of the Privy Council. The service rendered by that force is well known throughout Canada. The minister mentioned, amongst other things, that the first Victoria Cross gained during this great war was gained by a member or an ex-member of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. The first Victoria Cross that was granted in the South African War went also to a member of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, namely, Sergeant A. H. Richardson. I am pleased to note that the minister appreciates this fact because he is in a position to do something to remedy a grievance of long standing which I am not going to mention, but which was given into the hands of an hon. member on the other side, and which, I have no doubt, will be brought up this evening. We are all glad to know that the force instead of being decreased is

to be increased and brought up to full strength. That is right. For the few years during which they were not actively engaged, the law of the country was not as well administered and every one felt the effect thereof. The minister, in telling what the intention of the Government was, failed to tell us what is the pay received by the men, non-commissioned officers and officers. That would be of interest, because we in this House might then judge whether they were getting adequate pay for the services rendered.

Mr. ROWELL: The pay was increased last autumn by fifty cents per day to all the constables and non-commissioned officers of the force.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: What is the total pay?

Mr. ROWELL: A junior constable starts in at $1.50 a day. A married man gets double rations, which would be equivalent to about $3 a day.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I must say that for the services rendered the pay does not seem to be very large, and it must be very difficult for the members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police to raise a family on that wage, especially when we consider that labourers to-day are striking for $3.50 to $4 a day. The Royal Northwest Mounted Police under the present Administration—I do not know the reason, and I am not going to criticise at the moment—find it harder to get along to-day than they did a few years ago. Perhaps the minister will tell the House why a change in policy was made, as a result of which the men are to-day centered at headquarters in the large cities, where the cost of living is so much greater, instead of being distributed throughout the country as they were formerly. Travelling on the trains I meet a great many of these boys, and the complaint I hear is that it is almost impossible for them to live. If the reason for the change in policy is that more efficient service can be rendered by the men being centered in the large cities, the reason is a good one, but I cannot understand the change being made for any other reason, and it undoubtedly causes great hardship to the men. I am told that part of their duty in the city of Edmonton is to exercise their horses. In my time in the Mounted Police the trouble was to make our horses last; we sometimes used to have spare horses. The Government has mentioned some of the duties of the Mounted Police in connection with inland revenue and looking after alien enemies. Under the present system the Government is put to the extra expense of sending the men, perhaps, a hundred miles down the line to where their services may be needed, and livery or automobiles have to be engaged to take them to their place of duty. Under the old system that expense was avoided, and the men could get to where they were required very much quicker when the call for their services came. They would have their horses right there and could render quicker and better service. There was also the advantage I have mentioned of cheaper living in the small towns. I really cannot understand how a married man, even with double rations, can live in the city of Edmonton on $1.50 a day. It does not seem to be fair, considering the cost of living, and the services these men are rendering the country, and the minister himself has told us what really splendid service it is. The Royal Northwest Mounted Police should be dealt with a little more generously, and it should be made as easy as possible for them to live and bring up a family. Rent in Edmonton to-day is very high, and the cost of living is just as high as in the city of Ottawa. I repeat, I really cannot see how these men can bring up their families on such a wage. I do not think there would be the least objection throughout the country; indeed, I think it would only be fair to the men who are giving such splendid service if the pay started at $2 or $2.50, with the regular good-conduct pay after that.

The CHAIRMAN: Before this discussion goes any further, I must draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the item under consideraion is No. 11, which relates only to salaries here at the head office. The discussion has been very interesting, and I do not want to interrupt it any way, but I think we should either pass the item now under consideration, or hold this discussion over until we consider item 254, which provides for the pay of the force, subsistence, billeting, etc.

Northwest Territories, Yukon Territory, Province of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, British Columbia and part of Western Ontario—Pay of force, $1,007,984.90—Subsistence, billeting, forage and dog feed, fuel and light, clothing, repairs and renewals, horses, arms and ammunition, stationery, medical stores, transport, water service, building repairs and contingencies, $1,236,520.18—To compensate members of the Royal Nortwest Mounted Police for injuries received while in the discharge of duty, $5,000—$2,249,505.08.

Mr. COWAN: It has been my pleasure for some thirty-two years to live within

two miles of the headquarters of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and during that period I have had the pleasure of following very closely the work that has been done by this excellent body of men. I have been able to see how their administration of the law was accepted by the people of that part of the country, and I fully agree with the President of the Privy Council that when it was decided a few years ago to discontinue the services of the force, the people of Western Canada objected very much. Wherever I heard the people discussing the matter, and I did hear them very often, invariably they expressed exceeding regret that they were to lose the services of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. It was fully recognized by our people that the provinces had the right to administer the law, and that they were within their rights in asserting themselves, but notwithstanding that, our people did not want to lose the Royal Northwest Mounted Police because they knew that the "red coat" as he was familiarly known carried with him a prestige which no provincial body of men, no matter how good they might be or how free from political influence, could possibly build up for many years to come. After watching this force all these years and seeing what the result of their enforcement of the law has been, I have no hesitation in saying that their administration of the law in the Northwest Territories, and subsequently in the provinces for a period of several years, was the sanest administration of the law that this world has ever seen. A police force can create trouble just about as easily as it can allay it. If given to irritating methods in their administration of the law, to spying or resorting to trickery, or "stool pigeons," or anything of that kind, a police force can in a very short time stir up an animosity which will do more harm than can be outweighed by any good that they may do. But no such administration was known under the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. As a matter of fact, ever since I first knew the force it has been composed entirely of picked men; men of low type were not accepted. After the men had been picked and taken in the force, they received a training not only in the law itself, but in the administration of the law, which made it possible for them to give that administration which has been so acceptable to the people of that part of the country. It is not necessary to multiply instances in proof of the fact that in the opinion of the people of Western Canada the Royal Northwest Mounted Police has no superior. Such being the case, we are exceedingly desirous that the force shall be continued in our country, and we were just as pleased to learn a year or so ago that the force was to be re-established as we had been regretful to hear some time previously that it was to be disbanded. To-day we are told that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police are to be given practically new duties—naturally their duties will not be the same as they were before, for now we have provincial police forces in all the provinces which will have their own jurisdiction. These new duties will absorb a great deal of the time and attention of the Mounted Police, and will require a very strong force. Among other things, we are told, they are to administer the law made by this Parliament in regard to aliens. I suppose somebody will at once say that probably that means that our alien population in Western Canada requires severe policing. Such is not the case. I know whereof I speak, for I have no less an authority than Commissioner Perry himself,—and he can contradict me any time he sees fit, for he is not very far away—when I say that since the outbreak of the war our alien population in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta (and we have over 300,000 aliens in Saskatchewan) have not given us any trouble at all. There has been no rioting, and they have caused no disturbance. The Royal Northwest Mounted Police have so sanely administered the law and have dealt with them in such a just and generous manner that they have never felt in any way called upon to resort to violence. The aliens to-day, at any rate wherever I have met them, have shown that they know that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police will not tolerate any nonsense. They recognize that the police will administer the law with a smile and will not resort to trickery or anything of that kind, and that they will give to the aliens exactly the same protection as is afforded other people, all that is expected of them being that they shall respect the law. The aliens in that part of the country to-day are just as willing and anxious as any one else to have the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, for they know that they will be given protection as long as they obey the law. That is exactly the conditions that we want to see prevailing in Western Canada. We do not want any aliens to feel that they have to be kept there by force; they must be made to realize that

the law is their law, as much for their protection as for that of any other citizens. I doubt very much if there is any other police body that could deal with these aliens at the present time as can the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. There is, it must be admitted, some excitement in Canada today, and a certain amount of ill-feeling on the part of a portion of the population towards some aliens, and it would not do to choose any number of policemen from amongst that type of men to enforce the law against these aliens or to deal with them in any shape or form, because if we do so we shall create instead of allaying trouble. On the other hand, the Mounted Police, from their experience in dealing with this class of people, can go amongst them, as they have done for years and years, and so conduct matters as to give us law and order without any clash at all. We do not want clash between any two sets of people, and I am satisfied that the Royal Mounted Police can effect that condition better than any other body. The matter of pay was referred to by the hon. member for Victoria, Alberta (Mr. White), who, I believe, was himself a member of the Royal Mounted Police, and whom we are pleased to recognize as such. As far as pay is concerned, I believe that the men are not getting sufficient. Indeed, for many years they have not been getting enough, and I do not believe they were ever paid an adequate salary. We should remember that these are picked men, who have the ability to command high pay in any walk of life, and men of their type should not be asked to serve the country for lower pay than they can get elsewhere. I therefore support the suggestion that their pay be made such as will retain to our country the services of men who have had experience and training and know precisely how to handle the situation as it exists to-day. I sincerely hope that in this new arrangement the Government will see fit to make use of the large body of men who have served in the Mounted Police and who are now following other occupations. There is a great reserve body which can be made use of in the capacity that is required, and I hope the Government will take them into consideration in this new arrangement, and adapt their policy to that end.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not hear all the minister had to say, but the portion of his remarks that I did hear I very gladly endorse, especially his eulogies of this splendid body of men and his views in regard to their excellent record. I shall not discuss the points raised by the other speakers regarding higher pay and other matters connected with the force at present. I wish, however, to bring to the attention of the House a matter which I believe should be considered by the Government, and I think that if there is a favourable expression of opinion by the House to-night, the Government will perhaps be inclined to give it consideration.

It is a matter of long standing and perhaps may be considered somewhat out of date, but in view of the very eulogistic terms in which the minister spoke of the service and the record of this force, I think this is an opportune time to look back for a few years and consider whether we have dealt justly with these men in the past. To quote the minister's words, they have a splendid reputation and record, and, added the minister, there have seldom been such exhibitions of courage and heroism as we see constantly manifested throughout the years by this splendid force. Indeed, this is a matter of history, and with these sentiments the people of the country generally are in accord, especially those who have lived in the West for a great many years, who have learned not only to respect and honour these men, but to admire them in the highest degree. The force has been particularly fortunate in the splendid leaders it has had in the past, and the sanity of its administration has been largely due to that leadership and the discipline and excellent record of the men individually. At the time of the Northwest Rebellion, I suppose that of all the forces engaged in that rebellion the Royal Northwest Mounted Police can very properly be accorded one of the highest places, if not the highest place. These men gave their services at that time, and although it is true they were simply doing their plain duty, they did splendid work. After the rebellion was over the militia and other forces were granted scrip in recognition of their services. It was not very valuable, but still it was a recognition. They were given a medal and scrip and for many years the Northwest Mounted Police were unable even to get the medal in recognition of their splendid services during that rebellion. I cannot understand why there should have been the delay there was, but after a great many years, and after the matter had been brought to the attention of the successive Governments of the times during which it was in abeyance, a medal was finally granted to them, but no scrip was ever given to the veterans of the Northwest Mounted Police. This matter has been dealt

with at various times without success, and I am going to take the liberty, with the indulgence of the Committee, of reading a letter placed in my hands and a resolution by the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Veterans' Association. This association numbers about 400 members who have served in this splendid body and have retired. A great many of them are now well on in years, having spent most of their life in the police service, and some of them are none too well off. The letter is as follows:

Royal North-West Mounted Police Veterans' Association.

Sir,—At a meeting of the R.N.W.M. Police Veterans' Association held on the 25th day of March last, the matter of long-standing injustice to those members of the force who served during the Riel Rebellion in the year 1885 was discussed.

For several years after the rebellion both the medal and the land scrip were withheld from the members of this force, but both the medal and scrip were issued to other units, both regulars (A and B battery) and volunteers, taking part. After years of long and continued insistence, the medals were issued to members of this force but not the land scrip. Why the discrimination in favour of other bodies taking part in the rebellion, against the North-West Mounted Police has never been explained. That the N.W.M. Police did their duty equally with the other units engaged, was in a measure acknowledged (though late) by the issue of the medal, therefore if it be admitted that the medal was rightly issued, why is the scrip withheld?

Therefore, it is unanimously resolved:—"That this Association one more petition the Government of Canada to do justice to those members of the R.N.W.M. Police who took part in the Rebellion, that the scrip be issued, thereby removing the stigma and injustice to those who gave their loyal and faithful service. That the Government be reminded that members of this force, have, on many occasions since, performed valuable service to this country, and more especially have many of them brought honour to Canada in the South African War and in the last great war, also that the members who took part in the 1885 rebellion, and who we strongly believe are entitled to the land scrip, are now getting up in years, and the issue of the scrip at this time, would enable many of them to end their days with some degree of comfort, together with the satisfaction of the knowledge of the recognition of their loyal and faithful service for the Dominion of Canada and Empire."

C. R. Filtness,
Secy.

In answer to that it has been stated and argued that this matter has been considered by the governments of Sir John Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden, and that the present Government feel that the decision arrived at by previous governments should be sustained. That decision was that inasmuch as the Royal Northwest Mounted Police were simply doing their duty in putting down the rebellion, they were not entitled to this scrip, that they were not on a parity with the volunteers and that the scrip was for volunteers only. In answer to that contention, there are certain arguments which I think I should bring to the attention of the House. You will note that I referred to the fact that A and B Batteries which, I think came from Kingston, were engaged. They were regular soldiers doing their duty in exactly the same way as the Mounted Police. Yet A and B Batteries received the privilege of taking land scrip just the same as the militia units. I do not wish to suggest that there was any prejudice but I must confess that, after looking through this matter with a considerable degree of care, I am inclined to think that perhaps at the time of the rebellion, and shortly afterwards, there was indeed some slight degree of prejudice against the men of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police and that the militia units, and the commanders of the militia units, may have considered that their special duty was to look after the volunteer forces and not the regulars, that the Mounted Police should take care of themselves in any case, being regular soldiers, and that therefore they did not merit any special attention. I do not look at the matter in that light at all.

It seems that this is a very opportune time to consider the case of the members of this force in view of the statement made by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) to the effect that there is some difficulty in retaining the services of some of the most efficient men by reason of the fact that the encouragement is very slight and is probably not sufficient. I am not going to discuss that but I will say that the men of this gallant force, at the conclusion of a certain period of service, should be entitled to recognition, whether land scrip or something else, that would be an encouragement for them.

There is no body of men in existence to-day, nor has there been in all history, even taking the illustration given by the minister himself, which has performed such valiant service in opening up to the world that new country. We may talk about explorers and about the records of the members of the geological survey and other survey parties, but these pioneers who, in performance of their duty, launched forth into the wilderness away up into the Arctic circle, and who were often away from civilization for two or three years at a time, learned to know all about those regions, and from them and from the very minute and intelligent reports they gave to their officers

9 p.m.

and to the department, we know a great deal about the hinterland of Canada. Unquestionably, many of these men would gladly settle in some region where they have spent the greater portion of their lives as civilization and city life have little attraction for them. But we give them absolutely no encouragement. We give them the small pay of the regular force. I do not know that they have complained very much about that, but why should not we not only recognize the services of these men in the Northwest Rebellion of 1885, but also give a gratuity of some kind to which the members of the force might look forward?

Another point I have to make is this: It is not a very important point, but I am led to make it because apparently it is necessary to make every possible argument in favour of these men to enable them to get any consideration at all. It was argued that these men were not on the same basis as the volunteers. The answer to that is that they were under the command of the volunteer militia of Canada. You may say that is quibbling, you may say it is too fine an argument, but if you are going to tell these men that they are not going to receive this gratuity because they are simply regulars, I answer that I will quibble as well, if you like to call it that, and I will say that at that time they were under exactly the same commanders as the militia force of Canada and in my judgment one argument has equal force with the other.

It is also stated that there was too great a delay, that the matter should have been brought to the notice of the Government before. It has been brought to the attention of the House on many occasions. It has been brought to the attention of the Government over and over again from the time of Sir John Macdonald upwards. But there is a reason for that delay in recent years, and it is that many members of the police force serving in 1885 remained on the strength of the force for a certain time and during that time it would have been a serious breach of discipline on the part of the members to urge their claim for land scrip. That is obvious. That is not a narrow or stringent argument, it is a fair statement of the case. We know that these men have been under the strictest discipline. None know better than the Government or the Government officials that had these men, while they were still members of the force, brought any particular pressure to bear upon the Government to induce them to grant this scrip, they would have been very severely disciplined for doing so, and, it may be wisely so—that is a point that I am not disputing. Now that they are out of the force, after long years of service, they have, like other bodies, grouped themselves together in this Veterans' Association, and they come to the Government and say: Now, give us justice.

Sir, I consider that a grave injustice has been done these men, not only in not giving them their medals after so many years' service, but in not giving them this scrip. It may be argued that it is late, but that is no argument or real reason why we should hesitate to make good the discrepancy now. I think if it is recognized, and I am sure the Committee will be prompt to recognize it, that an injustice has been perpetrated in this case, we should agree at once that the injustice should be remedied forthwith. There is another reason why delay has occurred. The question was raised in 1913, but shortly after that the war broke out, and it was not desirable to press the matter while hostilities were in progress. That is perfectly clear. This House was occupied during almost the last five years in the consideration of the most momentous questions. To have brought this matter up during that period would have looked rather trifling, and therefore it was not brought forward. Now that the war is over, and we are able to give some sort of cleaning to the slate, as it were, I think we might very well clean this matter off. The feeling has arisen in the minds of these men that they have been discriminated against, and I must confess that after talking to a large number of them, and finding them not only intelligent, but intensely loyal and splendid fellows in every respect, I was impressed with the fact that they were suffering under discrimination, that there was no fair, logical reason that could be advanced why they should not have received this scrip long ago, and I see no fair, logical reason why it should not be given them to-day. There is no argument so far as I can see, that can be advanced against doing what is requested here, except that it is not wanted to be done. Now, Sir, I put it to the minister personally, and as strongly as I can, that he recognize the courage and the heroism of these men, that he recognize the services that they have performed in the past by admitting their just claim—a claim unanimously advanced by this association, numbering about four hundred; not a very large number, in fact a comparatively small one—and give to them the privilege of taking up scrip somewhere in the Government lands in the West, just as

the Militia Force of Canada at that time were rewarded with scrip. I am not going to argue as to the type of scrip to be granted; I do not care, nor do they, what reasonable restrictions are imposed. In any case, give to these men in the closing years of life, the satisfaction of knowing that they have at last been fully recognized, and remove from their minds all thought or suspicion that the country does not recognize that they have well performed their duty.

Mr. TWEEDIE: This is probably one of the most important items in the expenditure affecting Canada, more particularly the Western Provinces, although the amount involved is not large. I agree with all the words of praise which have been uttered on behalf of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and if every member in this House to-night were to utter similar praise I do not believe that we would overstate the case on behalf of these valiant men. They have rendered a service to Western Canada which could not have been performed by any other body of men; and the difference between the pioneer days in our country beyond the Great Lakes, and those in the Western States—a difference in which Canada compares very favourably with the pioneer period of any other country in the world—is due to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and the traditions which have been established in connection with that magnificent body of men. The red tunics of the police as they rode over the plains of the West created an impression upon the minds of the man who came in there, whether as a genuine settler or as an outlaw, that the affairs of this Dominion were administered in accordance with the principles of law and on the basis of justice and equity for all. It was impossible in those early days for any mischievous doctrines such as now appear to be in order to make any headway in that Western country, and I am very glad that the Government has seen fit to re-establish this fine force in connection with the administration of law in the West. I must confess that I was somewhat surprised when I heard the minister announce that the force was to be increased to the extent of only twelve hundred men, and that it was to exercise jurisdiction over the Northwest Territories, the Yukon Territory, the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, and part of Western Ontario. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if the force had been increased to some three thousand men instead of twelve hundred, the Government would not be providing any stronger force than is necessary to administer law in Western Canada. We might just as well face the facts as they exist. We know that the conditions that prevail throughout the civilized world—whether it be in Europe, or in Great Britain, or in the United States, or in Canada—are vastly different from those which previously existed at any time in the world's history. We know that in the past days men have gone through Canadian cities preaching their doctrines from soap boxes at street corners, and little heed or attention was paid to them. We know throughout the United States and throughout Canada at the present time, however, there are many disciples of anarchy, and men who are advocating secretly, and in some cases openly, the subversion of law and order by means of physical force. We cannot close our eyes to this serious condition, and it is the duty of this Government to establish a body of police to so administer our law that any man who comes from a land where they have trampled the government under foot and resisted all law shall be taught that he cannot come and preach that doctrine in Canada with impunity, but must be bound by the law and observe order here. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if there is any fault to be found with this Government in connection with that question, it is that it has not taken the reins of justice in its hands as firmly as it should have done. I believe the Government has been too lenient with a certain class of people who are going throughout the country sowing the seed of anarchy and destruction. The men to whom I allude urge the overthrow of the Government not by means of argument or reason, or process of evolution; they advocate that all governments in the world shall be overthrown by physical force and violence. It is the duty of the force, to whose maintenance we are voting money to-night to go throughout the length and breadth of the territory confined to their care and where they find men—I care not whether they come from Germany, or Russia, or Austria, or any other country—who preach the doctrine that the Government of Canada should be overthrown by violence and force, and that the laws on our statute books should be resisted by physical force, they should gather those men in and ship them back to the country where such principles are in force.

The Northwest Mounted Police may have had a great work on their hands in pioneer days, but I believe that they have a far greater work on their hands at the present time. As has been pointed out by the member for Regina, they have succeeded in enforcing observance of the law and commanding order in this country, not by violence themselves, but by the great care and tact they have shown in the performance of their duties. We want that same class of man now to exercise those same qualities, to uphold the dignity of the law as they upheld it in the pioneer days of the west, and if they do that they will render the greatest service to this country that can possibly be rendered by any police body.

Now, if we ask 1,200 men to perform those duties, are we not placing upon them a greater burden than they can bear and perform their duties efficiently? Their jurisdiction will extend from the remote parts of the Yukon Territory to the remote parts of western Ontario—1,200 men scattered over that vast area. I submit that their duties cannot be performed with justice to this country. I submit, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister that he should reconsider his decision to increase this body to 1,200 men, and should have anywhere from three to five thousand men. It might involve an expenditure of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 instead of $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. But would it not be better to spend that larger sum and rid our country of men who are a menace, men who are the opponents of law and order and justice? Would we not save much for the future? I care not about any man in this country who may hold views of government which are different from those held by the majority. Any man has the right to perfect freedom of speech, he can argue for any form of government he pleases as long as he proceeds by constitutional methods to arrive at that destination; but the line of demarcation is between that class of men—who are welcome in this country—and the class who come here or who are living here and who say: We know no law, we know no government; we are going to upset governments, we are going to resist laws by the utmost physical force and by the violence which we command. We do not want that class.

I want to point out to the Government that when the Northwest Mounted Police have come in contact with those men, and meted out speedy justice to them, as they must, their hands must be upheld, there must be no political interference, there must be no sympathy shown, the law must be supreme and they should be backed to the limit. We want to rid our country of lawless agitators, and the sooner we put this machinery in operation and rid ourselves of that revolutionary element the better for the Dominion of Canada and the better for her lawful citizens.

Mr. MANION: It seems almost superfluous after all the praise that has been lavished upon the Northwest Mounted Police for any one to add to that praise. However, the speakers who have preceded me are all from the Western Provinces, Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, and as the jurisdiction of the force is to be extended to the head of the lakes, I wish to commend the Government for having reached that decision. I have heard nothing but praise of that action, for the reason that every one in Western Ontario is glad to have a body of such noble traditions placed in charge of the enforcement of law and order in their territory. I have heard on one or two occasions very slight criticism, but it was from those who thought perhaps law and order should not be preserved.

The hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) has advocated strengthening the Northwest Mounted Police Force for the purpose of preserving law and order. I believe the Government has studied very carefully the possibilities of strengthening the Force and I thoroughly agree that they should at least be recruited up to 1,200 men as is proposed. If the strengthening of the Force is for the purpose of keeping down Bolshevism and revolution in this country, I believe the Government is well advised in the course it has taken. No one wishes this country to get in the chaotic condition which has overtaken Russia. Bolshevism means lawlessness, it means hunger and starvation, it means disruption, and we do not wish those conditions to extend to Canada.

I would like, if one might suggest to the Government what has been suggested to them a number of times recently by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), that they do something more than they have already done—and I know they have deeply considered the subject—regarding the control of the high cost of living. I hope this is not out of order, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I believe that the two things go together: the strengthening of the Northwest Mounted Police, and the control as far as possible of the high cost of living, for the reason that

Bolshevism is simply another name for revolution; and hunger is the legitimate mother of revolution. People do not revolt when they are happy, contented and well fed; they revolt when the high cost of living is beyond their reach—and to-day in this country the cost of living is beyond the reach of a great many people, perhaps not to the extent of starvation, but to the extent of forcing them to deny themselves many of those things that they had previously considered to be the necessaries of life.

The reason I mention this matter is that I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. R. J. McFall to the City Clerk of Fort William bearing on this question. He takes up a number of cases—I will not read the letter—of violations of the law by the cold storage warehouses in the neighbourhood. He names four cold storage warehouses, and he gives instances of violations of the law, totalling altogether 40, in regard to selling the necessaries of life to the people of this country, in other words, meat and eggs. To my mind, one of the reasons why we should extend the power of the Northwest Mounted Police is because the high cost of living is due to the profiteering of such corporations, and that is why I wish to put this matter before the House. It possibly is stretching the order point a little in bringing it in here—

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but it is stretching it altogether too far. The hon. gentleman cannot be allowed to do so.

Mr. MANION: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. But I still adhere to the point, without going further in discussing it, that two things are equally necessary—that the control of the high cost of living is as necessary as the expansion of the powers of the Northwest Mounted Police. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that you find it necessary to stop me proceeding with these details, because I think they would be interesting not only to the House and to you personally, but probably to the country at large. However, perhaps on another occasion I shall have an opportunity of dealing with the subject; but at least now I can go as far as to suggest that the Government should do everything possible to control the high cost of living. I wish to say that I support very strongly the proposal to strengthen the Northwest Mounted Police up to at least 1,200 men.

Mr. KEEFER: Mr. Chairman, I differ with my friend (Mr. Manion) from the sister city in asking that the Force be increased only to 1,200 men. Their jurisdiction is to be extended to the

head of the lakes, and we know what their services are. In the past, some of us have had business relations with them, not in being arrested, but in carrying out the work which they have initiated. The policy of the Government is, I understand, to recruit up to the full strength of 1,200 men, but that is too small a number, judging from the number of foreign people in the large cities of the West. As the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) said, the force ought to be increased to probably 5,000 as a permanent force. We have some rather dangerous days ahead of us; there are in this country places to-day where there are hotbeds breeding a possible revolution, and the best force to meet that is the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. We have altogether too few of them in Canada.

I would ask the minister to take into serious consideration some recognition of members of the force who went overseas for the time they were away. I made a promise to a carload of them about the first year of the war. I noticed about as fine a lot of men in "civies" as one would want to see anywhere coming down on the train, and wondered who they were. I went forward and sat in the car with them and found out that they were Northwest Mounted policemen, going back to serve in the Imperial forces, many of them being reservists. While I chatted with them they urged one thing upon me, and I promised that if I ever had an opportunity I would bring it forward, namely, that as they were giving up a dollar a day pay to go overseas to serve and draw one shilling a day in England, if they came back to this country, Canada should, in some way, give them a little nest egg or stake to induce them to return, so that they would have something to settle down on and marry and become citizens of this country. The proposition seemed so reasonable that I promised to do what I could. I wrote the commissioner about the matter at the time and got his reply, the only reply he could give, namely, that Parliament had made no such provision. It is not yet settled that these Northwest Mounted policemen who have gone over and served in the Imperial forces will receive the six months' pay that our Canadian soldiers are getting. It is true they will get the six months' pay or bonus from the Imperial forces, but that will amount to only about $120, whereas if they had enlisted with the Canadian troops they would receive a bonus

of six months' pay of $500 or $600. I understand there is difficulty in getting men of the right sort, and where can better men be obtained than amongst those who have had experience, and who have served overseas? Why not urge those men to come back and say to them: If you come back, not only will you be reinstated and your time count for the whole period you have been away, but the difference between the dollar a day you were receiving and the one shilling, or two shillings as it was afterwards increased to, will be paid to you? That will show our appreciation. Canada did that with some of her civil servants in the first part of the war, and why should we not do it with the very best civil servants we have? We should let those men know in every way we possibly can that we appreciate their services. We have possibly dark days ahead of us, and we have two police forces in Canada, one the Northwest Mounted Police, and the other the Dominion Police. They are not members of any union; the Government have not the trouble with them that the city of Montreal or Toronto and other places have with their police force; they are loyal to the country, and any reasonable demand that they make should receive most careful consideration. They cannot urge their grievances as strongly as others can. For instance, there is the question of the bonus which is given to the Civil Service. It is a little out of order, but if the Dominion Police have a request regarding that, it should be most generously met, and we should not wait too long, until we turn their sympathies against us. I merely ask the minister if he will take into his most serious consideration the question of doing something for those men who were on the force, who enlisted and went overseas to serve in British regiments. I had a letter from Curragh camp a year after I had travelled with those boys, and the writer said: "Do you remember the fellow you were talking to in the train along the north shore of lake Superior? Here I am stuck at Curragh camp because they know that I am experienced in training men. Do you remember that freckled-faced boy with the green hat and the blue suit of clothes? That was Micky O'Leary who got the V.C. I wish I could get over and get the V.C. too." That is the type of men we should get back into the force. I urge strongly upon the minister not only to increase the force, but to bring back all the men who went overseas to serve with the colours.

Mr. ROWELL: With reference to the observations of various members, I should first like to say a word or two regarding the observations of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) who has brought to the attention of the Committee the question of granting scrip to the members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police who served in the Rebellion of 1885. It is only right that I should give the Committee the position of the matter as disclosed in the records of the House at that time. At the time when the rebellion occurred Sir John A. Macdonald, who was the minister responsible for the establishment of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, was, I believe, the minister in charge of the administration of the force. The reason why the Mounted Police were not granted the scrip appears to be that stated by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, namely, that the then Government looked upon their service as being rendered in the performance of duty, as they were responsible for the administration of law, and the preservation of order in the Northwest at that time, and that the citizen soldiers who left their homes in other parts of Canada and went to the Northwest to put down the rebellion were in a different position. That is the ground upon which the then Prime Minister put the case for granting scrip to the volunteers. This is his statement as it appears in Hansard of 1885, page 3376:

> We all agree that the services of our citizen soldiery, who have left their homes and their hearths in order to fight the battles of the country in the Northwest. and to restore peace, order and law, where disorder and insurrection existed, should be duly acknowledged. These resolutions are offered with that purpose, and they are offered with the secondary purpose of opening up that country for the young men of that soldiery, who have seen the Northwest, who know its advantages, and who may, perhaps, take a liking to the country and desire to settle there. It is of great importance too, I think, to that country, and to the whole Dominion, that a considerable portion of that body should take up their habitation in the Northwest to which they have gone as loyal soldiers and as supporters of the supremacy of the law and of the Government of Canada, as it is constituted.

The then Prime Minister went on to say that it was more than probable that a good portion of the militia force then on duty in the Northwest, would not desire to settle there, but might return to their homes, and yet the Government should take recognition of their valuable services. Every one who settled there had the same right as any other settler to 160 acres of land. What was then proposed was to give a second adjoining homestead of 160 acres, or 320 acres in all, instead of the usual 160 acres, and that they should receive their patent free of all charges. Those who returned

home and did not become settlers, would get scrip for 80 acres as an acknowledgment of their services. In concluding his explanation Sir John A. Macdonald said:

> The resolutions have a two-fold object. First, that there should be a substantial recognition, beyond the mere daily pay of the militia men who went to the Northwest to fight our battles, of their services, by making them grants of land, or scrip if they don't want to have the land, and at the same time making a distinction between the men who will not settle there and the men who will. The man who does not, and who returns home, gets scrip equivalent to 80 acres; the man who goes there and settles there gets 320 acres.

In 1885 the militia men who were engaged in putting down the rebellion were awarded a medal. Under date of July 10, 1886, the medal was given to the Mounted Police, who were "actually under fire during the said troubles."

At different times the Northwest Assembly passed resolutions asking that the Mounted Police and the volunteers attached to the force be treated the same as the active militia as far as medals and scrip were concerned. In reply to the resolution of the Assembly of September 12, 1893, the Dominion Government passed an Order in Council refusing the request. This Order, under date of June 30, 1894, says:

> When the subject of rewards for services during the rebellion was under the consideration of the Government, a distinction was made between the Mounted Police, whose ordinary duties of maintaining law and order were within the limits of the disturbed districts, and the militia, who were called upon to leave their homes and occupations, at great personal inconvenience, resulting in many cases, in serious embarrassment to themselves and families. This distinction was marked by excluding the police from participation in the issue of scrip and by limiting the issue of the medal to those members of the Northwest Mounted Police Force who were actually under fire.

For these reasons the scrip and medals to those not under fire were not granted. That was the successor to the Government of Sir John Macdonald. So the matter was before not only the Government of Sir John Macdonald, but before the Conservative Government of his immediate successor. Then the matter came before the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was also the head of the administration of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and on the 20th of August, 1900, an Order in Council was passed recommending that "The Northwest Mounted Police who were on service in the Northwest Territories during the period of rebellion of 1885 should be dealt with as far as regards the medal, in the same manner as members of the active militia." So that the Order in Council of 10th July, 1886, was amended by striking out the words "who were actually under fire during the said troubles." In other words, the Mounted Police who were not under fire got the medal, but the law was not changed with reference to the grant of scrip, the Government adhering to the decision already reached by two preceding Governments.

The request was subsequently renewed to the Government which preceded the present one, and the same conclusion was reached. Therefore, when the matter came before the present Government, in view of the decision which had been reached by each successive Government during the period from 1886 down to date, the present Government thought it was not justified in opening up this old matter and changing the basis upon which this scrip was granted.

With reference to the Veterans Association to which my hon. friend has referred, I have nothing but the highest appreciation of that force and the branches of it at Vancouver and Victoria. I think it is only right to say that these men have offered to serve as a reserve force. They have made a very fine offer to the Government, and in the Bill which I hope to introduce into the House this week, because certain amendments to the law are rendered necessary by the changes which are being made, I intend asking the House to approve of a provision in the law whereby a reserve of the Northwest Mounted Police may be created and these men who have served their country with such distinction as members of the force in the past constitute a reserve which may be called upon in emergency.

The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has brought out one fact to-night which had not come to my knowledge before, and that was that members of the permanent force in Canada did receive some recognition in the way of scrip. That matter I shall be glad to look into and see if it affects the situation as it comes before the Government.

My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. White) mentioned the question of the pay of the Mounted Police. Since the force came under my administration, two or three important changes have been made with reference to pay. First the pay has been increased fifty cents a day. Separation allowance is provided for the wives of all married men, and will continue to be provided until the general demobilization of the militia force is complete. An additional ration has

also been granted to each married man, so that all these combined constitute a substantial addition to the pay. I believe there is good ground for considering that probably some further advance should be made in the pay, and in the Bill which I expect to introduce I purpose recommending to the House that power be given to make a further increase in the pay of the mounted police. Members of the House will also bear in mind that in addition to the pay, pensions are provided for service in the force; and that has to be taken into consideration in considering the pay. As the law stands at present, a man who serves twenty years becomes entitled to a pension upon retirement. In the amendment which I contemplate bringing in, I purpose recommending to the House that the pension also be substantially increased. When these provisions are before the House I think that the hon. member for Victoria will feel that we are dealing absolutely fairly with the members of the force.

With reference to members of the force serving in the Arctic regions, I may say that a special allowance is made to them. They get a larger allowance than men serving in the better settled portions of the country, due no doubt to the higher cost of living in those higher latitudes. The hon. member for Victoria also asked why the force was not now as widely distributed as it was before. The chief reason is this: The provincial authorities, of course, are now responsible for the ordinary administration of law and order throughout the province, and it is not necessary, having regard to the present duties of the force, that they should be located in every town and village throughout the country.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I asked why they were centred in the large cities, because a great deal of their service is performed at some distance from headquarters. A man may have to go down the line a hundred miles from Edmonton, for instance, and then have to hire a car to take him to where he is required. If a detachment was located at Vermilion or Lloydminster, we will say, the men could go out from there at less expense, and it would be much cheaper for the married men to live and bring up their families; I also think they might be able to perform better service.

Mr. ROWELL: When the force is recruited up to strength there will be more detachments than at present. At present the view that those responsible for the administration of the force entertain is that there is some gain in having a reasonably strong body of police at certain important points throughout the country. As regards the point raised by my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) I shall not enter into a discussion of the cost of living. I appreciate what he says about the fine service which the force is rendering and the appreciation of the people of Northwestern Ontario of the fact that there is a force stationed there. My hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) and my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) both spoke on the question of increasing the force beyond the present strength. We are recruiting the force up to the present authorized strength, namely 1,200.

Mr. KEEFER: Is it 1,200 yet?

Mr. ROWELL: It is not yet up to 1,200. My hon. friend from Port Arthur spoke about our asking the men who had been in the force and had gone overseas serving in Imperial units to come back into the force. That is part of the policy of the Government, and we have taken steps to bring to the attention of former members of the force who are now serving in Imperial units the fact that we shall be glad to welcome them back into the force.

Mr. KEEFER: Do these men know of these new regulations?

Mr. ROWELL: Some of them are only covered by the new Bill which is to be brought into the House, but the substance of the regulations was posted up in France. We endeavoured as well as we could to reach the men in the Imperial units, but it is not an easy matter to get into touch with men so widely scattered in so large a force. However, we have provided that any man who retired from the force in order to serve overseas in either the Canadian or the Imperial forces shall have his time service overseas counted in computing his pension, so that they will all have the benefit of the increased pension which we are providing and also the benefit, in computing the time for the pension, of the service they have rendered overseas.

Mr. KEEFER: Has the Government considered extending the war service gratuity to the members of the Mounted Police who served in the Imperial forces?

Mr. ROWELL: That is a much larger question, because there are not only the members of the Mounted Police who served in the Imperial forces but thousands of other men who went overseas to serve in

the Imperial forces. I do not see how it is possible to grant a supplementary war gratuity to men who left one branch of our service to serve overseas in the Imperial forces, and not treat every other British reservist in the same way. That is a question of policy which will have to be considered in relation to other departments of the Government as well as the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. I said that we were recruiting up to the present strength. Possibly we should recruit beyond that strength, but that is a question that will have to receive very careful consideration and is now under the consideration of the Government. If we decide to recruit beyond 1,200 it will be necessary for me to come to the House with a Supplementary Estimate to cover it. The present Estimates only cover recruiting up to 1,200.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: How many commissions have been granted? In increasing the force there must be a great many officers, and I would like to know whether non-commissioned officers and others in the ranks are receiving any special consideration. Are the Government granting commissions to men in the lower ranks, or are they going outside of the force for their officers?

Mr. ROWELL: Every commission so far granted has been a promotion from the ranks.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: In support of the remarks made by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) pointing out that permanent corps like A and B batteries received their scrip, I may say further that not only did the regular batteries receive it but a great many of the settlers that came into police headquarters or barracks as refugees with their families were sworn in to do guard duty. All these home guards really came in for protection but they were sworn to do duty while the police were out on patrol, and they were granted scrip as well as the others. I hope the minister has heard what I have said about that.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, I will note it.

Supplementary Estimates, 1918-1919—Civil Government Royal Northwest Mounted Police—To provide for a clerkship in the Second Division, Subdivision A, from December 1, 1918—$533.32.

Mr. ROWELL: This man was promoted by the Civil Service Commission, and this is to provide the difference between his former salary and the promotion.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Civil Government—Public Works.
Salaries including Deputy Minister at $6,000, Assistant Deputy Minister at $4,500, and Departmental Solicitor at $3,500—$575,537.50.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): When this matter was under consideration last, the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) asked some questions in reference to increase of salary of $1,000 to the Deputy Minister. I do not see the hon. member in his place now. It will be borne in mind that the same increase has been granted to the Deputy Minister of Public Works as to all other Deputy Ministers in the public service. I can give no further explanation, because there is none to give. It has been decided as a matter of policy that all deputy ministers shall receive a salary of $6,000 a year. There are only two other items in regard to which inquiry was made. I was asked what had been the reduction in the inside service of the Public Works Department since I assumed the duties of office. There were actually in the department in October, 1917, 307 officials; in April 1919, there were 277 officials, or a reduction of 30. I was also asked how much of the total vote had not been expended last year because the positions were not all filled. The amount voted was $574,955, and we expended $503,130, leaving $71,825 unexpended. I imagine that in the appropriation I am asking for to-night there will be more than that amount which will not be expended. As some salaries may go up, I have decided to ask for an appropriation such as this but I want to assure the Committee that in future, as in the past, there will be no increase in the staff unless it is absolutely necessary. As fast as people leave the service by death or marriage, or whatever the cause may be, there will be no appointment to fill these positions unless they are actually necessary. I think, therefore, that there would be a larger balance unexpended at the end of the present fiscal year than there was at the end of last year.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: The minister made a saving last year of $70,000 and he still asks for about the same sum this year. Why not reduce the Estimates proportionately if he expects to employ fewer rather than more? Does he expect to have a surplus next year?

Mr. CARVELL: I certainly think we will not expend the amount asked for in the appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER: You had a surplus last year of $70,000. Your Estimates should be reduced by that amount.

Mr. CARVELL: I am rather inclined to agree with my hon. friend, but in making up these Estimates in the department there is a strong feeling that we must provide for all contingencies, although I confess it does not look like good business.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who is the chief architect of the Public Works Department?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Wright.

Mr. McKENZIE: What has become of our good old friend, the late chief architect, Mr. Ewart?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Ewart is still in the department. He occupies a very responsible position as a sort of consulting architect in connection with the construction of the Parliament buildings. I want to say in the most public manner possible that I look upon him as perhaps one of the most valuable men we have in connection with the construction of that new building. While he is considerably over eighty years of age, he possesses all his faculties, he is at his office early and late and very many times in every month I call upon Mr. Ewart for information and he is always ready with it.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I see that there is an appropriation of $44,000, an increase of $14,000, for travelling expenses. It looks as if there is going to be more travelling, or more joy riding.

Mr. CARVELL: In my judgment no money can be expended by any department, especially the department of Public Works, more profitably than that which is properly expended for travelling expenses. I have found occasion, several times during the past year, to send men from Halifax to Vancouver. We have expended on the construction of military hospitals and other military buildings, since the first of April in the last fiscal year nearly $10,000,000. There is hardly a day when a report does not come in from one of these stations, and we have found that we get the best results by sending a man from Ottawa to make a personal examination, come back and not only make a report but sit down and talk it over. I am personally asking for that increase. I will defend it as vigorously as may be necessary and I look upon it as the best way in which we can spend public money in order to get results.

10 p.m.

. Public Works—Chargeable to Capital—public buildings—Ottawa Parliament Buildings restoration. The plans for the said building and the method to be adopted for securing the reconstruction thereof to be subject to the approval of the joint committee appointed by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.. .. ..$2,000,000
Ottawa—new public building.. .. 900,000

$2,900,000

Mr. SHEARD: I am anxiously awaiting the day when we will be able to occupy a different chamber from this. Those who have to occupy the side benches are suffering a great disadvantage not only because of the difficulty of intelligently following the debates in this chamber, due to the acoustic properties, but also because of the crowded and irregular manner of the seating. It seems to me a lamentable condition of affairs that the Dominion Parliament should be constrained to discharge the greatest public duties that fall to any body under such extreme difficulties. I had hoped that last year would see the last of these conditions. I would like some assurance from the Minister of Public Works that every effort will be made to expedite the work and that the conditions will be represented to those responsible so that we can have some promise that next year we will be relieved from difficulties which, I feel certain, are very trying to a great many, especially the newer, members of the House.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I appreciate the difficulties that the minister has been operating under during the past year. I am sure that the situation has been very trying. I understand that there was an inspection of the new buildings made by some officials and members at an earlier period of the session. Most of us are not familiar with the present condition of the building, but I think it would be very interesting to the members if the minister would give to those who have not had an opportunity of making an inspection a statement as to how far the building is advanced, and what the possibility is of being in the new House next session.

Mr. CARVELL: I shall be very glad indeed to do so, because if there is one work in connection with the department that I have taken a personal interest in for the last year and a half it is the construction of the Parliament Building. I happen to be chairman of the parliamentary committee because of the position that I occupy. While I do not want to say anything that may be construed as reflecting upon any person, I

do not think I would be doing justice to myself, let alone to the House of Commons, if I did not say that I have been very much disappointed with the progress of the work. There has been nothing in my experience as a minister that has given me greater disappointment, I think, than the manner in which that work has been carried on. I have made myself almost a nuisance to many people in connection with it, but I have done my best anyway. I have told the workmen, and I propose to say here, that I do not think we have received value for the money we have paid out, and the fault is not all with the workmen either. There seems to be a general feeling on the part of pretty nearly every one connected with the institution that it is good, easy, government money, and that it is a great mistake to get through with the job too soon. For that reason I am having a lot of difficulty.

As to the possibilities of the future, I am not as pessimistic perhaps as one might gather from the statement I am making, because I do believe that, barring strikes, the building will be in such shape by the first of January next—and I presume there will not be a session of Parliament before that date,—that it can be occupied for parliamentary purposes.

But I may as well tell the Committee that the building will be in no way nearly completed. I believe the House of Commons Chamber will certainly be ready for occupation, and probably pretty will advanced toward completion. The walls are practically all up; I mean the inside lining of stone is practically up. The ceiling is now being plastered and being got ready for the decorative work, and the galleries are started. Nothing has been done to the floors, but it seems to me that in the course of the next three or four months the House of Commons Chamber ought to be pretty well under way. I see no prospect of the Senate Chamber being ready for occupation unless there is a very great change in the movements of the men who are putting up the building.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: That will not affect the Commoners.

Mr. CARVELL: I think I should say there are a number of very fine committee rooms in the building. There are very large reading rooms, and there are rooms which could be easily fitted up for the reception of the Senate for one session. The Senators would be much more comfortable than they are at the present time, and they would be just as favourably situated as they were in the old House. The corridors will be pretty well finished, but probably not altogether. The building is different in the matter of entrances from the old structure; there are really three entrances instead of one. Members will recollect that in the old building everybody went in by the centre entrance and turned to the right and to the left. In the new building there will be a central entrance, which has not been started at all as far as finishing up is concerned, and I am sure, will not be completed. On the other hand there will be a lobby for the House of Commons and one for the Senate. The House of Commons lobby is pretty nearly completed, in fact most of the floors are laid and the stonework in the walls is all completed. Workmen are now engaged upon the decorative work, but that portion of the building is practically completed now. The lobby on the Senate side has not been touched at all, so that it seems to me there is not much hopes of that being finished in time.

But there is another phase of the work which is much more encouraging than that upon which I have been dwelling. The rooms are in a very forward state of completion, and there will be, I think, about twice as much accommodation in the new building as there was in the old. The building is one story higher than the old structure, and it is laid off in a different way altogether. The Senate and House of Commons chambers were in the middle of the building before. Now the chambers are at the extreme ends, so that they have lots of sunlight and fresh air. The space that was occupied by the former Senate and Commons chambers is now taken up by what they call the office blocks, that is, two blocks extending for three floors after you go up the two floors. In other words, two floors are taken up in the elevation of the House of Commons and the Senate chambers and large committee rooms below, and there are three floors in each of these office blocks. I think there are eighty-four very fine rooms which are now practically completed, and when we get delivery of the marble those rooms will be ready for the painters and even for the installation of the furniture in a very short time. In addition to that, there are a tremendous number of rooms—I would not like to say the actual number, but it must go into hundreds—all around the building both front and rear. These rooms are now, I would say. three-fourths and perhaps four-

fifths plastered. The floors are laid, and in some cases, quite a number of cases, the plumbing is in a very advanced stage. The heating is also practically complete, so that there will be no question whatever of ample room for the accommodation of members, both of the Senate and House of Commons. With this condition of affairs, with the corridors in such a state that they will be passable, with the House of Commons chamber practically completed, and with plenty of room for the Senate, I see no reason in the world why we should not get into the building for the next session of Parliament.

I think I should state to the Committee, however, that the building is going to cost us a great deal more money than anybody ever imagined it would in the beginning. We have expended already a little over $5,000,000. I estimate that we will expend $2,000,000 during the coming year, and then it will not be anyway nearly complete. I have no accurate estimate with me to-night —I am sorry for that, because I might have had it—but I have not much hesitation in saying that the building will cost $8,000,000 when it is completed.

Mr. COPP: What was the original estimate of the cost?

Mr. CARVELL: About $5,000,000, possibly a little more. But we must remember that there has been an absolute revolution in the building trade since this structure was started. Wages are very much in excess of what they were, as hon. gentlemen know; the cost of materials has gone up tremendously; and had we known everything, or had even my predecessors known everything—because the cost of things had gone up pretty well before I came into office—a saving might have been effected; but they did not like to buy too far ahead, there was always the hope that the war would be over and that there would be a reduction in the price of materials. Well, the war, unfortunately, lasted longer than people thought, the price of materials has not gone down, and therefore the building has cost a great deal more than was anticipated, due entirely to conditions over which perhaps no person had control.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are you still paying eight per cent to the contractor?

Mr. CARVELL: No, the contract provides for the payment of eight per cent to the contractors up to $4,000,000, seven per cent for the next million, and nothing above $5,000,000, so that the percentage payable to the contractors is practically earned. There is also a commission of five and a half per cent which goes to the architect, and that also stops at $5,000,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Five and a half per cent on $5,000,000?

Mr. CARVELL: Five and a half per cent on an amount not exceeding $5,000,000.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is that commission to the architects?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: What architects?

Mr. CARVELL: Well, Mr. Pearson, for one.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is he not an employee of the Government under salary?

Mr. CARVELL: No, he gets a commission. The other architect is Mr. Marchand, of Montreal. I do not know just how the commission is divided, but Mr. Pearson gets by far the major portion of it. Mr. Pearson gets, I think, four-fifths, and Mr. Marchand the other one-fifth.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was walking around the library to-day, and I noticed a little shack behind it marked with a couple of red crosses and the inscription "hospital." I understand that at one time a doctor, or two doctors, were employed.

Mr. CARVELL: I think that is correct.

Mr. EDWARDS: Are there two doctors still employed, or any medical man at all?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I am happy to say there are no doctors on the job, and there have not been for over a year.

Mr. EDWARDS: Have there been any casualties on the works since the doctors left?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not heard of any.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is the reason for dismissing the doctors then, I presume there were casualties before? When you got rid of the doctors there were not any casualties; the men did not fall down and get hurt. Who constitutes the committee that is supervising the construction at the present time?

Mr. CARVELL: I think I can give their names from memory. From the House of Commons there are, the Minister of Public Works, who is chairman; the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine. I think that is all. From the Senate there are, Senators Lougheed, Watson, and Robertson.

Mr. EDWARDS: Was that Committee named by the late leader of the Opposition?

Mr. J. D. REID: Senator Watson was so named.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes; and Dr. Pugsley, Mr. Lemieux and Mr. Murphy in the beginning. Mr. Murphy, I believe, never acted, and Mr. Lemieux resigned from the Committee at the time it was decided to tear down the old building and rebuild entirely. I believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier refused to recommend appointments to the Committee after the retirement of Messrs. Murphy and Lemieux. After the Union Government was formed Dr. Pugsley retired, and Mr. Hazen also, and other gentlemen were appointed to fill the vacancies. Senator Watson, the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid), and Senator Lougheed, I believe, are the only original members of the Committee.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who supervised the purchase of materials?

Mr. CARVELL: That would be a pretty hard question to answer. For the last year and a half practically everything that could be purchased by public tender has been so purchased. A large part of the work that originally was intended to be carried out by the contractors has been done by a sort of subcontract—for instance, the heating. Members, if they have ever gone over the work, will perhaps realize that the building is to be heated from a central heating plant on the bank of the Ottawa river about a third of a mile from the buildings. The heat is conveyed by steam pipes through a tunnel which is all completed, the steam heats the water, and the hot water is pumped through the building. That work was all done by contract; that is, we called for tenders, a number of people tendered, and the work was given to the lowest tenderer, and he has completed his work.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Do the contractors get a commission on that?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, 8 per cent; that is up to $5,000,000. The same is true of the plumbing.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does that commission cease at $5,000,000?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, the commission ceases when the cost reaches $5,000,000, and as the building has now cost $5,000,000, it really does not make very much difference because they will get no commission in the future. The same is true of the windows, the doors and the woodwork; we called for tenders. There was a good deal of criticism of our standing by that principle in the case of the woodwork, because that was held to be artistic work which some person should be appointed to design and execute. However, we took the ground that it was not impossible to draw specifications, and we did draw specifications and called for tenders. We gave one portion of the work to the lowest tenderer. As to the remainder, the next lowest tenderer withdrew his tender and the work went to the next lowest. We have followed that principle wherever possible, and we have found it possible in nearly every instance. I can scarcely recall the purchase of anything since I have been on the committee that has not been by tender; in fact, any exception would be a matter of very, very minor importance. Of course, we are reaching the point where some of the work cannot be done by tender. We have just completed arrangements with a gentleman to come here and design centres, ceilings, and decorations of that kind. Tenders cannot be called for for that particular work; it has to be done by hiring some person of artistic leanings to carry it out. The same will be true of many other things in the future. But I can assure the Committee that wherever it has been possible we have called for tenders, and invariably the contract has gone to the lowest tenderer, except, I think, one case, the details of which I have forgotten, but there were very good reasons there for departing from our rule.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has the architect been paid the full amount of his commission?

Mr. CARVELL: I am not positive about that. I think there is some little question at issue.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Does he get 5 per cent on the total cost?

Mr. CARVELL: He gets 5½ per cent.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Up to $8,000,000?

Mr. CARVELL: Up to $5,000,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The reason I ask that question is that the architect is getting a very large sum of money and there are particular points about his work that will not be known until the building is completed,—such, for example, as the acoustics. If he has made a mess of that he should not be paid the full amount of his commission, because that is a matter

of vital importance. It has been discussed frequently in the House, and the attention of the present minister and of the former minister has been drawn to it. If we get a chamber like this, for example, where we cannot hear what is being said, it would be a calamity after spending so much money, and the architect is the man to take responsibility for that. Then there is the ventilation, which was very bad in the old Chamber, and which we all hope will be good in the new one. I was disappointed to see a corridor around the lower part of the building so that the Chamber is not exposed to the fresh air on any side as this Chamber is; the upper part is. But the acoustics is a matter of vital importance, and if the architect has not been paid his full commission, I would suggest that a portion be retained until the building is completed and it is known if he has done his work properly or not.

Mr. CARVELL: I appreciate the point made by my hon. friend. Of course, I am not responsible for the contract. I have watched the construction of the new building pretty carefully from the standpoint of the architect. I do not think my hon. friend need have the least fear that it will not be the best that money can build—at least, I have seen no evidence of any attempt to stop the expenditure of money. There is one thing sure from Mr. Pearson's standpoint—and I want to say it to his credit, because it is a great national structure,—that he is determined that it shall be the very best of its kind that can be produced. I have discussed with him a good many times the question of acoustics. He has gone to different places in the States to investigate—in fact, he wants to go to Great Britain, and I rather advise that he should be allowed to go in order to discuss and investigate this very important question, because we all realize that the acoustics of the Chamber is the most important in connection with the whole enterprise, outside of having a substantial building. As to the ventilation, if my hon. friend would just take a forenoon and go through the building he would satisfy himself beyond question that the ventilation has been looked after in a manner that has never been attempted before.

Mr. EDWARDS: How do you get through the fence?

Mr. CARVELL: I think if my hon. friend will present his card he will find no difficulty in getting through—in fact, they will be only too happy to send some one with him to point out the different features of construction. Those are the instructions, and I am sure they will be carried out. In fact, I have asked and suggested that members take the trouble to go through the buildings, and I think they ought to do so. If my hon. friend would go into the building and go down into the basement, he would find miles of galvanized iron pipes, some of them four and five feet in diameter, extending all through the building. They come up into the chamber out of the wall about six feet from the floor, and fresh air is being constantly pumped from pipes outside of the building through the basement up through those pipes and distributed throughout the chamber. Then there are other pipes, such as we have in this building, ventilating pipes that take the old air away. I cannot give my hon. friend any guarantee as to the acoustics, but I can absolutely assure him that there will be no question about the ventilation. That takes place in all portions of the building where it is necessary to have ventilation. I do not think that takes place in what they would call the ordinary members' rooms, although it does to some extent. All the windows in the members' rooms are casement windows. There is no wood about them whatever; they are made of steel, copper and glass with a small lever by which they are opened and thrown out a little way, and a thumb-screw keeps them at any angle at which the member wants them.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Is there a clerk of works in charge of the construction of the building? That is usual in large buildings of this kind. If so, is he paid by the contractor or by the Government?

Mr. CARVELL: In justice to Mr. Pearson, I should have stated—and I intended to when I had the opportunity—that Mr. Pearson himself employs all of his own staff out of the 5½ per cent.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: That is the clerk of works who looks after the construction work?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Pearson is responsible for the inspection as the work proceeds. Hon. members must not run away with the idea that Mr. Pearson gets the whole four-fifths of 5½ per cent and gives nothing for it. He has quite a large staff and his expenditures will be very considerable. We may regret the cost of this work, and I have,

perhaps, somewhat disagreed with Mr. Pearson, and sometimes, I think, the work has not been done too well in some portions, but that does not make any difference, it is being done the very best it is possible to do it under the circumstances. Mr. Pearson has a competent staff and is responsible for seeing that the work is properly carried out.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister said he was very much dissatisfied with the progress of the work, but he did not tell us just how or why. The question arises as to the commissions to be paid to both the contractor and the architect. If the building up to this time has cost approximately $5,000,000, or the amount that the commission is to be paid on to the architect, what arrangement has been made for the completion of the building? The architect is paying out probably several thousand dollars a month in carrying out his portion of the work. Will he continue until this work is completed to pay that money out of his own pocket, or will an arrangement be made to pay him out of the public treasury? The same thing may be said with regard to the contractor. If his commission ends at a cost of $5,000,000, and the building is estimated to cost $8,000,000 and will go on for another year before it is completed, what provision has been made for supervision by the contractor and the architect?

Mr. CARVELL: There is no provision whatever. They receive this commission on $5,000,000. Of course, the money has not all been paid to them; there is a certain drawback still coming to them.

Mr. CAHILL: About how much?

Mr. CARVELL: The note I have says that one-fifth of the commission which is to be paid upon the whole $5,000,000, will be paid upon the completion of the preliminary sketches. The remaining four-fifths is to be paid pro rata from time to time as payments are made to the contractor. I know some money is being held back as regards Mr. Pearson. There is no provision made for that balance, but it must be remembered that these are honourable gentlemen and that they have received up to the present time a fair return for services rendered. I think I can state both as regards Mr. Lyall and Mr. Pearson that they will go on regardless of whether there will be any more commissions or not. I am satisfied that Mr. Pearson is so wrapped up in the work that if it took the rest of his natural life, he would gladly give it to stay there and see that the work was properly executed. Mr. Pearson, I think, looks upon it as his life's work, and regardless of commissions in the future, Mr. Pearson will stay there and see the work through and make it just as great a success as he possibly can. In saying that as regards Mr. Pearson, I do not wish to cast any discredit upon Mr. Lyall, but Mr. Lyall does not look upon this in the same manner as Mr. Pearson does. Mr. Lyall has many other business interests in Canada and he has to look after them. Mr. Lyall has, unfortunately, been ill for the last three months, and has not been able to give this work any personal attention at all, but from a conversation I have had with him only last week, there is no question he will be able to give it his personal attention and his staff will be there, and this work will proceed just as well in the future as it has done in the past.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the cause of the delay?

Mr. CARVELL: I can put it in very plain language. There is a feeling when men are working for the Government that it is good, easy money and there is no good hurrying themselves too much. It is just that temperamentality running through the whole thing. I have told the workmen to their faces what I am saying here, namely, that I do not think they have given us value for our money. Sometimes they disagree with me and sometimes they blame somebody besides themselves, but that is my view of the matter. And the last time I met them, which was one day only last week, I certainly told them in plain language what I thought about the matter and what I hoped would be the case in the future.

Mr. CROWE: The minister stated that the heating plant was stationed one-third of a mile away from the building. Any person who understands the conveying of heat from a unit to a building must realize that there is a very large percentage of waste. Why was that heating plant put so far away from the building?

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot give the reason why. I have seen nothing to lead me to believe that it is not one of the most up-to-date heating plants in the world to-day. There is this about it: The pipes go through a concrete subway six feet by seven, and if the subway does not stand it is not because enough steel and concrete were not put into it, because reinforced steel was put in underneath even over bed-rock, so that it is going to stay there. There will be no chance for cold getting in; there will be no condensation, and the subway, fortunately, is

all uphill from the time the steam leaves the plant until it gets into the building.

I am told that the amount of condensation or loss will be extremely small. The pipes, I think, are nine or ten inches in diameter. The east and west blocks, the Langevin block and the Supreme Court buildings are all to be heated from the same central plant. The engineers have figured out that there will be a very substantial saving in the heating of these buildings from a central plant, as compared with individual plants for the several buildings. But this is an engineering matter, and I have not expert knowledge on the subject. I would say, however, that the engineers must be right, and personally I look for no trouble whatever.

Mr. MORPHY: How far below the surface is the main conduit to the building?

Mr. CARVELL: On an average it is from three to four feet below the surface of the street to the top of the tunnel; the tunnel is seven feet deep and six feet wide. These pipes are suspended in the tunnel, and there are manholes at a few places so that repairs can be made, but these are all air tight. The pipes will be protected by asbestos, and every precaution will be taken that there shall be as little loss as possible in transmission. There is this further advantage: there will be no furnaces, and consequently no soot or dust around the building. This plan, I think, will effect a great economy and be of great advantage from the sanitary standpoint.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Does the minister's estimate of $8,000,000 include the cost of the furniture?

Mr CARVELL: No, I do not think so. I hope that the committee will realize that when I said $8,000,000, that is only an approximate estimate. My reason for saying that is this: I know about what is expected to be done during the coming year, and I know that $2,000,000 will not finish the tower; in fact, it will not do much more than lay the foundation for the tower. I think it will take $8,000,000 to finish the building exclusive of furniture. We have not considered the question of furniture yet, and I must confess I am somewhat at a loss to know how to go about it.

Mr. COPP: Are you going to use mahogany?

Mr. CARVELL: I presume there will be certain rooms that should be finished in mahogany. I do not see how tenders can be called for for furniture, because you cannot very well draw up specifications. A number of the biggest firms have been discussing the matter and would like to have a chance to tender. I can only say that they will all have the opportunity, but I think even before that time comes, some artistic brain must be set to work to advise the colour scheme and the general arrangement of the furniture and rugs and things of that kind. I confess that it is beyond me. I think I know something about the building, but I am not an expert on the artistic side of it. I can assure the Committee, however, that nothing will be done in the matter until it has been thoroughly considered.

Mr. STEELE: The statement of the minister to-night is very encouraging, so far as it holds out a reasonable prospect of the House occupying the new building next session. It will be a great relief to us who have spent several sessions in this building to get into the new building with all its conveniences and comforts. I should like to impress upon the Committee that the architect and the contractors are not the only ones who have a personal interest in the building. Every member of the House has a very direct personal interest in it, and while many of us may not occupy a seat in it for a great number of years, our successors will. The members of the House of Commons and of the Senate who are privileged to occupy seats in this and future Parliaments will be compelled to spend a very large portion of their lives in that building, and I think men who have spent from twelve to fifteen hours a day for five or six months of each year in this building are entitled to the very greatest degree of comfort that it is possible to give them in the new building now being erected. I trust that the inner arrangements for the comfort of the members will not be overlooked in the larger plan of producing a fine building. I have had the privilege of going over the building two or three times, the last time only a few weeks ago, and from what an inexperienced person like myself could see I must say that the building promises a very great degree of comfort indeed for the individual members of the House. That is necessary if we are to give our best to Parliament. The conditions here prevent us giving our best work; they are destructive to the interest that we take in the House, for the simple reason that we are unable to follow its proceedings. I would therefore again

impress upon the Committee the necessity of seeing that the very greatest possible degree of comfort and convenience is provided for the individual members of the House and Senate.

Mr. CARVELL: I quite appreciate the necessity of everything my hon. friend has indicated, and I can assure him that everything is being done that can reasonably be done in order to meet the requirements he has mentioned. There will be sufficient rooms in the new building to give every man who wishes it a private office. I do not imagine that every man will wish it, because in some cases two members would prefer to be together, but I think I can safely say that there will be sufficient space to give every man who really wishes it a private office. The offices will be suitably furnished. The floors will be of nailacrete, which is a little softer than concrete. Over that will be a covering of battleship linoleum, and over that a carpet or rug of some kind. Suitable desks, chairs, lounges and things of that kind will be provided. There will be a hot and cold water basin in every room, I believe, and ten elevators in the building. Lavatories will be provided where required. In my judgment one of the greatest comforts and conveniences of the whole building will be the restaurant, which is being built above the Commons Chamber. Not only will it be beautiful in design, but, overlooking the Ottawa river, I think it has one of the prettiest locations I have ever seen in my life. The kitchens will be on a very elaborate scale. Hon. members can rest assured that everything will be done to provide for their comfort and health and for that of the officials of the House and all those who have to live within its precincts.

Mr. EDWARDS: Will accommodation be provided in the building for the Speaker of the Commons and the Speaker of the Senate?

Mr. CARVELL: It has been decided that the Speakers of the respective Houses shall not reside in the building.

Mr. COPP: I appreciate the last remarks of the minister in regard to the arrangement of the new Parliament buildings and am pleased to see that some interest is being taken in the comfort and personal satisfaction of private members. My experience of the old Parliament was very short, but I found when I came there that I occupied a room in the cellar with five or six other members. We had some sort of desks but there was not a bookcase of any kind in which one could keep books or papers, and we did not find it very convenient. We did not expect anything elaborate here, but it would be impossible for members to do any kind of decent work in the rooms we are occupying here, there being as many as eight or ten in some rooms, and not fewer than four or five in any. It makes it very inconvenient and practically impossible for members to prepare their work. I am not very fastidious about the furniture that is in the rooms. In my room now I have an old desk that was brought down in pieces from the fire in the old Parliament building and nailed together. However, I have not made any requisition for furniture. I may, but I do not know that the Minister of Public Works would grant my request if I did. Speaking seriously, I am very glad to hear the minister tell us that in the new Parliament buildings there will be proper facilities and plenty of room. One or two in a room is all right, but in order to carry on the work of the session and to do any other work which may be necessary, proper facilities are indispensable. We regret that we have had to remain here so long, and trust this will be the last session. It would be gratifying for those who will have the privilege of being in the new building to have adequate convenience and comfort.

Mr. MORPHY: Will there be provided a recreation room in the shape of a gymnasium for the use of members? I am quite serious about this.

Mr. CARVELL: I am serious too, and I will go so far as to say that it has been considered, although I do not think it has been done. I may state what Mr. Pearson has suggested to me, and what I would regard with favour. He proposes that there be a walk all round the library, a place that can be kept in the winter time at a fairly warm temperature, where members can exercise. The suggestion appeals strongly to me. As to a real gymnasium or anything of that kind, I do not think that has been considered, although if it were thought necessary I think space enough could be found in the basement to provide almost anything like that, because there are two floors below the ground floor. There is much more space there than one would ever think unless he went through the building, so that if it were thought advisable to adopt this proposal there could be no difficulty about it.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am very glad that the hon. member drew attention to that feature

of the building. There has been a commendable unanimity of opinion amongst members that the new building should conduce to the comfort of the members both of the House of Commons and of the Senate. We spend long hours here, especially the members of the House of Commons. No eight-hour a day schedule applies to members of the House of Commons, and even the shortest day is a long day, and would be considered by any person in any other walk of life as requiring "time and a half" at least if not "double pay" for overtime. We are here twelve, fifteen and sixteen hours a day, week after week and month after month, and I say in all seriousness that there should be some provision whereby members who have an hour or an hour and a half at their disposal can take systematic exercise. That is a common-sense view of the matter. Personally it has always been a case of putting off exercise from day to day, but if there were a gymnasium room—and there would be ample space for a place of that kind—the members could take half an hour and go for an exercise with benefit to their health. Since the minister says that this matter has come up for consideration, I would suggest the advisability of appointing a Committee of this House—I do not know that it would be necessary to have a Committee of the Senate, although we might have some of the younger members of that body if it were thought fit—to confer with the Committee who have supervision of this work to consider the question of having some recreation room in the new building. Some may regard this as of little consequence, but in my opinion it is a matter of great importance, and I would like the question to be seriously considered.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not by any means consider it a matter of small consequence. On the contrary, I have been discussing it with the architects for the last year, and while we have not agreed upon what shall be done it has been practically decided that there shall be a promenade indoors, to which members can resort in winter time. I would very heartily welcome the advice and assistance of a committee of the House. I will bring the matter up at the next meeting of the Parliamentary Committee and also take means, if the House deems fit, to see that a committee is appointed to discuss the question with the Parliamentary Committee, because it is something that touches the health of every member. I do not suppose there are half a dozen members who do not realize that they are not getting sufficient exercise. I am not getting the exercise I should, largely because there is no opportunity without going off to the Y. M.C.A. I regard the matter as of great importance and will take whatever steps are necessary to see that it is brought up in the way suggested.

Mr. MANION: As a medical man, I strongly support the suggestion made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and endorsed by the Minister of Public Works, because I think it is very essential that men who are doing mental work, as we are here, should get sufficient exercise. We are all getting on toward middle life—I would not say that anyone of us was getting past that stage,—and we should consider seriously the establishment of a few rooms in the basement for a gymnasium and place of exercise, where there might also be a few shower baths. This would be all that would be necessary and it would be practically inexpensive. It would give a fair amount of exercise to most members, and the members of the Press Gallery could also work off some of their superfluous energy there.

Mr. FIELDING: Do I understand the hon. minister to say that practically the whole of the commission to the architects has been paid out?

Mr. CARVELL: It has been all earned and a substantial amount paid out.

Mr. FIELDING: It is of course gratifying to know that we are dealing with honourable gentlemen who will fulfil their obligations. But even when one is dealing with honourable gentlemen, regard must be had to business principles. Do we understand that in the making of these contracts the arrangement is of such a nature that we may pay the architect the entire amount of his compensation while the building is little more than half completed?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not the contract before me but I am pretty sure that is about the substance of it. Of course, I can do nothing but carry out the contract. There is no actual written contract with the architects, but there is sufficient correspondence in existence to practically make up a contract. There was some little question whether the commission would be allowed on one certain item, and I believe that a formal contract had never been signed. The fact that the building is going to cost $2,250,000 or $3,000,000 more than anticipated does not make any difference at all; we take it for granted that the architects

are entitled to their commission on $5,000,000. I am not in a position to say how much has been paid out, but I know that practically the whole amount has been paid, because the contract calls for it. They get their commission monthly upon the expenditure. That is the contract.

Mr. FIELDING: If that is the contract, of course the minister must fulfil it, but ordinary business principles would seem to indicate that the commission should be paid out pro rata with the progress of the building. Supposing anything should happen to these most excellent gentlemen, of whom I am quite sure I cannot speak too highly, suppose they should be called by death, you would have a building a little more than half completed, the commission paid out and nobody to supervise the work for the remainder of the time.

Mr. PARENT: Were there two contracts, one with the contractors and one with the architects?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. PARENT: Who are the architects who appear in the contract?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Pearson and Mr. Marchand, of Montreal.

Mr. PARENT: Are they in partnership?

Mr. CARVELL: In a way. Mr. Marchand acts in an advisory capacity and attends meetings of the committee whenever anything of importance is going on. Mr. Pearson acts as resident architect and inspector of the work and has personal charge.

Mr. PARENT: If a contract has been entered into between these two architects, plans must have been prepared and submitted to the Department of Public Works here. If such was the case, I would like to know whether the plans were prepared by Mr. Pearson or Mr. Marchand and what commission the Government agreed to pay for the preparation of the plans. I understand that there would be a commission paid for the preparation of the plans and also a commission for the supervision of the work.

Mr. CARVELL: They were to be paid one-fifth of the commission upon the whole $5,000,000 upon the completion of the preliminary sketches. It always seemed to me that that payment was entirely out of proportion to the amount of work performed.

Mr. PARENT: That is paid to them jointly?

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, it is a joint contract and they have a private arrangement between themselves as to the division. Then the balance of the amount is paid monthly according to the progress estimates. I feel pretty sure that the bulk of that amount has been paid out both to the architects and the contractors.

Mr. PARENT: Is there provision in the contract by which, if the cost of the work should exceed $5,000,000, the commission shall be reduced?

Mr. CARVELL: No; they simply get 8 per cent up to $4,000,000 and 7 per cent on the next million, and nothing on any amount expended beyond that.

Mr. PARENT: If I should require the minister to place on the Table a copy of the two contracts I hope he will be able to do so and that we will have an opportunity of seeing them.

Mr. CARVELL: I shall be delighted to get them.

Mr. PROULX: The minister said that the architects were paid monthly on progress estimates. Who makes these estimates?

Mr. CARVELL: They are made up by our own staff very largely. Mr. Ewart occupies the position of consulting architect for the department and all of this work is under his special care and attention. He has a staff with him. The deputy minister has to pass on everything, and he is in a sense a member of this parliamentary committee. All the progress estimates are supervised, revised and scrutinized in every way possible by the department before the estimates are paid. The architect makes the plans, and directs the contractor what he shall do and how he shall do it. We have men who are looking after the timekeeping and these reports are handed in to the Public Works Department. The department, under the supervision of Mr. Ewart, goes over these matters fortnightly and makes up the pay list. Outside of the pay list practically everything for the last year and a half has been a matter of contract. There is a pretty extensive pay list. We have something over 600 men employed directly under the contract of Mr. Lyall, and I do not know how many men there are who are carrying out these various subcontracts to which I referred a short time ago.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the minister in mind any plan whereby he might hasten this

work? Could the department take over the work themselves, get better results and get the work done more quickly? I do not know what the rate of pay to the men is, but as a general thing when men are getting satisfactory pay they work pretty well provided it is not made to look like a life job to them. We have this undertaking costing $5,000,000, which is practically a dead investment until the work is completed. If you could hasten the completion of the building you would save $250,000 or more a year on the investment. You might bonus the employees to get the work done quicker, and if you did so it would be a great convenience to the members and a benefit to the people generally.

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid my hon. friend is a little late in his plea for the employees, because they have signed an agreement that will fix their wages until next year. If he had made his plea eight or nine days ago he might have got some political benefit, but that time has gone by now. These employees are getting pretty well paid and they have come to an agreement with the employers in Ottawa. I had nothing to do with it at all. The contractors employing help got together with the workmen, our workmen included, and came to an agreement that was satisfactory to the men and which was signed by them. This contract runs until the first of May, 1920. I do not think there is much use in talking about a bonus to the men. As to the contractors, I do not think anybody will seriously consider that I should pay them a bonus, because I think the sense of this committee is that they are fairly well paid as it is. We possibly might have taken the work out of the contractors' hands but I do not know that any good would have been accomplished by it. I think it would have been a great mistake to have taken it out of the Lyalls' hands.

Mr. COPP: They might be quite willing to be relieved of it now.

Mr. CARVELL: They might be quite willing to be relieved now. I do not feel like relieving them of it. When I came in I was bound by the contract. I do not feel like violating contracts unless there are strong reasons for doing so. But I can say frankly that I have not been satisfied with the progress of the work. I repeat it here. I am doing all I can anyway, but I shall endeavour to see that the work goes a little faster in the future than in the past.

Mr. CAHILL: I am not trying to make any political capital with regard to labour, I represent a farming constituency, and I am not at all worrying about that phase of the matter. But I have had some experience in the building business, and I made it a practice to give my men a bonus if they completed the work before a certain date. I always had good results with that system, and got the work completed much faster than other fellows around who were trying to keep wages down and would not resort to the bonus system. In this case the contractors are practically through as far as regards getting a bonus. Now, they may be honourable men, but as the minister pointed out, they are not spending very much time here, because they have other work to look after, and if the Government could save money and get into the building sooner I do not believe there would be any great difficulty in cancelling the contract.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. gentleman believe in that policy in regard to all Government buildings?

Mr. CARVELL: I now wish to take up an item in the Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1919.

Ottawa Parliament Building—Restoration, $773,000.

Mr. CARVELL: I think last year a million and a half was voted, but it did not take care of the work. The money was advanced, I think, out of the war funds temporarily, and we are now asking Parliament to vote this Supplementary Estimate to provide for the work that was not covered in the Estimates as passed by Parliament last year.

Mr. FIELDING: That is for the past year?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. It is included in the estimate I have given of $5,000,000, as being the cost of the work up to the present time.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.13 p.m.

Tuesday, May 13, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Steamboat Inspection Report—supplement to report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the fiscal year 1917-18.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 92 (from the Senate), respecting The Fire Insurance Company of Canada

and to authorize the use of a French equivalent of its name.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of David Jamieson.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian North.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Davies.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Millman.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Irvine Tuck.—Mr. Wallace.

Bill No. 102 (from the Senate), for the relief of Simon John Fraser.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 103 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wilmot Orley Wiles.—Mr. Ball.

LOCATION OF RAILWAYS.

Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 93 (from the Senate), to amend the Railway Act (Location of Railways).

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

THE DOMINION IRON AND STEEL; NOVA SCOTIA STEEL AND COAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I wish to draw the attention of the Government to an article which appeared in the Financial Times of the 3rd instant, stating in effect that Premier Borden had communicated with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and advised them that they were not to amalgamate with the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, and that this action on his part had been suggested, if not insisted upon, by the British Government. I wish first to know whether it is true that the British Government has taken the position of advising our Prime Minister what should be done in connection with Canadian local affairs; and, if true, I would ask how the Government reconciles that position with its somewhat loud protestations in this House of the growth of nationality?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): In answer to my hon. friend's rather rhetorical question, I may suggest to him that the British Government is not at all likely to interfere, and has not to my knowledge interfered, in any way in such a matter of purely Dominion jurisdiction as the one brought to our attention. So I think I can ease his mind at once as to that. I may say further that it is not within my knowledge that the Prime Minister has recently communicated in any way with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company or the Nova Scotia Steel Company with regard to the matter in question. It did receive some attention during the war, when, I believe, it was thought decidedly inadvisable that the control of the steel industry in Canada should pass from Canadian hands. So far as I am concerned, that would be my position to-day.

RE-CLASSIFICATION OF CIVIL SERVICE.

AMALGAMATED POSTAL WORKERS.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Winnipeg Centre): May I ask my hon. friend the President of the Council, if the Government has received any communication from the Amalgamated Postal Workers in reference to a possible strike?

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): On May 7, the Postmaster General received the following telegram from the Secretary of the Amalgamated Postal Workers, Mr. J. A. Elrick:

> Events seem to indicate re-classification will not go through Parliament this session or if it does we will not have time to represent our opinion. If so must remind you our most important questions were deferred pending same and present restlessness will immediately develop trouble when prorogation becomes obvious. Would appreciate statement for information of membership.

To which the Postmaster General replied on the 8th:

> Your fears absolutely groundless. Newspaper reports entirely without foundation. Matter being printed every day and will be taken up as soon as bound and ready. It will unquestionably be attended to this session and every opportunity given to postal workers for examination.

That apparently did not satisfy some members of the Association, and the Postmaster General received a further telegram on Sunday afternoon pressing for a statement that the re-classification would be brought down this week, to which he replied in accordance with the statement made by the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. A. K. Maclean) in the House yesterday. I have also received the following telegram from Mr. Elrick:

> Re-classification Bill promised May first covers most important grievances of postal workers and its non-appearance and general upheaval driving members beyond control and when definite steps are taken only complete settlement will suffice. Official notification of impatient action will reach me within three days and only quick showing of re-classification

will stand the general demands for a tie up and the keystone of the trouble being Government employees will create a dangerous movement at this time. I appeal to you to have re-classification in the House not later than Tuesday.

When the representatives of the Western Postal Workers were here they interviewed the Civil Service Commission and the experts who were re-classifying the service, and they had exactly the same knowledge as the Government had as to when the re-classification would be brought down. They were informed, as the Government was, that it was anticipated that the re-classification would be ready in time to enable the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. A. K. Maclean) to present the Bill to the House during the first week in May. Last night, therefore, I replied as follows:—

Referring your night letter, you and your associates conferred with Civil Service Commission and experts while here and you know we had assurance from them that the re-classication would be completed so that it could be presented to House during first week of May and it was relying on this that Government made its promise to you. Government has been urging utmost expedition and we feel sure that Civil Service Commission and experts have done everything in their power to get schedules completed but it has not been humanly possible to do so. As Postmaster General has wired you schedules are now completed and are all in printers' hands and Printing Bureau has been instructed to have them translated and printed as rapidly as possible. Am advised by Civil Service Commission that printing which has already commenced will take substantially longer than originally estimated and this is one explanation of delay but as everything relates back to first of April, Post Office employees cannot be prejudiced in any way by unavoidable though regrettable delay, and precipitate action on their part would be wholly unjustifiable.

It has been intimated that the post office employees may go out on a sympathetic strike with other parties striking in certain sections of Western Canada. The Government's view is that such a course would be wholly unjustifiable. The Government has taken every possible step to bring the re-classification down at the earliest practicable date, and the post office employees will be in no wise prejudiced by a few days' delay, because the re-classification relates back to the first of April.

UKRAINIA AND GALICIA AND POLAND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): I desire to ask the leader of the Government whether he or any of his ministers have received a protest on behalf of the Ruthenian, Ukrainian, and, in general, the Galician people of Canada against the annexation of their native land of Ukrainia and Eastern Galicia to Poland, or to any other state whose authority would not be congenial to them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not had any recent communications on the subject. Some time ago representations were made which were transmitted to the Prime Minister, attending the Peace Conference.

Sir SAM HUGHES: This telegram came yesterday.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Possibly a similar telegram may be in my office now.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was sent to the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Arthur Meighen).

WAR EXPENDITURE—$350,000,000 VOTE.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister), Bill No. 68, for granting to His Majesty aid for demobilization and other purposes, was read the third time.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That the said Bill do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

He said: I desire to say a few words on account of a discussion which took place in the Committee stage with respect to the borrowing powers which this Bill authorizes. I find upon inquiry that as it stands the Bill is satisfactory to my department. The amount which it authorizes the Government to borrow is $350,000,000, less any amount borrowed in excess of the amounts authorized by any War Appropriation Act. That means that to the extent to which we have over-borrowed in respect of past war appropriations, the $350,000,000 will be reduced. If we have borrowed $100,000,000 in excess of the amount authorized by previous War Appropriation Acts, then the maximum amount which we could borrow under this Bill would be $250,000,000. I was under a slight misapprehension the other night when the Bill was in the Committee stage, and the point drawn to my attention by the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) was well taken; that is to say, that section 4 of the Bill authorizes the borrowing of $350,000,000, but less any amounts that have been over-borrowed in respect of previous War Appropriation Acts. The result of this legislation, so far as borrowing powers are concerned, will be—with previous legislation—to give the Government power to borrow for war purposes only to the extent for which expenditures have been authorized by the Acts in question, and no more. Any further borrowing power which the Dominion Govern-

ment may require in respect of the expenditures authorized by Parliament, either previously or at this session, will be provided for by other legislation. I think, therefore, that the Bill, as it stands, should pass.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill has been given its third reading, and the motion that the title pass is not debatable. I thought it was due to the Acting Prime Minister that he should make the explanation which he wished to make, and there should be no objection to the leader of the Opposition putting a question; but there can be no debate on this motion.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not intend to enter into any debate. I simply want to inquire how much over-borrowing is to be covered by this Bill. What is the exact borrowing power of the Bill?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am unable to answer definitely, but I think $200,000,000 would be the amount which under this Bill we could borrow. As I have stated, if we require further borrowing power in respect of other legislation, we shall provide either in the Appropriation Bill of this year or otherwise for such power.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister) Bill No. 7, to amend The Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act—Hon. Mr. Meighen—was read the third time and passed.

MARKING OF CONTAINERS.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide,—

(1) That every can, carton, bottle, box, barrel, wrapper, package or closed receptacle containing human food or any other commodity manufactured, produced, sold or offered for sale in Canada, when such container is in its original unopened or unbroken form as it is usually delivered to consumers when sold or offered for sale in Canada, should be plainly marked, branded or stamped with the name and address of the fillers, and the weight, measure or quantity of the contents of the container;

(2) That this proposed legislation shall not apply to packages for export from Canada, or goods sold in bulk or broken packages, or fresh fruit and vegetables, or articles held in stock by a wholesale or retail dealer prior to the coming into force of the proposed legislation, or packages containing two avoirdupois ounces or less, or one fluid ounce or less, or to any article the sale of which as regards the weight or marking thereof is already provided for under other statutes;

(3) That tolerance and variations shall be allowed for discrepancies due exclusively to errors in weighing, measuring or counting which occur in packing conducted in compliance with good commercial practice, or due exclusively to differences in atmospheric conditions, evaporation or absorption of water;

(4) That penalties may be imposed for violation of the law, and the proposed legislation shall come into force one year from the date of the Royal Assent.

Mr. ROBB: When similar legislation was before the House last year, objection was taken that it would impose additional obligations upon farmers who fill milk and cream for shipment to the cities, and that it would add considerably to the price paid by the consumer. Has the minister taken that into consideration? I presume he has looked up the debate upon the Bill of last year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill founded upon this resolution will be almost exactly the same as passed the House last year. The Bill last year was defeated in the Senate for some reason which I forget at the moment; I think it contained some provisions with regard to firewood and cement, which were objected to by the Senate, and the Bill was not proceeded with further on that account. The Bill does not contain those provisions this year, but simply provides for the marking of containers or receptacles containing human food with the name of the manufacturer and the net weight or quantity of the contents.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does it apply to drugs?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, but I think the Act which the Bill founded on this resolution will amend applies to drugs. The draft Bill sets forth the exceptions as follows: All goods sold in bulk or broken packages; fresh fruits or vegetables; articles held in stock by a wholesale or retail dealer prior to the coming into force of this Act; packages containing two avoirdupois ounces or less, which packages will be exempt from marking in terms of weight; packages containing one fluid ounce or less; and any article the sale of which as regards the weight or marking thereof is already provided for under other statutes. I am not able to say at the moment whether containers containing milk, which is marketed, without being in any sense manufactured, will be exempt under this Act, and on mov-

ing the second reading I shall be in a position to answer my hon. friend.

Mr. ROBB: As the resolution stands the Bill would provide that every bottle containing human food—that might be milk or cream—shall be branded or stamped with the name and address of the fillers, and the weight, measure or quantity of the contents of the container. A very large business is done to-day putting up milk in small bottles to ship them to the cities, and if the minister insists upon the legislation going through in its present form the consumer in the city will have to bear the expense of this additional work.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The enacting clause reads as follows:

Every can, carton, bottle, box, barrel, wrapper, package or closed receptacle containing human food or any other commodity manufactured, produced, sold or offered for sale in Canada, when such container is in its original unopened or unbroken form as it is usually delivered to consumers when sold or offered for sale in Canada, should be plainly marked, branded or stamped with the name and address of the fillers, and the weight, measure or quantity of the contents of the container;

And so on. I am doubtful if milk would come within the meaning of the Act.

Mr. ROBB: Oh yes, it is human food.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no question about its being human food.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why should not a bottle of milk be marked? Every dealer should be anxious to have his name labelled on his bottle, so as to let the public know that he is selling good stuff.

Mr. BELAND: It would mean an additional expense.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Milk bottles are washed every day, or should be, and the label would be washed off.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It would not cost a thousandth part of a cent.

Mr. McMASTER: I have some knowledge of the milk business, although I am not in it myself. The investment in glass bottles by the large dairy companies in the cities is very substantial, and if the legislation goes through in the form foreshadowed by the resolution I hope that ample opportunity will be given to the milk dealers to replace their bottles gradually with bottles having their names marked or blown in the glass. The suggestion of the hon. and gallant member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) that the label might be pasted on the bottle or receptacle would lead me to suppose that he thinks the bottles are washed one by one under the tap; that is not the way it is done. The bottles are washed by machinery, and the only efficacious method of marking would be to blow the name in the bottle itself. I trust that the milk dealers will be given an opportunity to use up all their old bottles before being forced to provide these new ones.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not suggest a mark on the bottom or on the top or anything of that kind. The label should be placed on the side of the bottle, and for the life of me I cannot see why it should not be required. Sometimes the gentleman who drinks milk will order a bottle and get good stuff, and at other times he gets only skimmed milk. The consumer after all has some rights, and one of those rights is to know whether the bottle of milk placed before him is put up by a man who puts up good milk or by a man who sails as close to the law as possible.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. A. K. Maclean therefore moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 105, founded on the resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure,—

1. To ratify and confirm the Order in Council of the twenty-fourth day of February, 1919, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and transportation of intoxicating liquors, published in an extra issue of the Canada Gazette of Monday, February 24, 1919, subject to the following amendments:—

(a) Paragraph (c) of regulation one to be amended by striking out all the words after the word "wine" in the last line thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words "or other intoxicating liquors of limited alcoholic content are permitted," so that the said paragraph shall read as follows:

"(c) 'Prohibited area" means any province, territory, municipality, district, county or other area wherein the sale of intoxicating liquor is under or by any law, Federal or Provincial, prohibited, and shall include any such area wherein the sale of native wine or other intoxicating liquors of limited alcoholic content are permitted."

(b) Subsection one of regulation three to be amended by striking out the words "until the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen" at the end thereof, so that the said subsection shall read as follows:

"3. (1) No person shall make or manufacture intoxicating liquor or cause intoxicating liquor to be made or manufactured within the Dominion of Canada after the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen: Provided that in case the sale of intoxicating liquor of any class for beverage purposes is permitted in any province, this regulation shall not apply to the manufacture of such intoxicating liquor in such province."

(c) Subsection three of said regulation three to be amended by striking out the words "until the thirtieth day of April, 1919," at the end thereof, and substituting therefor the words "or to sending, taking, transporting or delivering any intoxicating liquor lawfully manufactured in any province to any place in such province where such intoxicating liquor may lawfully be sold," so that the said subsection shall read as follows:

"(3) No person after the first day of April, 1918, shall send, take, transport into, or deliver in any prohibited area any intoxicating liquor, or cause any intoxicating liquor to be sent, transported or delivered. Provided that any intoxicating liquor actually shipped before the first day of April, 1918, may be delivered in such prohibited area by a common carrier within such period of time as is required for such delivery under the ordinary and usual conditions governing the business of such common carrier but not later than the first day of May, A.D., 1918. Provided that this regulation shall not apply to the sending, taking, transporting or delivering of native wines in the province of Ontario, or to sending, taking, transporting or delivering any intoxicating liquor lawfully manufactured in any province to any place in such province where such intoxicating liquor may lawfully be sold."

(d) Subsection four of said regulation three to be amended by striking out the words "which is in, or" in the third line thereof, and the word "prohibited" in the fourth line, and adding at the end thereof the words "where the sale of such intoxicating liquor is forbidden," so that the said subsection shall read as follows:

"(4) No person after the first day of April, 1918, shall either directly or indirectly sell or contract or agree to sell any intoxicating liquor which is to be delivered within any area where the sale of such intoxicating liquor is forbidden."

2. To ratify and confirm the Order in Council of the twelfth day of April, 1919, concerning the disposal of intoxicating liquors forfeited to the Crown, published in the Canada Gazette of Saturday, the nineteenth day of April, 1919.

3. To provide that for the purposes of this proposed legislation and the schedule thereto comprising the said Orders in Council, the sale of any intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to be forbidden or prohibited in any province, territory, municipality, district, county or other area where the sale of the same is forbidden, except for use in divine service, for medical purposes, for manufacturing or commercial purposes, other than for the manufacture or use thereof as a beverage, or for other similar purposes.

4. To provide that the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue shall have power to make such regulations as he may deem necessary to prevent intoxicating liquor from being illegally manufactured in or from being imported into Canada, or from being sold, sent, taken, transported or delivered in violation of this proposed legislation and the schedule thereto comprising the said Orders in Council. Any person violating the provisions of any such regulation or of the proposed legislation shall be liable to the penalty prescribed for violation of the provisions of the regulation contained in the said Orders in Council.—The Prime Minister.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As this is important legislation I think the Committee will expect a statement with respect to its purpose and scope. The object of the legislation which this resolution has in view is to ratify and confirm certain Orders in Council which were passed by the Government during the war under the authority of the War Measures Act, for the purpose of restricting, during the continuance of the war and for a period of twelve months thereafter, the manufacture, transportation and importation of intoxicating liquors as defined by the Orders in Council. The definition of "intoxicating liquors" is to be found in the consolidated order which was dated February 24, 1919, and which is as follows:

> Intoxicating liquor means and includes any liquor or beverage which contains more than 2½ per centum of proof spirit.

Dealing with the various restrictions, I may point out that by the provisions of the consolidated Order in Council, no intoxicating liquor was to be imported into Canada after December 24, 1917, unless actually purchased for importation before that date, and actually shipped before January 31, 1918. Provision was also made in that connection that satisfactory evidence of such shipment had to be submitted to the Minister of Customs. The prohibition against importation was not to apply to wine for use in divine service, to intoxicating liquor used for medicinal purposes, to intoxicating liquor used for manufacturing purposes, and in this latter case provision was made for a special license to be issued by the Minister of Inland Revenue for such manufacture.

The effect of the Order in Council was to prohibit the manufacture of intoxicating liquors after April 1, 1918. There was in that connection a proviso that in case the sale for beverage purposes of any intoxicating liquor was permitted in a province such liquor might be manufactured until December 31, 1918. Manufacture was permitted under license in the case of liquors to be used for sacramental, industrial, artistic, mechanical, scientific or medicinal purposes. In regard to the third restriction, namely, upon the transportation of

intoxicating liquors, this was forbidden into any prohibited area in Canada after April 1, 1918. "Prohibited area" is defined by the consolidated Order in Council to mean

> Any province, territory, municipality, district, county or other area wherein the sale of intoxicating liquor is in or by any law, federal or provincial, prohibited and shall include any such area wherein the sale of native wine is prohibited.

In connection with the restriction upon transportation, provision was made to meet the case of shipments actually made before April 1, 1918, delivery to be not later than the date at which such liquor would be delivered in the ordinary course, and in any case not later than May 1, 1918. There was a further provision that no contract should be made to sell after April 1, 1918, although a licensee might send into any prohibited area for delivery for authorized purposes intoxicating liquors in accordance with the terms of the license issued to him by the Minister of Inland Revenue. Similar licensees in prohibited areas were authorized to receive intoxicating liquors under the terms of their license and not otherwise. There was a further regulation made to ensure that such transportation should be only by common carriers, by rail or water, to the end that the provision of the Order in Council might be more effectively carried out.

The purposes for which the Orders in Council were passed are set out in the recital of the consolidated Order in Council as follows:

(1) To prevent waste;

(2) To promote thrift;

(3) To conserve resources; and increase national efficiency.

As I stated, the duration of the measure was limited by the Order in Council to the period of the war and twelve months thereafter. As the orders were passed under the authority of the War Measures Act, it is necessary that they should be now ratified and confirmed by Parliament if they are to continue in effect as was the intention for a period of twelve months after the conclusion of the war.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Does the twelve months mean from the signing of the armistice, or from the signing of peace?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: From the time the conclusion of the war is officially declared. The present position is that we are still at war with Germany, Austro-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria. There seems to be no doubt that the period which the Order in Council was intended to cover was the remaining period of the war until officially at an end and twelve months thereafter. The consolidated Order in Council points out that the regulations made therein are to be construed as supplementary to the prohibitory laws now in force, or that may hereafter be in force, in a province or territory and that such regulations should continue in force during, as I have stated, the period of the present war and twelve months thereafter.

It was felt by the Government that the period succeeding the war would, as to many of its characteristics, be similar to the war period. Further, it would be the time of demobilization and it was believed that the country would, for at least a year after the war, be subject to what would virtually be war expenditure and that is the case to-day. The Order in Council therefore provided that the legislation enacted, for it was legislation under the authority, as I have said, of the War Measures Act, should continue during the war and for a period of twelve months thereafter when it was expected that demobilization would be completed.

The resolution provides for certain amendments to the consolidated Order in Council and the other orders which were passed for the purpose of more effectually carrying out the provisions of the consolidated order. "Intoxicating liquors," was defined by the consolidated order to mean and include liquor exceeding a strength of two and a half per cent of proof spirit. At the time the order was passed there was prohibitory legislation, I think, in all the provinces under which the two and a half per cent of proof spirit standard had been adopted. Since the armistice, and as a result of a plebiscite in the province of Quebec, it is lawful under the laws of that province to sell for beverage purposes liquor to the strength of five per cent of proof spirit and, in the special case of wine, 6.98 per cent alcohol.

In the province of Ontario announcement has been made that a plebiscite or referendum will be taken, and it may be that other provinces will pursue a similar course. The Government, therefore, thought it advisable—in view of what has taken place in Quebec and Ontario, and what may take place in other provinces—to modify the Order in Council to the extent, and to the extent only, necessary to permit effect to be given to provincial laws respecting the sale of liquor for beverage purposes. We have therefore provided, as an amendment to the consolidated Order in Council, that liquor may be manufactured within

a province to the standard of strength authorized by the laws of that province for sale for beverage purposes. To use a concrete illustration: It will be permissible when this resolution is carried into law for brewers in the province of Quebec to manufacture beer to the strength of five per cent proof spirits in order that it may be available for sale and consumption as authorized by the laws of that province.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would the minister kindly explain what "proof spirits" means? Those of us who are strictly temperate men, like the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), do not know the meaning of the term.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am so strong a temperance man myself that I could not really give my hon. friend what would be regarded as a scientific definition, but it might be right to say—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perhaps the President of the Privy Council can give us a definition?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: —that alcohol has about twice the strength of proof spirits—or in other words, that two and a half per cent of alcohol is about the equivalent of five per cent of proof spirits. It is said, and some hon. gentlemen will be able to pronounce as to this very much better than myself, that there is not as much "bite" in the proof spirit beverage, as there is in the alcohol beverage of the same apparent percentage. I think I have stated to the House in sufficient detail the legal effect of the Order in Council and of the modification which we now propose. I have caused to be laid upon the Table a number of copies—sufficient I think for the use of members—of the consolidated Order in Council and the two amendments referred to.

Mr. BELAND: The Acting Prime Minister has given some explanation regarding the use of beer. Would he supplement that explanation by further details in connection, for instance, with the use of wine.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As to what?

Mr. BELAND: As to the sort of wine which is to be permitted to be consumed in the province of Quebec?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Or in any other province?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is a matter which we had under consideration. I understand that Quebec does not manufacture native wine to any great extent. Am I right in that understanding?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The question then arises as to how native wine, or at least wine of the strength authorized there by provincial laws, will be provided to meet the requirements of the people for beverage purposes. I may say to my hon. friend that it was my intention to have modified this Order in Council to the extent necessary by providing that there might be imported into the province of Quebec, or into any other province where similar legislation might prevail, wine of the strength permitted by such legislation. I was informed, possibly erroneously, that there are no wines likely to come from France of as low an alcoholic standard as the wine which is authorized for sale now by the legislation of the province of Quebec to which I have referred; but in order to carry out the principle which I have indicated, I should be prepared to consider an amendment to the resolution which would provide for the importation into a province of wine not exceeding the alcoholic standard authorized by the law of that province. Such an amendment might provide for importation from a country outside of Canada, or for transportation from another province in Canada, into any province where such a law as I have mentioned is in effect. If any hon. member is in a position to say whether wine is likely to be imported, especially from France, of the alcoholic strength which is now lawful by the laws of the province of Quebec in liquor for beverage purposes, I shall be glad to hear his representations in that regard.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know but that the Acting Prime Minister could have made himself more clear if he had a little of the beverage which he has been describing.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Two and-a-half per cent?

Sir SAM HUGHES: It would have steadied his nerve; he is a little nervous in his explanations. I do not know whether the President of the Privy Council would not have given the explanation much better. I cannot see why this burning and shining light of temperance is over-shadowed by the Acting Prime Minister to-day; we thought this was the former's special sphere. But what I wanted to ask is, why not

4 p.m. make this general rule applicable to all provinces? Why should the maker of wine in Ontario be prohibited

from selling his product in Quebec, provided he is not violating the laws of that province, and so on? Make it a universal rule. If France wants us to import strong wines and the province of Quebec will not allow it, there is no harm done; but if that province wishes to import strong wines from France and the laws of Quebec permit it, why not allow such importation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have already stated that I would be prepared to consider an amendment, after discussion in the House, which would permit wine to be imported from France, or any other country, and from any province in Canada, such as Ontario, where native wine is manufactured, into a province whose laws authorize its sale for beverage purposes.

Mr. FIELDING: What will be the effect of the law as it will stand in respect to wines in Ontario where they are manufactured?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Under the law as it will stand?

Mr. FIELDING: What will happen to the wines of Ontario, what will be the effect of the law as to them?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The position is that native wine in the province of Ontario may continue to be manufactured because by the legislation of that province there is no restriction upon its sale—that is an exception.

Mr. BELAND: Regardless of percentage of alcohol?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is permitted today by the laws of the province of Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER: What strength?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no limit as to strength.

Mr. FRIPP: As I understand the resolution, it would prohibit the importation into the province of Quebec of beer manufactured in the province of Ontario?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. FRIPP: That seems to me to create a monopoly in the province of Quebec, and all monopolies are obnoxious and vicious.

Mr. BELAND: We will have to drink the whole of it; we cannot export it.

Mr. FRIPP: You will have to drink the whole of it at a price fixed by your manufacturer. I have not considered the matter sufficiently to give an opinion, but if my recollection of the British North America Act is correct, it seems to me there is difficulty in the way of legislation of this sort. Section 121 of the Act says that the growth, produce, or manufacture of a province shall be admitted free into another province. That, of course, does relate to duty in the sense of customs duty, but it must necessarily mean free importation. How can this Parliament create a monopoly so that one province alone shall have the right to manufacture and sell within its boundaries an article which may be manufactured in another province? I do not know whether the Government has considered that question, but it seems to me there is some difficulty in the way, apart altogether from the point I raise as to a monopoly being created. There are probably millions of dollars invested in breweries in the province of Ontario. Why should not the brewers of that province have the right of entry into the province of Quebec in competition with Quebec brewers, when the latter province gives to its people the right to purchase beer of a certain quality?

Mr. BELAND: We have no objection.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The constitutional question raised by the hon. gentleman was considered carefully by the Department of Justice, and they reached the conclusion that the Government was within its powers in enacting the Order in Council as it stands.

Mr. FIELDING: Is it quite clear and beyond dispute that in the province of Ontario, which I understood was a prohibition province, one has the right to get drunk, provided he gets drunk on native wine? Is that the law?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not think it is so specified in the law.

Mr. CHAPLIN: For the information of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) I might say that the Ontario law does not allow the retail sale of wine other than in undisturbed packages to the house of a consumer; it does not allow the sale of wine over the bar.

Mr. CRONYN: The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's has raised a question on what has always appeared to me to be the most extraordinary piece of legislation perpetrated by the province of Ontario. There is no doubt that that province has enacted what is in effect the clearest kind of class legislation. It allows, as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) has just stated, the sale of wine, the strength of which is not specified. This is

the clause of the Ontario Act covering this point:

Subject to any regulations or restrictions which the Board may impose, manufacturers of native wines, from grapes grown and produced in Ontario, may sell the same in wholesale quantities only, that is to say in quantities of not less than five gallons in each cask or vessel at any one time and when sold in bottles not less than one dozen bottles of at least three half pints at any one time.

Now, the law of the province of Ontario, as I understand it, did not prohibit—I am subject to correction as to this—the manufacture of ale of any strength for export, and if the breweries of Ontario found a market in foreign countries they were entitled to manufacture and export. Under the proposed resolution and Order in Council that market is cut off. Not only are they prohibited from exporting to the province of Quebec beer of 5 per cent proof spirits, or 2½ per cent alcohol, whatever the ruling in Quebec may be—but they cannot export to any other country. That seems to me such an absurd and illogical position that I propose an amendment to the resolution. Subsection 3 of paragraph (c) of the resolution reads as follows:

(3) No person after the first day of April, 1918, shall send, take, transport into, or deliver in any prohibited area any intoxicating liquor, or cause any intoxicating liquor to be sent, transported or delivered. Provided that any intoxicating liquor actually shipped before the first day of April, 1918, may be delivered in such prohibited area by a common carrier within such period of time as is required for such delivery under the ordinary and usual conditions governing the business of such common carrier but not later than the first day of May, A.D., 1918. Provided that this regulation shall not apply to the sending, taking, transporting or delivering of native wines in the province of Ontario, or to sending, taking, transporting or delivering any intoxicating liquor lawfully manufactured in any province to any place in such province where such intoxicating liquor may lawfully be sold.

By amendment I propose to strike out these words:

Sending, taking, transporting or delivering of native wines in the province of Ontario.

If we are to have this legislation imposed let us have it imposed fairly. Do not let us make an exception in the case of some one favoured class or province. I beg therefore, Mr. Chairman, to move that amendment.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is a complicated piece of legislation and I would ask the hon. member if he will kindly give notice of his resolution.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I make a suggestion to the Acting Prime Minister in

that very regard? Why not have the Order in Council printed so that we can deal with the matter intelligently? I do not suppose it is a very voluminous affair; it will only take a day.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Copies of the Order in Council are laid upon the Table for the use of hon. members. I think the resolution shows clearly the effect of the amendments which we propose. I still do not quite appreciate the point made by my hon. friend from London (Mr. Cronyn) and I would be glad if he would state again what he has in mind in the amendment.

Mr. CRONYN: By this legislation we are backing up the exceedingly unfair legislation of the province of Ontario. And we are going further; we are adopting, as I understand the resolution, the sale of liquor in the province as a test. As I said, under the legislation of the province of Ontario brewers and wine merchants alike were permitted to manufacture for export. I speak subject to correction.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not understand that the legislation of the province of Ontario prevents the manufacture of wine and beer for export. The jurisdiction of a province is with respect of the sale and consumption; the question of manufacture and export I think is a Dominion matter.

Mr. CRONYN: That is undoubtedly right, Mr. Chairman. But the province recognized that situation by providing as follows in section 45 of the Ontario Temperance Act:

Nothing herein contained shall prevent any brewer, distiller or other person duly licensed by the Government of Canada for the manufacture of spirituous, fermented or other liquor, from keeping or having liquor manufactured by him in any building where such manufacture is carried on.

The provincial authorities knew that they had not the right to prohibit the manufacture, and under the law as it stands the wine merchant and the brewer can and do manufacture for export. Under this Order in Council manufacture for export must cease, and that being the case we should be logical. If we are going to be temperate, let us be temperate. Why should the manufacture and sale in Ontario of wine which runs from sixteen to twenty per cent proof spirits be permitted, while the manufacture and sale of beer of five per cent is not permitted?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The principle which should underly the action of the Dominion with respect to legislation of this

kind is recognition of the rights of the provinces to enact such legislation within their jurisdiction as they may deem proper. It is true that the legislation of Ontario excepted native wines. No doubt they did so upon considerations which appeared proper to them as representatives of the people of Ontario. The hon. member sees an unfairness in permitting the manufacture of wine of unlimited strength in Ontario, while at the same time a limitation as to strength is imposed in respect of beer manufactured in the province. But that is essentially a matter for the legislature of Ontario. If Ontario, acting within its jurisdiction, sees fit to enact that beer for beverage purposes shall not be sold in Ontario of greater strength than two and a half per cent of proof spirits and at the same time feels justified in authorizing the manufacture and sale of native wine in the province, I suppose that is a matter for the legislature and the people of Ontario. I do not know how far we should be justified in reviewing their action with respect to what is clearly within their jurisdiction under the British North America Act. I am of the opinion that this Order in Council does not prohibit the export of native wine manufactured in Ontario. If Ontario adopted legislation under which wine of a strength not exceeding, let us say, five per cent alcohol, should be sold for beverage purposes there, then under this legislation they could not, I think, manufacture beyond that strength, either for domestic use or for export. But Ontario, I understand, has not placed any limitation upon the strength of native wine manufactured there.

Mr. NESBITT: Would the minister be averse to an amendment permitting Ontario to export to Quebec its native wines at the strength which Quebec allows? Moreover, does this resolution stop the exportation of beer from Ontario to points outside that province?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: According to the law of Quebec, wine of the alcoholic strength of a little under seven per cent is authorized for sale for beverage purposes. Unless that legislation is to be defeated by Dominion enactment, it is necessary to permit importation into Quebec from outside of Canada or transportation into Quebec from any other province where such wine is manufactured. I have stated that I would be prepared to consider a suggestion for permitting the importation from outside of Canada into a province such as Quebec of wine of the strength authorized for sale for beverage purposes by the legislation of that province; and also the transportation into such province from another province where wine is manufactured for the purpose of supplying local requirements in strict accordance with the laws of that province. With regard to beer, the situation is somewhat different. Beer may be manufactured in any province to the extent of the quantity required to meet the consumption needs in accordance with the provincial laws. I think the same statement might be made with regard to whisky. With regard to wine, it is only in some provinces that native wine is manufactured. But if any difficulty arises with regard to the logic of the situation I suppose we would have to meet the condition in a province such as Quebec by permitting importation from outside. There seems to be a very strong sentiment in the community that if a province by its legislation prohibits the sale for beverage purposes within that province of liquor beyond a certain strength, the manufacture of liquor beyond that strength in that province should not be permitted.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Instead of labelling one law for one province and another for another, why not make our legislation universal and apply the same form of legislation to all provinces—having regard, of course, to existing provincial laws?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will not find the name of any province mentioned in this resolution, or in any amendment. The amendments to the resolution are for the purpose of enabling effect to be given to provincial legislation in any province. I used the illustration of Quebec because Quebec has taken action and no other province up to date has.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Suppose Ontario refuses to go beyond the two-and-a-half per cent for beer, and Quebec goes five; would it be impossible for a brewer in Ontario to make his beer up to five per cent for sale in the province of Quebec?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would under this resolution.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I should like, in the first place, to straighten out the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) as to the meaning of "proof spirits," and I am surprised that the hon. member, so rich in military lore, is not familiar with the historic association between proof spirits

and military regulations. The term had its origin in England in the old days when the army was armed with flintlock rifles. In those days it took a certain percentage of alcohol to get the powder to the point where it would explode with a spark. It was found through experiments made by the British army that alcohol could be considerably reduced in strength and still strike fire when used in the flintlock rifle. When the alcohol was reduced to the lowest point at which it would strike fire, it was known as "proof spirits;" it was the test or the "proof." While alcohol has a strength of 165, they could reduce it to a strength of 100, and at that strength the powder would strike fire. That was the origin of the term or standard known as "proof strength."

I want to say a word on the principle involved in the resolution now before the House, because, if I understand parliamentary procedure, we are in order in discussing the principle of the legislation at this stage, and the details later. The Acting Prime Minister has emphasized more than once to-day that this legislation is to give effect so far as possible to the intention and the desire of the provinces as expressed by the legislation enacted by the different provinces. That, I submit, is precisely what will not be done by the legislation founded on this resolution. True, the resolution has been drawn in such a way as carefully to safeguard the wishes and intentions of the province of Quebec, but I submit that it shows no desire or any intention to meet the views of the legislature of the province of Ontario. The connection in which I raise the question of the Legislature of Ontario is this: This legislation is intended to prevent the importation into the province of Ontario of alcoholic liquors of a strength in excess of two-and-a-half per cent proof spirits. Now I submit that in the province of Ontario there has been no desire or attempt on the part of the legislature to avail itself of the rights which it had under the existing law prior to the Order in Council of March of last year, to put an embargo on the importation of alcoholic beverages into the province. I submit that the province of Ontario at the present time has the right to do everything which this legislation proposes to do with reference to importation into the province. The legislature of the province of Ontario has an absolutely legal right under the Doherty Act of 1916, passed by this House, to do exactly what is here attempted to be done in a paternal way. For that reason, I submit that if there is a desire on the part of this Government to give effect to the rights of the provinces to deal as fully as lies within their power with the question of prohibition, then, to be consistent, the whole question should be left to the Government of Ontario to be dealt with by them. I believe that it is the opinion of the province of Ontario that the provincial Government at Toronto was dealing with the question prior to the Order in Council, and is dealing with it now, in a way that is likely to give ultimately the very best results.

Just a word with reference to the Doherty Act. The question of prohibition has developed in parliamentary procedure to an extent never known before, the passing of the buck—of course, I quite understand that many honourable gentlemen do not understand the term. In 1916 when the Ontario Temperance Act was before the Ontario Legislature, the question was raised that under the British North America Act the provincial government had no right to put an embargo on the importation of spirits into the province, any more than it has a right to deal with the question of manufacture. Those of you who were in this House at that time will no doubt remember that a determined campaign was carried on for the Dominion Government to do what it was beyond the power of the province to do. The Ontario Government was quite willing to pass up to the Dominion Government the responsibility of providing the necessary legislation to prevent the importation of spirits into the province; I am dealing only with the province of Ontario because I know nothing about the conditions in the other provinces. The Dominion Government accepted that responsibility, and the Doherty Act was before this House at the same time the Ontario Temperance Act was before the Ontario House. Instead of dealing with the question definitely, the Dominion Government passed the Doherty Act, and then passed the question back to the province of Ontario saying, "Under this Act you have the necessary legislation to give effect to any law that you may pass against the importation of liquor." During the debate in this House the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) in reply to a question of Mr. Sinclair said (Hansard, page 2482-3):

> If the hon. gentleman thinks otherwise, he entirely misapprehends the Bill. Anywhere in Canada, it will be an offence for a man to send liquor into a province where there is a law against it.

In introducing his legislation the Minister of Justice said that its whole object was

to give the very fullest power and authority to the Governments of the different provinces to give effect to their wishes in respect of matters which, under the British North America Act, they might otherwise be prevented from dealing with. I am not arguing the question one way or the other but what I say is this: In this respect the legislation before us does not give to the province of Ontario that same measure of provincial control over this question that it is so solicitous to give to the province of Quebec. If, in the opinion of the province of Ontario, there should be an embargo on the importation of spirits into the province, I say that without reference to this Order in Council at all, the province had and has a right to prevent the importation. It might very well be said that this was not law when the Ontario Temperance Act was passed. If that means that this Act had not been passed in this House at the time the Ontario Temperance Act was finally passed in Ontario, that is true. But the fact is that the resolution was in the House and the Bill had been introduced. Apart from that, however, the Ontario Legislature met in 1917, prior to the Order in Council, and there was no suggestion by either the Government of Ontario or the Opposition of Ontario asking for the legislation that is now enacted by this Order in Council. I desire to deal with another feature of this Order in Council, and a feature of the law that will be enacted in pursuance of the resolution. When the Order in Council was passed last year, as all hon. members will remember, it did not become effective until a future date fixed in the Order. It was passed early in March and became effective on the first of April. It would have been just as easy under the provisions of the War Measures Act and under the Order in Council to have had it effective at once. And I submit that there can be only one inference, namely, that the period between the time the Order in Council was passed and the date upon which it became effective was left in order that the people affected might be permitted to stock up, and they did stock up. If it was wrong for a man to have liquor in his possession, there could be no hardship in making the Order in Council effective at once, thereby placing all citizens on the same basis. The result of its not being made effective immediately was that in Ontario those who had the inclination, the foresight and the money—particularly the money—stocked for their requirements for a very long period in the future. There is no possible question about that, and we are face to face with this fact to-day—and I want to impress upon the Government that this is a view of the question which no Government can afford to overlook—that there cannot possibly be a more dangerous form of class legislation than is contained in the legislation which it is now proposed to enact in this House. We virtually say to the people of this country: If you have had the inclination and the means to stock your cellar and to provide against all your requirements for any length of time in the future, the law will protect you. But if, on the other hand, you have not done this, if you have been abroad during the past four years and have not had the opportunity to provide yourselves with alcoholic beverages, there is no way by which you can get them under the law. I submit that if there is going to be an absolute embargo on the importation of alcoholic beverages the Government should have the courage of its convictions and should make it illegal to have private stocks except for medicinal purposes and under the order of a physician. That would place all people on the same basis. Those who represent cities will bear me out when I say that it is fast becoming an established fact in the larger centres that there is no recognized property in whisky. In the city of Toronto, those who are in a position to know, will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that there are on an average as many as twenty and twenty-five cases of theft from private places in a day, where houses are broken into and nothing of value removed except whisky. We do not hear much about that, because the long suffering people of Toronto would sooner lose their whisky in silence than have any one know that they had it. I clipped from a paper to-day the report of a case that will show what a grave injustice will exist in this connection. It is from Ontario and I shall not mention the name. The report says:

> The home of Brig.-Gen. . . . . was entered by burglars last evening and eleven cases of liquor were stolen from the wine cellar. The cases were carried to a wooded part of the grounds, where the contents were removed and taken away in an auto. There was no person in the house at the time, Brig.-Gen. . . . . being overseas and Mrs. . . . . .in Atlantic City.

Thousands, and hundreds of thousands, of men are coming home, and I think it would be a mistake on the part of this House to waive aside the importance of the feeling that is going to be created in this country if the man who has not had the opportunity or the means to "stock up"

realizes that his next door neighbour has a well stocked cellar,

Mr. NESBITT: Could they not visit their neighbours?

Mr. J. A. STEWART: They do sometimes when they are away. I submit that it is within the power of this Government to enact that there shall not be any private stocks. If the Government does not do that then I think the matter should be left to be dealt with by the province, and under the Doherty Act it is absolutely clear that they have the legal right to deal with it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Just to advert to two or three points made by my hon. friend in his very interesting speech. I do not understand that he is suggesting that this Government is asking Parliament to "pass the buck"—to use a vernacular expression that has never appealed to me. We are asking Parliament to pass this resolution. Let me put myself right with the House in view of the implication of the hon. gentleman that nearly all the houses in the city of Toronto, in which I have the honour to live, are largely stocked with intoxicating liquors. I can assure my hon. friend that if he visited my house he would find it very much in the condition of Mother Hubbard's cupboard, and I think that that is the case with regard to the vast majority of houses in Toronto, as in other cities in the province of Ontario. My hon. friend says that under the Canada Temperance Act, while there was a prohibition against the sale, for beverage purposes, or liquor beyond a certain alcoholic strength, it was open to the citizens of the province of Ontario to buy intoxicating liquors from adjacent provinces and have them sent directly to them for their use. He argues that if a province desired to prevent that state of affairs it had the power to do so, and I think from a strictly legal standpoint he is correct in that statement. I think the province of Ontario, through its legislature, has the power to prevent the holding of stocks of liquors for consumption by private individuals, but my hon. friend will not fail to appreciate the impracticability of the Government of Ontario giving effect to any such legislation, which would involve a search of every house in the province, leading to a most undesirable condition of affairs.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the province of Ontario the right to search?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think it has.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not think so.

[Mr. J. A. Stewart.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend may be right, but I have the impression that the Minister of Justice stated, when the Doherty Act was before Parliament, that it was within the power of the province of Ontario, if it thought fit, to enact such legislation as would effectually prevent the bringing in of liquor from other provinces and the keeping of such liquor in the custody of citizens of Ontario.

I point out that, while that may be legally so, there are very grave practical difficulties in giving effect to such legislation. My hon. friend further argued that the province of Ontario did not ask for this legislation and that therefore it should not have been adopted by the Dominion Government. I have already pointed out that it was adopted as a war measure under the authority of the War Measures Act. The Government of Ontario was not opposed to this legislation. Let me read a telegram from the Premier of Ontario, dated December, 1917, and addressed to Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister:

> Please accept my warmest congratulations on the important action taken by your Government in connection with the liquor traffic. I am sure it will materially assist in conserving the strength of the nation for the struggle in which we are engaged.

This telegram is signed by Sir William Hearst. I put that forward to show that the province of Ontario, through its Premier, had nothing but commendation for the action taken by the Government. I think it is to be conclusively inferred from that telegram that the premier of Ontario welcomed action on the part of the Dominion Government which would prevent the importation for sale purposes into the province of Ontario of intoxicating liquors from adjacent provinces.

I submit there is a good deal to be said for that view. Let us just look at this. A province, such as Ontario, says: There must not be sold within this province liquor of a strength beyond two and a half per cent of proof spirits. That is what they say in the Ontario Temperance Act with respect to all liquors except native wine. If that is the deliberate judgment of the legislature, and presumably of the majority of the people of Ontario, it does seem to me that those who passed that legislation could hardly have had in contemplation a situation in which it would be largely nullified—that is if they meant it, seriously—by a round-about arrangement whereby liquor of any degree of alcoholic strength could be brought in by any citizen from an adjacent province. Some extraordinary ex-

pedients were devised. For example, a wholesaler or retailer of the province of Quebec would establish an agency in the city of Toronto, and the order would be given to the agent. The agent would then pass the order on to Quebec, the Quebec House would fill it and send the liquor back into Ontario. I need not dwell upon the incongruity of that. If the people of Ontario did not want—and do not want—liquor of a greater strength than two and a half per cent proof spirits to be consumed in Ontario, they have the right to say so. They do say it through their legislature in the law which they have enacted. I think it is clearly to be inferred from the legislation that it was not the intention of the legislature, or the Government, of Ontario, to approve the use for consumption of liquor beyond that strength. Certainly, the situation which resulted, and which I have referred to, did not seem to me to be a very satisfactory one. The Dominion Government, in order to implement what seemed to be the intention of the Ontario Legislature, provided that there should not be transported into the province of Ontario—I am using Ontario merely by way of illustration—from any other province liquor beyond the strength authorized for sale as a beverage by the legislature of the province. That is all we did. We decided that that should not be done for the period of the war and for twelve months after. That is the enactment that is now before this House for ratification and confirmation if Parliament should think it advisable.

The next point made by my hon. friend is that there was a period between the passing of the Act and bringing it into effect in which large quantities of intoxicating liquor were transported from one province to another, or sold within the province in which they were held, and, as he states, to enable people to "stock up." That statement is not correct. The Government had no such motive or purpose in view. The object of the provision was to enable people who had large stocks on hand for sale to partially dispose of their stocks. That is not an unusual position in connection with legislation of this kind. The effect of this enactment, or Order in Council, was to safeguard the very serious situation, indeed, of firms who were carrying stocks of liquor which they had on hand for sale in the usual course and against which some had borrowed heavily. If suddenly without notice, or time for the partial disposal of those stocks, the Order in Council had gone into effect, and especially if permanent legislation were also passed, these people would find themselves in the position of having been financially ruined without any notice. Those were the considerations which influenced the Government in coming to the conclusion it did.

One other point made by my hon. friend, one which is often put forward and one which is very forcible in the way in which he puts it. It is that those who had means were able to stock up and that they had their cellars full of liquor. From the way my hon. friend put it, it would appear that that was a highly desirable state of affairs from their standpoint. I do not know that it is a great advantage to a man to have his cellar full of liquor.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): It seems to be so in Toronto.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Then I say it is not good for the man who has it. It is not good for any man to have too much liquor on his premises and I am a moderate in regard to that. My hon. friend puts forward the view that the public are greatly concerned about that on the theory that they have not been able to likewise stock up. I submit that that begs the whole question in so far as the provincial legislature is concerned. If the provincial legislature enacts a law, presumably, it embodies the views, opinion, wishes and desires of the people whom it represents. If the province of Ontario, through its legislature, deliberately passes an Act which contemplates that liquor beyond a strength of two and a half proof spirits shall not be drunk in that province, in so far as they have power to prevent it, I submit that the legislature must be deemed to reflect the wishes of the majority—and the great majority—of the people of Ontario. If they do not want that situation then they can change the law. As far as Parliament is concerned, or any authority external to the province of Ontario, it seems to me that it must be conclusively assumed that the legislature of the province of Ontario speaks in its legislation for the majority of the people of the province until that legislation is changed.

I submit that that legislation does implement the legislation in force in the various provinces of Canada. The Orders in Council in question were adopted for that purpose, and as a desirable war measure; to prevent waste, promote thrift and conserve resources. This is still a war year, having regard to all those purposes, and all that we are asking Parliament to do is to ratify

and confirm these Orders in Council in order that the object which we had in view may be carried out for the period for which the Order in Council was to operate.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If this is still a war year, would not every year in the history of any nation be a war year in order to conserve thrift?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think it very desirable in every year, as my hon. friend has said, that thrift should be promoted and resources conserved; but this is peculiarly a war year because of the enormous continuing expenditure of the Dominion Government for purposes arising out of or connected with the war and demobilization.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I would like to say one word, and in doing so do not wish to be placed in the position of opposing the resolution of the Acting Prime Minister. My chief complaint is that it does not go far enough—that if it is intended to prevent importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, it should go further and prevent possession. I submit it would be within the power of this Government to do that. I say also that having regard to the attitude of Ontario that I entirely agree with everything that has been said with reference to giving effect to the wishes of that province. I submit it has been known that this legislation was coming before the House, and it would possibly be of interest to the members to know, not so much what Sir William Hearst thought of this legislation at the time the original Order in Council was passed, but what the views of the Government of Ontario now are, with reference to the extension of that legislation for a further period of twelve months.

Mr. BLAKE: We have heard a lot about conscription at various times—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews) has the floor.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Winnipeg Centre): While the subject is under discussion, I feel that I must say a few words, because I am in rather a peculiar position. Of all the subjects that have been under discussion this session, I think no particular one has brought more grist to the legislative mill than the question of total prohibition. I have been, I think, bombarded by every W.C.T.U. in the country—at least in that portion of it from which I come—and, in addition, representations have come to me from all the churches in my constituency, and from a trade protection society. I quite agree with the minister that there is a very large temperance class which must be considered by the Government in dealing with this question. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I have had expressed from the labour organizations the request that this Government should come out boldly and declare for the consumption of beer and wine. Furthermore, I have been brought into contact with the man in the street, sometimes called the "silent voter". He has said to me, "Major, we did not vote for total prohibition, we voted for the Macdonald Act" —I am referring to legislation enacted in my own province—"and I should like another vote. We submitted to this total prohibition as a war measure, realizing that every grain of barley counted. We were willing to submit to that, but now that the war is over we want to see that legislation wiped out". That is a very considerable vote in my constituency, too, Sir. The point has been brought to my attention that this is class legislation between the rich and the poor, but that is not an argument. I never heard it advanced as an argument, except as to how it affects individuals; some fellows have the good luck to have their cellars full of liquor while the cellars of others are very, very empty. I felt that I had to say something on this question, because in my constituency there are a very large number of good temperance people. Personally, I stand absolutely and entirely four-square against total prohibition, and I shall try and give my reasons for occupying that position.

5 p.m.

First of all, as to the medical side of this question. A committee appointed in England by the Central Control Board to inquire into the liquor traffic has recently completed its work, and the report of that committee bearing the imprint "H. M. Stationery Office, 1918" is very interesting. The committee in question consisted of the following gentlemen:

Lord D'Abernon, G.C.M.G. (chairman), chairman of the Central Control Board (liquor traffic);

Sir George Newman, K.C.B., M.D., (vice-chairman), Principal Medical Officer to the Board of Education, and member of the Central Control Board (liquor traffic);

Prof. A. R. Cushny, M.D., F.R.S., Professor of Pharmacology at University College, London;

H. H. Dale, M.D., F.R.S., Head of the Department of Bio-chemistry and Pharmacology under the Medical Research Committee, National Health Insurance;

M. Greenwood, M.R.C.S., Statistician to the Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine, and Reader in Medical Statistics in the University of London;

W. McDougall, M.B., F.R.S., Reader in Mental Philosophy in the University of Oxford, and Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford;

F. W. Mott, M.D., F.R.S., Pathologist to the London County Asylums, and Consulting Physician to Charing Cross Hospital;

Prof. C. S. Sherrington, M.D., F.R.S., Waynflete Professor of Physiology in the University of Oxford, and Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford;

W. C. Sullivan, M.D., Medical Superintendent of the Rampton State Asylum for Criminal Lunatics.

It will be seen that the committee was composed of very eminent men, whose reputation is world-wide, and to ignore their findings is to ignore the conclusions of scientists—you might as well pull down your colleges and be done with it. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read a few short extracts from the report. The first is as follows:

Apart from the results of its continued excessive use, the main effects of alcohol that have any real significance are due to its action on the nervous system . . . . . The result of scientific research concerning the action of alcohol on the respiration, the circulation, the digestion, the muscular system, is to show that, so far as direct action is concerned, alcohol, when administered in moderate doses, in dilute form, and at sufficient intervals, has no effect of any serious and practical account. (p. 125).

Again the report says:

A further conclusion of capital importance which emerges with equal clearness, is that the action of alcohol on the nervous system is essentially sedative, and—with the possible exception of its direct influence on the respiratory centre—it is not truly stimulant. (p. 125.)

Hon. gentlemen will note that the committee consider the action of alcohol on the nervous system is essentially sedative, and if there ever was a time in our history when the frazzled nerves of a tormented world needed a sedative, it is now.

Mr. ANDREWS: Further the report says:

An exhausting and worrying day may leave a condition of tension and irritability which interferes with appetite and digestion; and in such a condition, and in some persons, it may be that wine or other dilute form of alcohol, taken with the evening meal, will assist the assimilation of food. Again, persons who have overworked to such an extent that they have become too tired to rest may be enabled to sleep when they have taken a small amount of alcohol. (p. 127.)

Gentlemen, those findings are exactly in accord with my own experience, which now extend over some years.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ANDREWS: I am a father and a grandfather, and I have found by experience that some things agree with me and others do not—I have tried them all. The point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, is that after a man reaches my time of life he knows pretty well what agrees with him and what does not. If I take coffee for a week I am sick; if I take a little whisky and water with my meals, then everything is all right. It does annoy me when somebody else comes along and tells me what I must drink, and would force me to follow his orders just because he happens to be in a majority. There is a little too much paternalism about that to please me.

I have given medical reasons and my own experience. I will now give the historical reasons. I claim, Mr. Chairman, that the race has not deteriorated under this alcoholic treatment that it has had for many years. No man who saw the "beer-sodden Englishman" at work on the other side can argue that it was too dangerous a drink that he had been taking; and one remembers in 1916 going to that "whisky-sodden Scotland," where every man able to march was on his way towards Flanders; and certainly in regard to the "wine-bibbing Frenchman" one remembers Verdun—"They shall not pass." Are we going to bar from this country the drink of those virile men? I know Canadians can stand it and do good work on it.

It has been pointed out to me by many of my correspondents that it is a very serious moral question. I fail to see that it has anything to do with morality. I have only to point hon. members to the unspeakable Turk, who has been a teetotaller all his days, and rather a mess he has made of it.

I would just say one word as to the rum ration in the army which has been criticised rather severely by the extreme teetotallers. In my humble opinion it saved tens of thousands of our men from the grave, and perhaps worse. After a man has been out in the water all night and comes in chilled to the marrow, there is no place in the wet trench where he can run up and down to stimulate his circulation preparatory to going to sleep. A little shot of rum at that time restores his circulation and soothes his nerves, and he gets to sleep without any trouble.

I have some notes about the "swing of the pendulum," but I do not need to tell you about that. If you go too far the pendulum inevitably swings back the other way. But I would say one word as to the danger of going to extremes, and that is

the subterranean traffic which has already been mentioned. It is everywhere springing up, and it is a frightful price to pay for temperance; indeed it is too big a price to pay if you are going to build up a body of law breakers.

My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Whidden) when he was talking on this subject recently—I am sorry he is not in his seat to-day; he is unavoidably detained—said we should be the dumping ground of the worst elements and the worst type of business men of the North American continent. He was referring to the possible situation if Canada went wet and the United States went dry. I understand that the hon. gentleman lived over there for some years, and is therefore probably better posted than I am, because my visits have been few and far between. But every time I have gone over there I have met some of the best business and professional men imaginable, and I do not remember one who did not take "a little drop" for his stomach's sake. When my hon. friend was talking I could not help thinking, as I remembered the moderate men I had met over there, that I would be tempted to trade off the hon. member and all his followers for them, and give fifty cents to boot. But on second thoughts, Mr. Chairman, I concluded I would not do that; and on third thoughts I decided that probably these extreme men were filling a very useful purpose in life, because unless we had extremists at the top and the bottom there would be no sane middle course for this Government to pursue.

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (Winnipeg North): We have heard a good deal of talk in the last year or two about conscription of wealth, and now we are confronted with conscription of liquor in our homes. I wonder if the hon. member who advocated that will be inclined to inject a little socialistic doctrine as well and distribute the liquor at present in bond, or how else does he suppose the Government will be able to dispose of the liquor if it is all taken over from its present owners?

The point I wish to raise is the point raised by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn)—the making of wine in Ontario for export. There has been a lot of talk in this House about reconstruction, about fostering our industries and improving them as much as possible. I see no reason why this Ontario wine should not be transported to Quebec to meet the requirements of that province, as that province has decided to have beer and wine, and in the event of Ontario in the near future voting to follow suit a great industry would spring up in the Niagara district, where the grapes are grown. I think no objection should be taken to this clause for allowing the manufacture and export of native wine.

As to the breweries in Ontario being allowed to manufacture beer to meet the requirements of Quebec or any other province that may vote wet, I see no objection to it. At the present time the Ontario brewers are manufacturing supplies to meet medical needs, and I cannot see what objection can be taken to their being allowed to go a little further to meet the needs of a sister province, and so being prepared, perhaps in the very near future, to meet the needs of Ontario itself. I think that might well have been included in this motion.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I do not see anything in this resolution about permitting the importation of wine for sacramental purposes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Order in Council permits the supply of sacramental wine, and we are validating that Order in Council.

Mr. BELAND: Is it the intention of the Government to introduce an amendment in respect of the importing of wines from France—of a percentage of alcohol, of course, not higher than that permitted in the province which imports them? Notwithstanding what the Acting Prime Minister has said with regard to the possibility of transporting native wines from Ontario into Quebec——

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I said that with regard to export from Canada I was of the opinion that native wines manufactured in Ontario of any strength—because there is no restriction—might be sold for export. They cannot be sent into Quebec.

Mr. BELAND: Is it the intention of the minister to introduce an amendment with regard to the transportation of wines from Ontario into the province of Quebec, with the amendment which I have referred to, covering importations from France?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government would be justified, in order that effect may be given to provincial legislation which authorizes the sale of wine of certain strength within a province, to permit the importation from outside of Canada and the transportation from any other province in Canada to such province, of wine not

beyond the strength authorized by the law of that province for sale for beverage purposes. When the Bill is in the committee stage I will introduce an amendment to that end.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Public Works—Chargeable to Capital—Harbours and rivers—Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements, $300,000.

Mr. CARVELL: This item is to carry on improvements that have been in progress for some time. The amount asked for is not sufficient to complete the works; in fact, it will take very much more than this. The intention is to start the extension of a breakwater on the Port Arthur side and to continue the construction of a revetment wall near the terminals of the Grand Trunk Pacific on the Fort William side of the harbour. We believe that this is about as much money as will be expended during the coming year, although it is possible that an additional amount will be asked for in the Supplementary Estimates.

St. John harbour—Improvements, $750,000.

Mr. CARVELL: This is to carry on improvements in the harbour of St. John. The work, which is under contract, involves also the construction of a dry dock. The amount of the vote will really be applied to harbour improvements. The harbour improvements and the dry dock are both under contract with the same company, the St. John Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company, really the Canada Dredging Company, which has carried out works at Port Arthur and Fort William and at many places in Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: At what stage of completion is the dry dock, and what harbour improvements are being carried on by this company?

Mr. CARVELL: The original contract was given in 1912, and provided for the construction of a breakwater, the dredging of a very large area in what is called Courtenay Bay, and the construction of a dry dock. Up to the time that the contract was assigned to the new company it had been carried on by the Norton-Griffiths Company, and about $4,000,000 had been expended on the harbour improvements and about $900,000 on the dry dock. The dry dock is being built under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act. It will cost at least $5,500,000 and the contractors are to receive not a subsidy of four and one half per cent, but interest on an amount up to $5,500,000 at four and one half per cent for thirty-five years. The principal of the bonds, of course, has to be taken care of by the contractors themselves. When the work is completed the harbour improvements will belong to the Government and the dry dock will belong to the company; so that two distinct propositions are incorporated in the same contract. Work is progressing on the dry dock.

The contract calls for the construction of a dry dock and of a ship repairing plant. The ship repairing plant itself comes under The Dry Dock Subsidy Act, but the money will be furnished by the company and not by the Government. It involves an expenditure of, I think, $3,250,000. The company are also laying out a big shipyard, but that is entirely their own affair; we have nothing to do with it whatever; it has nothing to do with the dry dock subsidy contract, nor with the harbour works. Under the contract the dry dock was to be ready for operation in the summer of 1922, but we believe from the progress which they are making and from the reports of our engineers that it will be ready for operation in the summer of 1921.

Mr. McKENZIE: What size ships will it be able to accommodate?

Mr. CARVELL: The largest ship afloat to-day. In fact, it will be one of the largest dry docks in existence. It is 1,150 feet in length, 125 feet wide, 100 feet on the sill, with 40 feet of water at high tide. In every way it will be one of the most up-to-date dry docks in the world. There are only three others on the American continent that will at all compare with it. First, the Champlain dry dock at Levis; secondly, the dock at Boston, and, thirdly, the dock at the Atlantic entrance to the Panama Canal. It will be equipped with the most up-to-date machinery, and, with the ship repairing plant, it will go a long way towards being a shipbuilding plant. I shall gladly give any other information if the members wish it.

Mr. McKENZIE: No doubt there was a written contract between the Government and the company for the building of this dry dock under the Dry Docks Act. That Act is a very short one, and I should like to know if there is anything in the contract itself conserving the rights of the public as to the use of this dock when completed. The dry dock, of course, will be privately owned, but it will be the public who will

utilize the dock. Otherwise, the dry dock could not do business. Now we can always trust Government-owned utilities of this kind, because they are the property of the people, and governments have to cater to the wishes of the people. But in the case of a private-owned institution it is well that there should be some control over the fees that they can charge against the tonnage that is put into the dock for repairs. Has any such provision been made in the contract?

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend, if he reads the statute, will see that all that is provided for. The contract is a very short document, and simply provides that the Government agree to pay a subsidy of 4½ per cent on $5,500,000; that actual work must be done to the amount of $1,000,000 before any bonds can be guaranteed. No bonds have been guaranteed as yet; in fact, no application has been made to the department for the guarantee of bonds. No bonds will be guaranteed until the $1,000,000 of work has been done, not on the harbour, but on the dry dock itself by the company. The Act itself provides that there shall be no discrimination, that every person shall have the right to use the dock, when it is capable of being used, of course. There is also provision that the fees charged must be authorized by the Governor in Council. If my hon. friend will read the statute he will see exactly what the contract contains, because it practically incorporates the statute.

The dry docks question is, of course, a big one, which I think the Parliament of Canada ought to consider carefully. Personally, I am very strongly in favour of the construction of dry docks under the Subsidy Act, but in my judgment the Act must be amended if we wish to have dry docks built. The Act has been on the statute book for nine years, and the St. John dry dock is the only first-class dock which has taken advantage of its provisions. A number of second-class docks have been constructed under the Subsidy Act. There is a floating dock of the second class at Montreal, belonging to Vickers; another in Prince Rupert belonging to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company; another at Port Arthur; and another at Collingwood. There are only four second-class docks in Canada, and the subsidy on these docks is only 3½ per cent for twenty-five years. My opinion is that if we want to have docks built, we shall have to amend the law, but I would not recommend the amending of the Act for the building of first-class docks, because I do not think we require very many docks of that class in Canada to-day. There must be a dry dock on the Pacific coast; and ever since I have been in the department, and I think for some time before, two companies have been proposing to take advantage of the Subsidy Act to build in Vancouver, but so far nothing has come of it, and I think I am safe in saying that nothing will come of it unless the rate of subsidy is increased. It is also proposed to build a Government-owned dry dock on the Pacific coast, but I think it would be quite improper for me to make any pronouncement on that subject until the Government shall have decided what they are going to do. I am pointing out that the Dry dock Subsidy Act has been a failure so far as the production of dry docks is concerned, and I presume it is because the assistance is not great enough. It is quite a problem to know what to do with a dry dock after it is completed. It is very simple to build a dry dock, if you can get the money, but to operate it is a different thing. We have two Government-owned dry docks at Levis. One is a small dock that has been there for a great number of years, and the other is the Champlain dry dock, which is 1,150 ft. long, and one of the finest pieces of work of its kind in the world. But we have no plant at Levis, we have no person to operate the dock. I do not think the Government would be justified in engaging 150 or 200 men down there and saying to the world "Come along with your ships and we will repair them for you." That would be very unbusinesslike. The dry dock is being operated by the Government in a sense; that is, we have a dock master who has the right to say what vessels shall enter the dock, and under what conditions, and we charge a certain rate per day according to the tonnage of the vessel; but the work is being done by a local firm, the Davies Shipbuilding Company. We dock the ship and receive a fee according to the tonnage, and the Davies Company does the work. In my judgment the company has got a very, very fine proposition because it has two dry docks to work in, and their works are between them.

This same question comes up in connection with the proposed dry dock in Victoria. There has been some talk of the Government building a dry dock in Esquimalt. That problem would have to be settled before proceeding with the work. What would be done with the dock after its completion? There are two methods in

vogue to-day in the building of docks, one being for the Government themselves to build the dock, which means a tremendous outlay, and there is always the great problem as to what will be done with the dock after completion. If we can get docks constructed by companies under the dry docks subsidy and under Government control and subject to Government ratification of fees that can be charged, they are relieved of a very large expenditure, because the 4½ per cent extended over a period of thirty-five years is a very small matter compared with the initial cost of building a first-class dry dock, and the Government is also relieved of its operation. My hon. friend is enough of a business man to know that there is not much use in talking about operating a dry dock and making money out of it. That cannot be done by the Government. If an up-to-date business concern own the dock, it is in their interest to get business. There will be no question of discrimination, and the only question that will weigh with them will be the getting of enough business to make it a paying concern. Personally, I am very much in favour of the construction of docks under subsidy, but up to the present time we have had very poor success, and I do not believe it is possible to get any other docks built in Canada under subsidy without an increase in the subsidy. My own judgment would be that the second-class dry dock should receive subsidy up to 4½ per cent for thirty-five years upon cost the same as first-class docks. If that were done, dry docks of the second class could be provided in a number of places in Canada without the Government actually paying for them.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I have to call the Chairman's attention to the fact that there is no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will count the members.

The CLERK: Mr. Chairman, there are 19 members in the House, with the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall have to report to the Speaker who will direct the Clerk to count the House.

The Deputy Speaker having taken the Chair:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There not being a quorum in the House I will ask the Chairman to take the names of the members present.

The Clerk having taken the names of the members present reported:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Clerk having found that there are more than twenty members present I declare that there is a quorum and that the House may resume in Committee of Supply.

The House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I have anything further to say.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why is this dredging tied up altogether? There does not seem naturally to be any particular connection between the building of a dry dock and dredging at Courtenay bay. While the dry dock is a fixed proposition, years one way or the other will not change the situation, and I think it is perhaps dangerous to make a contract for dredging that will extend over a great many years. Labour and everything is high, but after some years we can hope that matters will be such that the proposed services will be obtained at a cheaper rate than contracts made during the past few years. I would like to know what number of years this dredging arrangement covers, and what amount, apart from the dry dock, the dredging involves.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend's question would be a very apt one if a new contract had been made, but I think he will be surprised to learn that this contract was entered into in March, 1912, and that the work is going on under the prices prevailing then. There is no public work in Canada in which the Government is getting the work done under conditions existing in 1912. Tenders were called for this work, which was advertised perhaps as no other public work was ever advertised in Canada. Every district engineer in Canada had a copy of the plans and specifications, and there were notices running for between two and three months in all the big newspapers. In addition to this, a copy of the plans and specifications was deposited in the Office of the High Commissioner in London. Three tenders were received, all from English firms, the lowest tender being from the firm of Norten-Griffiths Company, Limited, for between eight and nine million dollars, including the dredging of a certain specified area, the building of piers, and the construction of a breakwater. The second part of the tender concerned the construction of a dry dock. When I came into the department I found that about four million dollars' worth of work had

been done on the harbour part of it. Work had proceeded on the dry dock, but no subsidy contract had been entered into. The only subsidy contract that was ever signed was that signed about a year ago, with the present company, that is, Norton Griffiths Company Limited. While they did a large amount of work on the dry dock they never had a subsidy contract. Now there is a subsidy contract under the law, and instead of going on and increasing the work we have decreased it. For instance, the channel leading from the main St. John harbour into Courtenay bay was to be 32 feet at low water. That involved some submarine rock work. We have eliminated all the rock work in the channel, and the channel itself will be dredged down to about 22 feet. We have reduced the cost of the channel by hundreds of thousands of dollars and are not doing any submarine rock dredging in the channel, my view being—and perhaps I am taking my own engineering opinions in regard to this work—that no ship will ever dock in St. John at low water. It is well known to many members of the Committee that St. John labours under a great disadvantage, having a high tide of 25 feet normal and 27 feet in spring tides. I do not believe that any ship will ever go into that channel to dock at low tide. Ships do not do it to-day but wait at the bar until at least half tide. Under the circumstances, we thought we could save considerable money and eliminated a lot of that dredging. The construction of the four piers was provided for in the original contract. We have eliminated that from the present contract because we do not consider it absolutely necessary. We want the basin and the entrance to the dry dock completed, but there is a clause in the contract which provides that whenever the present contractors are called upon to complete the piers they must do so under the prices in the contract of 1912. So that if we attempted to call for new tenders to carry on this work under present conditions, it would cost at least 50 per cent more than at the present time, and probably higher than that.

Mr. CAHILL: Did the minister not inform the House last year that this dredging contract had been cancelled?

Mr. CARVELL: I informed the House that I was not sure whether we were going on with the work or not. When I came into the department, it was contended by certain people that the contract was cancelled. I had no hesitation in saying that the contract had not been cancelled. Just before I made that statement I had referred the matter to the Department of Justice. Within about a month, or when the Supplementary Estimates came up, I was asked the question again and I said that we were going on with the work and in the meantime I received a notification from the Justice Department that the contract was not cancelled, that it was still alive. On that assurance I ratified the assignment of the contract by the Norton Griffiths Company to the St. John Shipbuilding Company, or rather consented to it.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount is involved in the subsidy?

Mr. CARVELL: You can figure it out yourself; it is 4½ per cent on $5,500,000 for thirty-five years. No part of this has been paid because the work has not progressed to the point where I feel justified in guaranteeing the bonds. Just as soon as $1,000,000 has been expended, if the company want it, I shall ask council to guarantee the bonds. They have to finance it themselves. At the present time I do not believe they could sell these bonds for sixty, if for anything at all. However, they can take the bonds if they want to because they are entitled to them; that is entirely their affair. They finance it and we do the harbour work. The basin, which will be provided, will cover about 80 acres, and notwithstanding the fact that some derogatory things have been said about it, it is going to be one of the finest harbours in Canada when it is completed. It is true that we have a very high tide to contend with; it is true that nature has not been kind to the port of St. John, but geographically it is in the place where the business is being done. The people of St. John have had the courage and energy to do what no other city or community in Canada has done. They started out to do a transatlantic business and to make St. John a great national port, and they have put up between $2,250,000 and $2,500,000 of their own money, carrying out the work, financing it and taking hold of it themselves. It is urged that the Government should take this port over and put it under a commission. I believe it ought to be done. But, however, they have spent their own money and the Dominion of Canada has spent less on the harbour of St. John than on any other harbour in Canada of its size and importance. There is more business done at the port of St. John than in any other port in Canada save Montreal; in the last fiscal year $221,000,000 worth of business was done through the port of St. John. The

business there does not start until after November. The armistice was signed in November, but since that time $175,000,000 worth was done through that port. It is the natural port of Canada in the winter time. There is no use of saying that there are some mud banks and that for that reason we cannot go on. The mud banks may be there, but it is the duty of any man who occupies this position to see that that port is fairly dealt with and that it is put in a position to carry on the business that they have there in the winter time. We must either do that or hand it over to Portland or Boston. It is true that we have the port of Halifax, the finest port probably on the American coast. I am sure there is nothing like it on the whole Atlantic coast.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not better than Sydney harbour, is it?

Mr. CARVELL: It is far better—and I do not want to say anything derogatory of Sydney harbour. Halifax has a magnificent harbour, the like of which hardly exists anywhere else in the world. But, unfortunately, it is 200 miles farther away from the business of Canada than St. John, and notwithstanding all the war business that has been going through Halifax it has not done a quarter of the business that has been done through St. John. That is on account of the geographical position of St. John.

Mr. McKENZIE: The three greatest harbours in the world are Halifax, Sydney and Melbourne. The great man who made that pronouncement did not undertake to differentiate between them.

Mr. CROWE: What about Vancouver?

Mr. ROBB: The minister said that Halifax was 200 miles farther east than St. John. Is there any difference in the freight rate between a point in Ontario or Quebec on export shipments by St. John or Halifax?

Mr. CARVELL: There is one cent per hundred pounds. Boston, Portland and St. John enjoy the same rate. There is an advance of one cent as against Halifax.

Toronto harbour—improvements, $500,000.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Does the minister know the condition of Toronto harbour? Last year the matter came up before the House, but since that time there have been many changes in connection with the harbour due to storm destruction. Perhaps the minister remembers that about 1897 the south shore of the island was in a very dangerous condition and it was possible that the whole of the island would be destroyed. The Board of Trade and City Council, realizing the situation, made representations to the Government at that time and it was pointed out that if something was not done there was a possibility of the entire island being destroyed. The Government realized that if that should happen there would be no protection for the riparian rights of the Government along the harbour and it would become a very expensive proposition for them. The Board of Trade and City Council entered into negotiations with the Government. The Government undertook to spend $200,000 if the city would expend $100,000; so that about $300,000 was expended at that time to protect the south shore of the island. That gave temporary protection but in a year or two it was found that the protection was not substantial. They had to adopt another method and again expend more money to protect the south shore. They protected that part of the island. Now we realize, and the Government realize too, that there must be further protection. The minister will remember that the Government agreed to expend about $6,000,000, the Harbour Commission $13,000,000, and the city of Toronto $2,000,000, making an investment in harbour improvements in Toronto of about $21,000,000. There have been, I think, three Orders in Council passed committing the Government to this expenditure. I have here a copy of Order in Council No. 1,426, passed on June 10th, 1913, which describes some of the protective works that were required and which form a part of the contract. Section (b) on page 5 contains this description:

> The construction of a crib breakwater, approximate 18,600 feet long, to protect the lake shore west of the western entrance to the harbour.

Then section (c) of the same Order in Council relates to:

> The construction of a seawall of pile work, approximate 17,295 feet long, to protect the lake shore on the east side of the east entrance to the harbour.

Under the authority of this Order in Council the work was undertaken, and in the western section about 4,100 feet of crib sub-structure has been built at a cost of about $187,000, which is now being protected by concrete coping. I may say that the greater part of this work was destroyed by a storm. The Harbour Commissioners of Toronto spent about $1,240,000 on this part of the western section, and already about $100,000 damage has been caused to the western section of the cribwork on the

lake shore. This estimate of damages was made in the early part of the present year, and within the last week a further destruction of the work on this part of the harbour shore has taken place.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

THE CANADIAN WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION.

On the Order: Third reading of Bill No. 45, to incorporate the National Wholesale Grocers' Association, (as amended); and recommending that the title of said Bill be changed to "An Act to incorporate the Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association":

Mr. CHARLES SHEARD (Toronto South): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Thomas Foster, that the title be "An Act to incorporate the Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill as amended read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee rose at six o'clock we were considering item 110 on page 69 of the Estimates. The item had been considered sub-item by sub-item and we had reached:

Toronto harbour—Improvements.

Mr. Foster had the floor.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I would like to say to the Minister of Public Works that the engineer of the Harbour Commission estimated the damage done in the early part of the year along the shore of Humber Bay at about $100,000. Since that estimate was made we have had some very heavy southeast storms which have caused a further loss of $10,000 or $15,000. About two weeks ago I had occasion to go along the shore and I noticed a great change since my former visit by reason of the washing away of the reclaimed land, showing that if something is not done immediately there is going to be a further tremendous loss for the Harbour Commission and the city that the Government will no doubt have to make good. If the work had been completed a year or two ago, as we expected, the Harbour Commission and the city would have saved about $75,000 per annum as well as this loss of $115,000, which makes it a very serious proposition for them.

The cribs that had been completed for section 5 have been lying for almost two years exposed to the weather and they are rapidly deteriorating, and, consequently, a heavy loss is being sustained. To protect this work and to place three 100-foot cribs on section 5, would cost, it is estimated, about $152,448. Surely it would be good business and economy to spend this amount to make use of those cribs and to protect this reclaimed land.

In 1918-19 the Estimates provided for some $500,000, and about $80,000 or $100,000 of that was to meet some drawback, which would reduce the amount intended to be used to complete the ship canal to about $420,000. Whether that has been completed and this work protected or not I do not know, but I expect the minister will be able to explain if there is any balance unexpended. If the Government would expend about $496,180 protection would be provided for reclaimed land that has cost about $1,240,193 to reclaim. If that is done I understand from the engineer that it would not matter so much if the work was then allowed to stand for some time until the minister found it more advantageous to carry it to completion. I also understand from the engineer that the substructure that was put down about two years ago has been for the most part destroyed. I drew the attention of the minister to that fact last year, and I understood him to undertake to place in his Supplementary Estimates some $150,000 to protect that work. I do not know whether he is carrying that forward, but it seems to me false economy to have $187,000 worth of work destroyed for want of an additional expenditure of $150,000 to complete it, and to defer the expenditure of some $400,000 to protect $1,240,000 worth of work. So, while I give the minister a great deal of credit for his policy of economy, yet in a case of this kind I would say that to refrain from making the additional necessary expenditure is not economy and does not show good judgment.

According to this Order in Council the Government is committed to an expenditure of some $6,000,000. I think three Orders in Council were passed by the Government in reference to this expenditure. There was to be a sea wall built from the western channel crossing Humber bay and from the

eastern channel to Woodbine avenue, or a little further east. Nothing has been done on the eastern section and as the result there has been further destruction of Kew Beach park, a very valuable section. I understand from the city engineer that it will cost $50,000 to protect a small part of the shore there. In the last two or three days a very heavy storm from the southeast has taken away a considerable section of the southwest portion of the island. According to a report I have received two or three large trees and a couple of hundred feet of concrete walk were washed away, and the water is now very close to some valuable residential property. Surely it is time that immediate action was taken to avoid further destruction of these improvements which have cost a great deal of money, and as the Government is committed to this expenditure I would urge the minister to take the necessary steps to have the work completed.

If the minister has made an inspection of the harbour and of these shores he must appreciate the value of the part of the island of which I speak. This year the water is higher than usual and when there is a strong southeast wind there is often great destruction on the island. We have had an evidence of that within the last three days. I see that the minister is asking for only $500,000 this year as against $702,000 last year. I shall be glad to hear him explain how he proposes to spend that $500,000; I cannot conceive that it will give the protection that is desirable and necessary. A good many years ago we undertook to protect a section of the west side of the eastern channel by building a breakwater there; that has helped to protect that section of the island. But that work has been there over thirty years and has become partly destroyed. If this sea-wall that the Government has committed itself to is not very soon placed in its proper position, the needed protection to that part of the island will not be given, because the old breakwater will not last much longer. On this section of the island there are some valuable summer residences and the erection of a breakwater along this entire shore from the east to the west should be immediately undertaken. Perhaps the minister will give us some information regarding this proposed expenditure and tell us whether he intends to put in the Supplementary Estimates the amount necessary to carry out the policy to which the Government is committed in connection with this work.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend has very fairly indeed stated the condition of affairs from his standpoint, and also from the standpoint of fact. He referred first to the protection of the island and to the fact that a good many years ago the Dominion Government erected a number of groins along that portion of the island in front of Toronto harbour lying westward of what is called the Eastern Passage. I was in that vicinity a year and a half ago but I did not inspect that portion of the work closely enough to be able to discuss it intelligently. The description, however, which the hon. member has given corresponds almost exactly with the information which I have received from the officers of the department. The protection of land in various parts of Canada from the action of the waters of rivers, lakes and the sea is a question with which I have laboured more, perhaps, since I have been Minister of Public Works than with any other question of policy. I have had applications from British Columbia, involving tremendous amounts of money, for the protection of lands in that province from the ravages of the Fraser river and other rivers in British Columbia. I have received numerous applications also from Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec. I do not know how many applications I have received from members of Parliament and Boards of Trade and Municipal Councils in the province of Quebec that steps be taken by the Dominion Government to take care of erosion along the river St. Lawrence. I mention these merely to show you that the problem is a very great one. I have a very strong feeling that, theoretically at least, the Federal Government ought not to be called upon to protect the land of any part of Canada from erosion. That is something that is the natural consequence of things; it is something that follows the ownership of land. But it is hard to lay down a policy founded upon principle, because all sorts of things have been done in the past; therefore I cannot say that nothing will be done. I promised the people of Toronto a week or ten days ago that I would go there with my engineer and look into the matter; I will do so. What I call the principle with regard to this matter has been violated so many times during the last twenty-five or thirty years that I think we should consider these cases individually as we find them, and do what is right in the premises.

Now I come to the next portion of the hon. member's remarks which had reference to a scheme partly of harbour develop-

ment, partly of shore protection and partly of the beautification of Toronto. He is correct in saying that in 1913 an agreement was made between the Dominion Government, the city of Toronto, and the Harbour Commissioners of Toronto under which certain work was to be done. The Dominion's share was a little under $6,000,000 and the Harbour Commissioners of Toronto and the city were to spend $15,000,000. A contract was entered into with the Canadian Stewart Company for the carrying out of the Dominion Government's portion of this work. That contract was very unsatisfactory from the Government's standpoint. The work was to have been completed about the time—I think the very week—I entered the Government, but it was not nearly completed. A tremendous amount of work, involving about $600,000 or $700,000, had been done so badly that the company were compelled to tear it down and build over again.

Mr. McKENZIE: Can the minister explain why work involving $600,000 was permitted to proceed in such an unsatisfactory manner?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I cannot. I can only say that it did proceed and that the department found it out and compelled the Stewart Company to make good. And they did make good; I think that work is the finest of its kind that I have ever looked at. I speak now of the piles and the construction, the development generally, in Ashbridge's bay. When I visited the work in the fall of 1917 the water had been pumped out of the canal so that the character of the work could be seen. The sheet-piling was driven in so closely that you could not find a space of a quarter of an inch between the piles. So far as I could observe, everything seemed to be in perfect order. But I came into this Government with the distinct pledge that I would save every dollar that I could possibly save until the war was over. I did not close up the Toronto Harbour works, but I put on all the brakes I possibly could. My first act as Minister of Public Works was to cancel a contract for a million dollar breakwater at St. John.

I thought that a pretty good place to commence to show that I was in earnest in trying to shut off unnecessary expenditure was at home, and I did it, and I have received a great deal of adverse criticism for doing so. We also closed down the works on the St. Charles river and on the Welland canal. I have closed down construction on every big work wherever I possibly could. Among the works that I partially closed down were the Toronto harbour works. I cannot agree with the figures quoted by my hon. friend, although he quotes them in good faith, having got them from the Toronto Harbour Commissioners. The commissioners have quoted the same figures to me a good many times. They have said that $100,000 of damage has been done to their work, because the Government's part of the work was not finished in the Humber Bay district. I have inspected the work at Toronto. The construction consists of a series of cribs sunk out in the lake about 300 to 400 yards from the shore. The intention is that that crib work is to be covered with cement, and a wall built higher than the waves of the lake. This will leave a sort of lagoon between the wall and the shore. The Harbour Commissioners have had a tremendous quantity of sand pumped out of the lake back against the shore, and in some places this sand is within, I suppose, 500 or 600 feet off the crib work, or perhaps less. The contention of the Harbour Commissioners is that because a concrete top was not put on the crib work there has been a loss of the material which they have pumped back against the shore. It may be all true what they say about the damage, but I could not see it. From my homely way of looking at engineering problems, I have not been convinced that there has been the loss they state.

Mr. T. FOSTER: You will see the damage when you go back.

Mr. CARVELL: Undoubtedly there has been some loss. In fact, wherever works have been closed down in Canada there has been some loss. Last year there was a vote in the Supplementary Estimates for $156,000 for putting the concrete top on the cribs that had already been sunk and for sinking a further short distance of crib.

Mr. T. FOSTER: Three 100-foot cribs.

Mr. CARVELL: The cribs have been constructed and they are now tied up to the shore. The idea was to sink them, and we started out to do so. I called upon the contractors, the Canadian Stewart Company, to sink these cribs and put the concrete top on the cribs that had already been sunk. They took the ground that on account of a letter which had been written to them by the chief engineer in the fall of 1917 their contract was cancelled after a certain amount of work was done. While I did not write that letter, I take full responsibility for it. I did not know whether the contract

was cancelled or not. They said it was, and they refused to go on with the work. I submitted the matter to the Justice Department, and the Justice Department said that in their opinion the contract was cancelled. I started out to see if I could get the work done by other parties, but in view of labour conditions in Toronto and all over Canada it was not only an impossibility, but a God-send that we could not go on with the work. At that time you could not get men to perform work of that kind, so I simply accepted the situation and allowed the matter to stand, and nothing was done so far as the cribs were concerned. That is the reason why the total amount of the money voted last year was not expended. In the letter which had been written to the Canadian-Stewart Company we pointed out that they were to do certain work, amounting, I think, to a little over $300,000. They carried out the work in so far as we instructed them. Then they claimed their contract was closed and we were very glad, indeed, that they did claim it was closed. We also claimed that it was closed, so there is no hard feeling on our side. Now they claim that the contract was not closed, and they want half a million dollars damages because the contract was closed down. I want to say here what I have said to them, that the only way they will get their half million dollars will be at the tail end of a lawsuit which will go just as far as the courts of this country will allow it to go.

As to the work in contemplation, there is an item in the Estimates of $500,000 which we estimate is as much money as can possibly be expended on Toronto harbour during the coming season. We may be a little out, but I think not. The work to be performed consists in putting the top on the cribs which have been sunk, sinking the 300 feet of cribs which have already been built and putting a concrete top on them, and finishing up the work in Ashbridge's Bay. Now, $500,000 will not do all this work. We estimate that it will take $800,000, or, perhaps, a little more to finish up the work I have described.

It must be remembered that the Toronto harbour proposition consists of two portions. The development of Ashbridge's bay is purely a harbour proposition, and in my judgment a very good one. Ashbridge's bay is a great level sand bank in front of the city of Toronto, covering some thousands of acres which at certain times of the year are practically inundated; at all events, the water comes almost to the top. When the water goes down, the land will be a foot or two out of the water. The idea was to dig a canal 400 feet wide and about half a mile or a little longer in length right through the centre of the bay. The material that is pumped out of the canal, and out of the big turning basin at the far end of it, is thrown back over the land, and the harbour commissioners are pumping sand out of the lake as well. They are building up the land on either side of the canal for industrial sites, and I have no doubt that Ashbridge's bay will be one of the greatest industrial sites in Canada in the near future; in fact, large concerns have already located there. For instance, the Imperial Munitions Board established a very large plant there.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who will own that land ?

Mr. CARVELL: The Toronto Harbour Commissioners. We are simply carrying on the navigation work. The spoil has to be taken care of in some way, and it is a great deal cheaper to pump it back on the land than to take it out and dump it in the lake. When this work is completed there will be a canal 400 feet wide, and from one-half to three-quarters of a mile in length, with a turning basin about 1,100 feet square at the end of it, with a breathing space between the turning basin and the island. This will avoid any trouble over stagnant water, and will make the place clean and sanitary. I repeat, I think it will become a great industrial centre.

The other portion of the work is not in any sense a navigation proposition. It is building this breakwater on either side of the city of Toronto, about four miles in length on the western side, and three and-a-half miles on the eastern side.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have never seen the canal the minister has referred to. Will the minister explain why he is endeavouring to improve navigation by cutting through this flat?

Mr. CARVELL: I am not doing it, because it was done before I came in. I examined the work, however, and I looked upon it as a splendid proposition. The idea is to provide a water front on Ashbridge's bay of over half a mile, and my hon. friend will remember that there are no tides in Toronto harbour as in his part of the country. The canal is 24 feet deep, which will take care of any vessel which goes through the new Welland canal. Taking both sides, there will be a series of wharves extending about a mile and-a-half. On both sides of this canal and around the turning basin will be industrial sites. It may be a large contribution to the in-

dustrial life of Toronto, but it is a transportation proposition pure and simple from the standpoint of the Government and one which requires no defence, because if any one went and inspected it he would come to the conclusion that it is a real transportation problem.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is really a proposition to reclaim land.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, it is in a sense. Without a doubt it is a proposition to reclaim land, but at the same time it is making available a mile and a half water front which will be of inestimable value.

Mr. DUFF: Is wharf accommodation needed now?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know. They have considerable wharf accommodation in Toronto, but my friend must remember that the Welland canal when completed will mean a revolution in the water-borne transportation of the whole of lake Ontario, and in fact down the St. Lawrence river as far as Prescott. Then following that comes the next great problem of canalizing the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Should not these reclaimed lands pay for the expenditure involved in these improvements?

Mr. CARVELL: That might be. I can only say that as I understand the contract that is not the case. I have nothing to defend and nothing to conceal; I state the facts as they are. The Government might have said: "We will retain the ownership in these lands and will lease them." But they did not. I do not want to attempt to disguise the thing at all.

Mr. FOSTER: You do retain a section on the west part of the channel?

Mr. CARVELL: We retain a small section but the great majority goes over to the Harbour Commission. As regards the remainder of the work, it would mean the construction of a sea wall of about seven or eight miles in length altogether if the whole scheme were carried out. At present we are carrying out only a small portion of the scheme, and it will certainly be a most beautiful place. The city of Toronto is reclaiming land along the lake front but is doing it at its own expense and of course will own it, but I do not think that even gentlemen from Toronto will claim that that is a transportation proposition as much as Ashbridge's bay.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. PEDLOW: Is it the intention of the Government to continue with the work on that seven or eight miles until completed?

Mr. CARVELL: Not this year.

Mr. PEDLOW: In succeeding years?

Mr. CARVELL: That will be a matter of policy later on. I have no announcement to make except that we propose this year putting on the concrete tops on the cribs that are now sunk and on 300 feet that we intend to sink. We also purpose to finish the Ashbridge's bay proposition. There is no use disguising the fact that there is a contract between the Government of Canada, the City of Toronto and the Harbour Commissioners of Toronto to carry out the whole scheme which will involve at least $7,000,000.

Mr. McMASTER: When was the contract made?

Mr. CARVELL: The Order in Council was passed in 1913 and I believe the contract was made in October of the same year.

Mr. EULER: Is there a time limit for its completion?

Mr. CARVELL: It was to have been completed in October, 1917.

Mr. PEDLOW: How much has been spent to date?

Mr. CARVELL: Practically two and a half millions.

Mr. COPP: What portion was the Government to expend?

Mr. CARVELL: A little less than $6,000,000. The city of Toronto and the Harbour Commissioners—which is the same thing because their bonds are guaranteed by the city of Toronto—were to expend about $15,000,000. The total expenditure was to be about $20,000,000. I think that if we go on and finish our part of it it will cost about $7,000,000 when completed. We have now expended about $2,500,000 and are asking for an appropriation of $500,000 at the present time which will be used in putting the concrete tops on these piers and finishing the Ashbridge's bay part of the work as far as it will extend. It will take about $850,000 to finish up what we have in prospect at the present time.

Mr. McMASTER: Can the minister give the Committee an idea of the water-borne exports from and imports into Toronto?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I cannot do so, but I do not think they are anything like

what they will be in the immediate future. I am a great believer in water transportation. I believe that the people will devote their attention to water-borne transportation, especially on inland waters, to a much greater extent in the future than in the past, and when the Welland canal is completed Toronto will be one of the most important seaports on the Great Lakes. Toronto is not an important seaport to-day for the reason that the big ships which navigate from the head of the lakes to Port Colborne cannot come to Toronto and therefore the shipping in Toronto is confined to the 14-foot draught vessel which can get through the Welland canal or down the St. Lawrence. But with a city having the manufacturing and trade possibilities of Toronto, there cannot be any question that when the Welland canal is completed Toronto harbour will be entirely different from what it is to-day. And the Government are not only entitled but compelled to provide necessary transportation facilities in Toronto for the future as they have done in Montreal, St. John, Halifax or any other port. I will admit at once, however, that if the Welland canal were not going to be deepened the Ashbridge's Bay proposition would not in my opinion be justifiable because there would not be traffic to justify it.

Mr. DUFF: When will the Welland canal be finished?

Mr. CARVELL: I hope in about three years, but that is not in my department. It seems to me that it should be completed in three years. This work, I presume, will be completed sometime in 1920. In other words, Ashbridge's bay will be completed a year or two before the Welland canal.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is important to know how the system of connecting Montreal with say Toronto is to be completed. When we get to the eastern end of the Welland canal what position are we in between there and Montreal?

Mr. CARVELL: We are then in a position to reach the largest boats that will come down the Great Lakes as far east as Kingston and there should be good business done as far as Prescott. It would be possible to navigate the St. Lawrence as far as Prescott, although I understand it would require some work in the river channel between Kingston and Prescott in order to make it navigable for large boats. But the moment the Welland canal is completed the biggest boats that ply on Lake Erie and Lake Superior at present will be able to come down not only to Toronto but to Kingston, and any man who looks at the map and who travels over the country and knows anything about its business will realize that Toronto will be a very different port after the Welland canal is completed from what it is now.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am afraid the minister is beginning a big expenditure at the wrong end. I think he should begin in navigable water and continue going inland.

Mr. CARVELL: There are various views about that phase of the question. Of course I did not begin it, although I not only do not have to justify it; but I am heartily in accord with the Ashbridge's bay portion of the Toronto development. There is another thing we must remember. It is all very well to say: "You have started here, whereas you should have begun somewhere else." It means a great many millions of dollars, indeed tens of millions of dollars, in order to make it possible for a 21 or 22-foot boat to navigate from Montreal to Toronto, and I do not think we would be justified in holding up navigation as far as Kingston pending the completion of the bigger scheme. The Welland canal, we know, can be completed and will be completed within a reasonable time. But the other I will not say is very far in the future, but it will require a great deal of study and investigation and the expenditure of a tremendous amount of money before it is finished. In view of this, I am not sure that the Government were not right in starting on the Welland canal. There is always the contention that the construction of the Welland canal is going to benefit the American lake ports, and that wheat will be brought to Oswego on lake Ontario, and sent by canal thence to New York. I am not in a position to discuss that point intelligently and I do not know that it plays a very great part here. I repeat that the Ashbridge's bay proposition is a sound one and will not be completed very much before it is used and used in a very profitable manner.

Mr. McMASTER: The minister has been putting figures before us which I cannot help regarding as simply appalling in view of the financial condition of the country. Has the Government in continuing or launching upon this scheme—I am not prepared to say whether it is a new scheme or the continuation of an old one—made any calculation of what is the probable use these great public works necessitating the

expenditure of tremendous amounts of money will be? We are being asked to pass these Estimates and the responsibility is upon all of us for the expenditure of these very large sums. I would feel easier in my conscience if the minister could give us some idea of what the result of this expenditure is going to be.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know that I can give my hon. friend very much information along that line. This is no scheme launched by this Government. The Welland canal and Toronto harbour works were launched before the war. With a debt of $325,000,000 or $300,000,000 and with buoyant revenues, there was no trouble about expending $10,000,000 upon a transportation problem. We had the money to do it with.

Mr. McMASTER: The situation is absolutely different now.

Mr. CARVELL: It has changed; there is no man in Canada who realizes that so much as I do. I took the trouble on the Address to sound a note of warning and sometimes I think I did not get very much assistance or sympathy from the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: We made all the use we could of the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. CARVELL: I tried to point out something about the financial condition as I viewed it. I have not launched out upon any new scheme and I am going to be pretty careful how I do launch out upon any new scheme. But I think I have some idea of business, and when I find in my department a public work upon which some millions of dollars have been expended, and which is absolutely useless until it is finished. I see nothing to do but to finish it in so far as you can. I hope my hon. friend will not charge me with launching upon any new schemes involving the expenditure of large amounts until I know what the results are going to be. But in a case like this I see nothing else to do. We have spent $2,500,000 on the Ashbridge's bay proposition which is two-thirds or three-fourths completed. We have to finish it; otherwise the money we have put into it will be lost. I agree that we ought not to launch upon any new scheme involving the expenditure of large amounts unless we have well considered the business phase of it in order to see if it is going to give us a revenue.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister tell us if it is his intention to finish up the damming of the St. Charles river at Quebec?

Mr. CARVELL: There is no vote in the Estimates for that. The trouble with the St. Charles river proposition at Quebec is a very simple one. The scheme is to construct a dam across the mouth of the river where it empties into the St. Lawrence. There were to be two entrances from the St. Lawrence up into the basins of the St. Charles river. That was to create practically a lake 12 or 14 feet higher than the ordinary level of the river at low tide and, to some extent, higher than the level would be at high tide. The sewage of at least three-quarters of the city of Quebec enters into the St. Charles river above the location of this dam and before the work was started an agreement was made with the city of Quebec by which they were to provide for the sewage. There was to be a big trunk sewer constructed by which the sewage would be emptied into the St. Lawrence river around and below the dam at the mouth of the St. Charles. It will cost probably $2,000,000. I suppose they had some trouble about financing it during the war but no attempt has been made to take care of that sewage. They have refused to go on with the work until something is done about the sewage. If you build a dam across the St. Charles river and dump the sewage of 75,000 or 80,000 people into the river for a year you will have a pest house; you could not live alongside of it. I would not take the responsibility of consenting to go on with the work until something was done about the sewage. With this I take the same ground that I have taken in regard to St. John and other places. We have about $1,750,000 invested in the St. Charles river work at the present time and it will take another $1,000,000 to finish it. The money we have expended is absolutely lost until the work is completed but I cannot go on and complete it until something is done to protect the health of the city of Quebec.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) finds the figures indicating expenditures at Toronto harbour appalling.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not say Toronto harbour. It was the whole thing, the Welland canal, Toronto harbour and other works, that I referred to. I was not especially referring to Toronto.

Mr. EDWARDS: Then the hon. gentleman's interjection occurred at an inop-

portune time. One would naturally conclude that he was appalled at the expenditure at Toronto. I am glad to know that that was not the case because I have never seen any indication of panic on the part of the hon. gentleman when an expenditure was to be made in the vicinity of Montreal. He could stand any amount of expenditure down there without turning a hair.

Mr. J. D. REID: He has not got any hair.

Mr. EDWARDS: Then my remark is incontrovertible; it cannot be questioned. There is another thing that I want to refer to. The minister would have us believe that a new era of economy, retrenchment and general saving opened up at the time that he entered office. Time and again he has assured us that he is not to be held responsible for any expenditures previous to that event. I have sat in this House for a number of years and I think I am correct in stating that when these expenditures were entered upon at Toronto and other parts of the country they went through without any very serious opposition from the gentlemen who are now sitting on the other side of the House and from gentlemen who are now sitting on this side of the House. The general principle was accepted then. These expenditures, as a general thing, have been justified. In regard to the St. Lawrence route, I did not hear the minister mention anything about the carrying of grain from lake Ontario down through to Montreal. I would almost infer from his remarks that Toronto was to be the trans-shipping point for grain coming down in big freighters when the Welland canal is completed. I hope that is not the intention of the Government because it seems to me that when that time arrives the proper point for trans-shipping the grain carried in these large vessels is the city of Kingston.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend certainly misunderstood me. I made no reference, or even a hint, to a possible trans-shipment of grain at Toronto; I don't believe that will ever happen. What I was talking about was the expansion of the general business of Toronto.

Mr. EDWARDS: Then we are in entire agreement on that point. I do not think the leader of the Opposition has the right idea when he suggests that the proper way to arrange this line of transportation would be to begin at the lower end, at Montreal I presume he means, and canalize the St. Lawrence. Before you undertook to make provision for transporting the grain available for the route from the Welland canal to Kingston or Prescott—before you could possibly complete an enterprise of that kind—that grain would be diverted from Canadian channels to American routes entirely. It does seem to me that something should be done, and done right away, to make provision at Kingston for the trans-shipment of the grain which will come down when the new Welland canal is completed. Kingston is the natural point for trans-shipment, because the grain can be loaded there into any kind of vessel at all by reason of the fact that the route from Kingston to Montreal lies in sheltered water. A vessel which could not stand the heavy seas or storms likely to be encountered on lake Ontario would therefore be quite capable of engaging in the carrying trade from Kingston to Montreal. In my opinion the Government should not wait until the new Welland canal is completed before making provision at Kingston for the trans-shipping of the grain which the big freighters will carry as far as that point. Although I speak from the standpoint of an Ontario man, and one who resides in the neighbourhood of Kingston, the advocacy of this idea is not confined to eastern men alone. I think I am right in saying that some years ago the grain growers of the West, when looking forward to the completion of the Welland canal, suggested that a Government elevator, somewhat similar to the one which is now in existence at Port Colborne, should be built at Kingston. I hope the Government will not delay in providing the necessary facilities at that port because if delay takes place we are going to lose the carriage of that grain; the Americans will promptly provide the necessary facilities to transport it over their own routes.

Mr. CARVELL: I take no exception to the hon. gentleman's reference to the fact that I voted for the expenditure of money in very large amounts prior to the war. I did so, and I have no regrets for so doing. However, I stated some time ago that the financial conditions of Canada have been revolutionized in the last five years. If we wanted ten, fifteen or twenty millions of dollars before the war there was no trouble whatever to get it, and nobody suffered because Canada had the money. Hon. gentlemen will recall that we formerly had surpluses of twenty-five and thirty-five millions of dollars a year. Why the cost of the con-

struction of the Transcontinental down to 1914 was paid out of surpluses. We also could build grain elevators and canals whenever we so minded, there was no difficulty about it at all. I am not posing as an economist because I am fond of doing so; no man who ever occupied the position of Minister of Public Works would like to engage in building as much as I would. I would be delighted if we were able to go on and construct public works, and I have enough optimism about me to think that I can build fairly competently, and I should like to go on and do so. But I realize the changed condition financially which has taken place in this country and that if I am going to be true to the position which I occupy and true to my conception of what a public man in Canada should do, I have got to look before I leap.

9 p.m.

Coming to the second part of my hon. friend's remarks, I heartily agree with him. When the Welland canal is completed it seems very reasonable indeed that the big freighters should go eastward as far as they can. I do not think they can ever economically go farther than Kingston at the present time but probably it would not take a great expenditure of money in order to so deepen the channel in the St. Lawrence river, so that those vessels might proceed as far as Prescott. Some months ago I visited Kingston, where I met the Board of Trade and the municipal authorities and certainly had a very pleasant day. To-day a board of engineers, of whom an engineer of the Public Works is one, are considering this very question, and I imagine that within the next month, or two months at the outside, we will have a very comprehensive report as to what in their judgment should be done for the future development of Kingston. Not only from the railway standpoint, but from the transportation point of view, and having in mind the erection of elevators and other facilities, notwithstanding the financial obligations which we have to bear, I think that something has got to be done in order to take care of the transportation problem which will be altogether changed as soon as the Welland canal is completed. What the nature of that policy will be I cannot announce this evening, because it has not been considered by the department or the Government, and I do not make any announcement with regard to matters of policy unless they have been decided upon. However, I quite agree with my hon. friend, we must provide for the changed conditions in respect to transportation which will exist when the Welland canal is completed. We are thoroughly investigating the situation at Kingston, and a report will be presented inside of two months showing what the "layout" will be and the probable cost of any works that may have to be undertaken.

Mr. COPP: What title or interest has the Government in the property which is being improved at Toronto as a result of the channel which is being dredged through Ashbridge's bay? In consequence of the works that are in progress certain industrial sites will be created and I would like to know who will own those sites?

Mr. CARVELL: With the exception of three or four acres on the western side of the channel, the property will belong to the Toronto Harbour Commission.

Mr. COPP: We are spending a large amount of money on the Toronto harbour works, which will amount, when the contract is finally completed, to something like $7,000,000. I can quite understand the Public Works Department building wharves in order to improve shipping facilities, but I remember when this vote was before the House last year, or a similar appropriation, there was a good deal of discussion, and it was claimed by some members that no inconsiderable part of the money was being expended in the improvement of private property. In other words, that the property fronting on the lake was privately owned, and cellar walls were being built on that property out of the public funds. Whether that is true or not I cannot say, but in glancing over last year's debate such is the tenor of some of the arguments that were advanced at that time. The Minister of Public Works last year explained that as a result of dredging a channel through the property in question some very valuable industrial sites would be created—indeed, some of these sites had already been built upon by business concerns, and others were in course of construction.

If that work continues and the property adjoining this channel becomes valuable, and the Government is protecting it, I cannot see why the Government should not have some control over the disposition of it.

Mr. CARVELL: I thought I had already answered that question. I have stated that under the contract this property belongs to the Toronto Harbour Commission, with the exception of five or six acres. There is something in what my hon. friend says, but you must remember that every time you develop a harbour or build a wharf or pier you are

going to benefit somebody's property. The Government does not own all the property joining such improvements, and of course it would not be possible for it to do so. It is true that new property is being created by this work.

Mr. COPP: That is the point I make.

Mr. CARVELL: No doubt; and the property will belong to a public body—the Toronto Harbour Commission. I have no doubt that they will lease it, probably at some profit, although I understand that as far as the Toronto Harbour Commissioners are concerned any money they may make is for the purpose of providing extra accommodation, just the same as in the case of money that is being expended by this department. My friend referred to something about cellar walls. That is new to me; I do not know anything about the matter at all. I also want to say that none of this money is being expended for the protection of private property. As I explained before, it is being expended for the development of Ashbridge's bay—which I have described very fully—and for building the sea wall in front of property that has been reclaimed by the Toronto Harbour Commissioners by pumping sand out of the bottom of the lake.

Mr. McKENZIE: My objection to this reclaiming of land is that it is too expensive. There is plenty of land in Canada, and I presume the city of Toronto could grow toward the place where the land is and not go out into the lake for it.

Mr. CARVELL: If Toronto grows inland it will not have water for these industries. I want to make this as plain as I can. The idea is to provide a location for industries, and a very great number of them, that will have both rail and water transportation; and you cannot get both anywhere in Toronto that I know of except in Ashbridge's bay.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. member will satisfy this Committee that the shipping from the city of Toronto is so congested that there is not enough water frontage at present to accommodate it, I readily agree with him that it is necessary to extend the water line. But that is the only condition of things existing in the city of Toronto or any other city that would justify the Government in building frontage at such a high cost as this must be. If this money is necessary in the sense I have suggested I would be in hearty accord with the proposed expenditure, but I am not satisfied that it is a good business proposition to spend this money in order to give more dockage to the city unless it is absolutely necessary. That is my criticism.

Mr. CARVELL: I thought I had answered that criticism once before. I have no figures before me, but in my judgment this additional water frontage is not an absolute necessity under present conditions. But I do believe when the Welland canal is completed and the city of Toronto has access to all the Great Lakes that there will be a great many times the amount of shipping to and from that city that there is at the present time; and that was the only justification, and a complete justification, for the expenditure of this money. There is no attempt to help any private individual, because, as I have already said, this property becomes vested in the Toronto Harbour trustees and there is no private interest involved so far as I know.

Mr. PEDLOW: In view of the fact that this work is not of immediate necessity would it not be well to defer proceeding with it until some later date when it does become really necessary?

Mr. CARVELL: I am deferring it to such an extent that some of my friends from Toronto are not altogether pleased. I am trying to finish up the harbour proposition. I believe it ought to be done, and for the present I am asking only for an appropriation to complete the sea wall in so far as it has been started, and of course it is deteriorating all the time while in an incomplete state.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the Government in mind the deepening of the St. Lawrence to facilitate the passage of deep draught lake vessels to Montreal?

Mr. CARVELL: That would be a pretty big question to answer. I can state this much for the benefit of my hon. friend, that a committee, composed of the engineers of some of our departments in Ottawa, the chief engineer of the Hydro Electric Commission of Ontario, and the chief engineer, I believe, of the Public Works Department of Quebec, Mr. Amos, have been working for some years on the problem of canalizing the St. Lawrence river; data has been collected, and the matter is in such shape that a report will be available in a couple of months at the outside, I would imagine. There is also a proposal, which I think will be carried out, that in a very short time this question should be handed over to the

International Joint Waterways Commission in order that they may take the data which our engineers and the American engineers may be able to give them, and investigate what the probable cost of canalizing the river would be, the amount of water-power that could be developed as the result of canalization, what it would cost to develop, what it could be sold for and where it could be sold. So I can assure my hon. friend that we are going into the matter in a thorough way, and I believe that within a year the public both of Canada and the United States will have all the information on the subject that it is possible to obtain. When that information is available, then it becomes: First, an international question; if this work is to be developed, when it is going to be developed, the expense of the development and in what proportions it should be borne, and secondly, how much money it is going to take, how much power can be developed, what is going to become of it, and how much revenue can be made out of it. I sincerely hope that it will be treated as a business proposition, and I believe that it will not be very many years before this great work is undertaken—one of the greatest in the Dominion of Canada. But we must remember that it is an international proposition to a great extent, and therefore it must be worked out between ourselves and the United States authorities. But I believe they are anxious to have it developed, if possible. I know our authorities are of the same mind, and I know we are taking every possible means to gather the fullest data for presentation to Parliament in connection with it.

Mr. CAHILL: What return cargo would be carried by a ship which brought wheat from the head of the lakes to Kingston, say, or to Toronto?

Mr. CARVELL: One would not require a very vivid imagination to foresee the supplying of ample return cargo so far as Toronto is concerned. Toronto will become the distributing point for practically all of western Ontario along the lakes. I do not pretend that Toronto will be able to furnish a return cargo for all vessels carrying wheat down the lakes; that would be an impossibility. I imagine that a large proportion of the wheat carriers must go to United States ports to get coal, which is the big return cargo. But Toronto is the centre of one of the greatest manufacturing sections of Canada. Then, west of Toronto we have Hamilton, which is the next place on the Great Lakes that ought to be attended to. I believe that the Dominion Government has been lax in not going on with the proper development at Hamilton, because that city is becoming one of the greatest manufacturing centres of Canada. A tremendous amount of farm machinery which now goes from Toronto and Hamilton to the West by rail could be sent by water if big vessels called at these ports. I cannot say exactly what these ships will carry, but I think it is no stretch of imagination to believe that there will be plenty of cargo when the Welland Canal is completed.

Public buildings—Nova Scotia, $19,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the minister going to do at North Sydney?

Mr. CARVELL: The amount of $5,000 is required for an addition at the rear of the North Sydney public building for an examining warehouse.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have been talking about building that warehouse ever since Adam was a baby. When is the work to be finished?

Mr. CARVELL: During the present summer.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have been carrying that vote for five or six years.

Mr. CARVELL: We intend to go on with practically all the work for which I am asking the Committee to pass votes to-night. I do not think there are more than a dozen items in any of these Estimates in respect of which we have not the plans and specifications practically ready to call for tenders.

Mr. McKENZIE: For five or six years the Customs Department for want of space, has been obliged to rent a place quite apart from the public building, and it is absolutely necessary that this wing be added to the public building as soon as possible. Seven or eight years ago I was given a little vote to put clocks on certain public buildings in my riding, one at Sydney Mines, one at Baddeck and one at North Sydney. The clocks were put in at Baddeck and Sydney Mines but my own home town was left out; there was a change of government I think, before the hour arrived for the installation of my clock. Possibly the minister could save enough out of the $5,000 to give us the long promised clock.

Mr. CARVELL: We have $1,000 in this estimate for my hon. friend's clock.

Public buildings, New Brunswick, $35,500.

Mr. LEGER: Last year an amount was appropriated for repairs to the Richibucto

public building, but they have not been carried out. I do not see any amount in the Estimates of this year for this work. May I ask the minister whether anything will be done this year?

Mr. CARVELL: Item 113 provides an amount of $25,000 for improvements and repairs to public buildings generally in the Maritime Provinces. The matter to which my hon. friend refers was brought to my attention and I am informed by my deputy that arrangements have been made and instructions given to have the small repairs on the Richibucto building paid for out of this $25,000 vote. That is why it does not appear in the Estimates.

With regard to the item of $10,000 for addition to the Moncton post office, the Post Office Department reported to our department that they required that much additional space. There is no doubt that there is great congestion in that building. No city in the Maritime Provinces has grown as fast as Moncton, and there is great demand for a new public building. The matter developed during the last two or three weeks and I could not make any decision as to what we would do, because a new building would be fairly expensive. I am not sure, therefore, that this $10,000 will be expended. It is only fair that I should make this statement in order that the member for the constituency or any other interested persons may know what the attitude of the department is with regard to the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: The amount of this vote is not sufficient to build a new public building.

Mr. CARVELL: It would be enough to make the addition, but it would not be enough for a new building. We could not use money that was voted for an addition to the Moncton post office for the purchase of a site for a new building. A new vote would be necessary for that. It may be possible in view of the congestion in that city that this $10,000 may not be expended, and that we may try to get along with the present building in the hope that later on a building more commensurate with the importance of the city may be erected.

Mr. COPP: What I have to say will not be new to the minister because I already have had some conversation with him about a public building for the city of Moncton. The building there now is very small and was erected some twenty-five years or more ago, when Moncton was only a small town. The city is growing very rapidly and has now a population of between 17,000 and 20,000. The building is located at one extreme end of the city, and at the present time the city is expanding in exactly the opposite direction. The present building is used as a custom house and post office combined. It might possibly do as a custom house, if some additions and improvements were made. I am sure that if the minister would have an investigation made he would at once conclude that the proper and economical thing to do would be to erect a new building as soon as possible. I would urge that that be done this year, because business there is expanding very rapidly and it will be absolutely necessary to have a new building very soon. I assure him that the people of Moncton, rather than have a small addition to the present building, would prefer to put up with the present inconvenience a little longer so that a building more commensurate with the importance of the city could be erected in the near future. I am sure that if the minister would have a report made on the situation he would come to the conclusion that a public building must be erected in Moncton in the very near future.

Some of us are very disappointed that no appropriation appears in the Estimates for public buildings in other parts of New Brunswick. I refer particularly to the town of Sackville in the county of Westmorland. We have never had a public building there, although we have a population of between 3,000 and 4,000 and the town is prosperous and growing rapidly. In the town of Sackville we have the Mount Allison institution, which is known all over Canada, if not all over the world, and at which a large number of students attend. It is hardly necessary for me to impress upon the minister that a public building is very urgently needed in Sackville because he knows the locality very well. Apparently, however, the Government does not see its way clear to make an expenditure for this purpose this year. I sincerely trust that the minister will give the matter serious consideration and see if he cannot include an item in the Supplementary Estimates to provide for a public building in the town of Sackville. The building we are now using is one of the oldest in the town and is not much better than a common shed on a farm. It is exceedingly inconvenient for postal purposes, because the proper facilities are entirely lacking. There are hardly any boxes for the delivery of mail and people have to stand in the lobby till the mail is sorted, and sometimes, if the mail train is an

hour late, the lobby will be full and people will be standing in the cold outside, which is very unpleasant on a stormy night.

Mr. CARVELL: I may as well state in answer to my hon. friend the position in which I find myself in regard to public buildings all over Canada. As hon. gentlemen know, I come from the province of New Brunswick and I am very intimately acquainted with all the cities and towns of that province. I know the exact truth of everything my hon. friend (Mr. Copp) has said about the town of Sackville, but what can be said of Sackville can be said, I suppose, of fifty or a hundred towns in Canada. When I began to make up the Estimates, after four years of war, I found that promises of public buildings had been made to a great many cities and towns, and in many cases the sites had been purchased. Since the armistice, members of the House, boards of trade, and municipal bodies have told me "Now is the time to implement these promises and start the construction of these buildings." The matter was taken up by Council and considered very carefully. I do not know whether we were right or not, but the policy decided upon by the Government was not to construct buildings in the smaller towns and villages at the present time; and as the Estimates show, we have provided only for the construction of buildings in half a dozen of the larger centres. This was done, as I explained in the debate on the Address, partly for the purpose of providing employment in the large cities where we knew there would be a great number of unemployed, but even in those places we are not erecting buildings if they are not required and will have no economic value.

Personally, I am a great believer in a neat small building for every town in the Dominion of Canada. It adds to the appearance of the town and gives people some local pride. Furthermore, I think that the ground surrounding the building should be beautified. If there is one thing we have neglected in connection with our public buildings in the past, it is the beautifying of the grounds.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend says, Hear hear. He and I had this very matter up a year ago, when I was trying to help him and the municipality of Three Rivers carry out this very idea. I tell the House frankly that the question of constructing public buildings in the smaller towns is a matter of policy for the Government to decide. When the Government decides in favour of erecting these public buildings, I suppose the burden will be cast upon me of saying where the money will be expended, and that is not a pleasant duty, I can assure the Committee. But I must assume the responsibility when that time comes, and do the best I can. If we were back in the days of 1914, and I was Minister of Public Works, I would not hesitate to ask for an expenditure of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 for the construction of a public building in every town in Canada with a population as low even as 1,000. Considered purely from the standpoint of dollars and cents, it would not be good business, because a building can be rented for much less than the annual interest charge and maintenance, but I think a public building in a small town has an educative value. It gives people a pride in their town, and I look upon it as a good way to spend public money.

These remarks will apply to at least fifty different constituencies in Canada and perhaps a hundred, and I thought it well to make this statement so early in the debate in order that members might know exactly the position of affairs.

Mr. McMASTER: Would it not be possible in connection with the erection of small buildings in towns to have a rule laid down that if the income arising from the Post Office, or the Customs, amounts to so much, that would justify the expenditure of a sum in proportion? To say that we like to see fine public buildings throughout the country is merely to say that we enjoy the beautiful. Everybody does. But we are face to face with a condition which the Minister of Public Works realizes as well as, and probably better than a great number of other people do, and I think it would hold up the minister's hands in his struggle for economy if he would lay down the rule that when an application is made for the erection of a public building in this place and the other, the income must justify the expenditure which will be involved. I would like to know what the minister has to say to that suggestion.

Mr. CARVELL: There is a good deal of merit in the suggestion of my hon. friend in so far as the postal revenue is concerned. I cannot agree with him as regards the Customs revenue, because in very many places in Canada the Customs revenue may be entirely out of proportion to the amount of business actually done, for the reason that

it extends to many outside points. As a rule the nearer a place to the border the greater the Customs revenue is as compared with an inland city or town. Take the town in which I live. There are only 4,000 people and we are ten miles from the border. I am not sure, but I think the Customs revenue runs close to $100,000. I am speaking from memory, but I know that it is a pretty large amount for a town of its size. That would not be a criterion as to what kind of a public building we should have because it serves a territory seventy-five miles up the river. I do not think you can take the Customs as much of a guide, but my opinion is that the postal revenue should serve to some extent as a guide as to the necessity for public buildings.

Mr. McMASTER: The minister has hardly answered my question as to whether it would not assist him or any Minister of Public Works in an effort to economize and to restrain the spending proclivities of the people, to lay down the rule that if the postal revenue, for instance, amounted to so much, the expenditure on a post office building should be proportionate. I know of place after place in Canada which for several years was adequately served by a small rented building, and the total expenditure in the upkeep of the building, including rent and everything might be under a thousand dollars a year. Public buildings have been put up in these places and possibly one item such as heating may cost that much money. Of course, I am not giving exact figures; this is merely by way of illustration. I am perfectly certain that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been uselessly expended on the public services of Canada in order perhaps to meet the more or less justifiable pride of this or the other little place which demands public buildings of a character far more pretentious than the circumstances warrant.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as I know, the revenue is always taken into consideration. I have no figures before me, but if my hon. friend should come to the department I could show him that there is not a proposed building in Canada in connection with which we have not the data as to population, postal revenue, customs revenue, etc. We certainly consider that and take all the data into account. There are, however, some cases in which you would have to depart from that rule because you might have a pretty large population which for some reason was not contributing very much to the postal revenues. Very often a train going through the town is the most convenient place to mail letters, and people get stamps from all sources. It is a fair criterion but it is not absolutely perfect.

Mr. COPP: I trust my hon. friend from Brome, who happens to have lived in Montreal, is not trying to excuse the expenditure on the post office in the city of Montreal because the revenues of that city were large.

Mr. McMASTER: My remarks upon this question of expenditure are not influenced either by the part of the country I live in, or by the part of the country I represent. I am endeavouring as far as possible to take a Canadian view of the question. I am thoroughly convinced that very difficult financial times confront the Canadian people unless we change their mentality in regard to what they think they should get from the Government and what they should give to the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: The question I desire to put to the minister is rather influenced by the part of the country I come from. The minister stated that he could not under the circumstances entertain the erection of new buildings in the various towns, but I understood also that he laid down as a principle that it was proper—

Mr. CARVELL: My friend is misquoting me. I have no recollection of making such a statement. I said that the Government had decided before the session that for the present year they would only erect buildings in half a dozen of the large cities, but I said that the matter was one of policy which the Government should decide upon.

Mr. BUREAU: There is a building already erected in the town of Trois-Rivières and my hon. friend knows the facts connected with it. Is it the intention to put anything into the Supplementary Estimates for fixing the grounds around the post office site? It really includes more than the post office—customs, excise, weights and measures, etc.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend knows there was a temporary building erected on a portion of the post office square. We have sold that property and I presume it is being removed.

Mr. BUREAU: It is removed now.

Mr. CARVELL: We certainly intend to fix up the grounds around the new building.

Mr. MICHAUD: The minister says it is the intention to spend some money in connection with the building mentioned by the

hon. member for Three Rivers. I would like to know if he intends to spend anything in connection with the post office in my own town.

Mr. BUREAU: He intends to spend some money around the building.

Mr. MICHAUD: There is a great necessity for a public building in my town. We have been paying into the treasury about $75,000 a year for many years and have been asking for public buildings, but have been refused. We have a population of about 4,000 and our town is growing, and a building is required to meet the increasing needs of the place. I have been asking the minister to spend some money in connection with this matter, but—

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend from Restigouche and Madawaska (Mr. Michaud) evidently believes in the scriptural injunction, "Ask and ye shall receive." He came to me about a year ago and requested to have fitted up a building which had been used as a post office for a great many years. He got exactly what he asked for. I will admit it did not cost very much.

Mr. MICHAUD: I asked for a new building and you only repaired the old one.

Mr. CARVELL: The work cost $700 or $800 and—

Mr. MICHAUD: Only $400.

Mr. CARVELL: It made a comfortable post office. I must admit it is not the kind of building the town of Edmundston is entitled to. This is one of the growing towns of eastern Canada. A pulp mill has recently been erected costing over $3,000,000 and the place is growing very rapidly. It is in the class of those towns that I have been talking about. I would like to see a public building erected in all towns of the size of Edmundston and up. The general remarks that I have made in answer to my hon. friend from Westmorland will apply to all these items that may arise all over Canada.

Quebec—Public buildings, $1,118,000.

Mr. CARVELL: These are all pure maintenance items with the exception of two. The first of these exceptions to which I refer is a vote of $35,000 for what we might call ordinary maintenance and repairs and then we come to the Grosse Isle quarantine station. There is a contract existing for the installation of a steam plant in the Grosse Isle station and the price to be paid is $30,000. Then there is a vote of $400,000 asked for the erection of a practically new

[Mr. Michaud.]

building at Grosse Isle. I am not in a position to state exactly what may be done regarding the construction of this building until I have positive instructions from the Immigration Department. There is a doubt in the minds of a great many people whether the quarantine station should be at Grosse Isle or at Quebec because that is where the boats all land. Nothing definite has been arrived at. That must be left entirely to the Immigration Department and when they decide what they want the Public Works Department will have to carry out the work. I am taking this vote and unless there is a change of policy I expect to construct the building.

Mr. McMASTER: This seems to be a very large sum. Can the minister give us some idea of the number of immigrants who pass through this station and the average length of time that they remain there, in order that we may have some knowledge of what it costs per capita to entertain these strangers who come within our gates for the few days during which they are detained at the quarantine station?

Mr. CARVELL: I am sorry I cannot do so. In a sense the Department of Public Works is only the agent of the Immigration Department for matters of this kind. Since the beginning of the war there has been practically no immigration passing through.

Mr. McMASTER: I would not want the minister to base his argument on the time that has elapsed from the beginning of the war. Let us take a few years before that which were very active immigration years.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not in a position to give the number of immigrants who pass through that building anually but I will try and get the information. It is at the extreme entrance of the great St. Lawrence river. In the summer time probably nine-tenths of the immigration coming into this country passes up the St. Lawrence river and must go through Grosse Isle. If there is one thing in my judgment that Canada has been lax in, it has been in the management of the quarantine station. I do not think we have paid sufficient attention to the immigrants who came in here. We have not been able to give them a proper medical inspection. Men and women have been allowed into Canada who never should have been allowed in. If there is any public building that ought to be attended to immediately it is the quarantine station. We must look after the health of these people. I admit that $400,000 seems quite

an amount to expend in adding to an existing plant. I can assure my hon. friend that if we go on with it there will not be a dollar expended more than is necessary whether the building is erected here or at Quebec. I think there is quite an opinion in the minds of some of the officials of the Immigration Department that better results would be obtained if this building were erected at Quebec.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is this in addition to the existing building?

Mr. DECHENE: I come from the constituency in which the Grosse Isle plant is situated. This island is divided into two portions. There is a place provided for first class immigrants and also for the second and third class immigrants. The second and third class immigrants are using a shed that we would not think fit for cattle. The lower part of the island is specially set apart for certain diseases and the minister and the immigration authorities know that we had cases of bubonic plague there last summer. In that part of the island there is no proper accommodation whatever. There are a few houses but no hospital of any kind to take care of any serious cases. Millions of dollars have already been spent at Grosse Isle but no accommodation has been provided. The growing town of Montmagny, with a population of 4,000 or 5,000 is not far away and without proper accommodation at Grosse Isle diseases may spread through the town. I would impress upon the mind of the minister the desirability, as soon as possible, of erecting some part of this hospital. It would serve to improve the facilities at the quarantine station and help our part of the country by giving employment to people who were thrown out of work by the closing down of factories at the end of the war. We have a lot of unemployed men. This is a good time to build because so many people are out of work. We might here apply the argument used by the Acting Premier (Sir Thomas White) who says that we should give the people work so that the working classes will not go in for Bolshevism. I have heard that the Government has bought an island near Rimouski with the intention of removing the quarantine station there. Is that right or wrong? I am just speaking from hearsay.

Mr. CARVELL: I am also speaking from hearsay but I have no recollection of having heard anything about that.

Mr. DECHENE: I heard it and I wanted to ask the minister whether there was any truth in it.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think there is anything in it. The only thing I have heard is the proposition that it might be removed to Quebec. I think the hon. gentleman is correctly describing the conditions which exist at Grosse Isle. The accommodation there is absolutely unfit for human beings, at least it is not suitable for any human beings coming to our country. If we are to maintain the plant at Grosse Isle, we must provide the necessary hospital accommodation for all classes of immigrants.

Mr. DECHENE: Could the minister tell us now many millions have already been expended at Grosse Isle for immigration purposes?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, the expenditure amounts to $1,143,000.

Mr. DECHENE: Has the contract been awarded for the new building at Grosse Isle?

Mr. CARVELL: A contract was awarded last autumn for the construction of a power plant.

Mr. DECHENE: That was covered by the $30,000 vote?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. The work was not proceeded with during the winter time because of the difficulty of carrying it on at that time in that portion of the province. I think the contractor was given until the first of May to commence the work. I am not sure whether the work has been actually commenced or not. If not, it will be undertaken immediately and will be carried to completion.

Mr. DECHENE: Last year there was a very bad storm and the wharves on both sides of the river were seriously damaged. The steamer carrying on the service between the quarantine station and the mainland has been greatly handicapped in consequence, there being practically no wharf at all on the south shore. Is it the intention of the minister to repair the damaged wharves, one on Grosse Isle and the other on the mainland?

Mr. CARVELL: It the hon. gentleman will refer to the estimates he will find that $50,000 has been appropriated for the extension of the wharf at Grosse Isle, and $6,500 for repairing a wharf.

Mr. DECHENE: The $50,000 is for the lower wharf at Grosse Isle, but there are two wharves.

Mr. CARVELL: As I read the items we are repairing one wharf and extending the other.

Mr. McMASTER: I frankly admit the soundness of everything the minister has said as to the necessity of having proper accommodation for the immigrants coming to this country by way of Grosse Isle, but that is not the point I tried to make. The point is that we are asked to pass an item of $400,000, which is a large sum of money, and the minister, whether he is acting for another department or not, should tell us why this amount is required; what accommodation has to be provided, and why we require to vote such a large sum. After all, the responsibility for the passing of these items is not merely upon the Minister of Public Works, it rests upon every member of the House, and it is a responsibility which I am afraid a number of us take very lightly. I lay it down as a matter of principle that when a minister asks us to approve of large expenditures of public moneys, every reasonable detail that we would exact if we were spending our own money should be placed before us.

Mr. CARVELL: I concur in practically everything which my hon. friend has said, but I have already stated that we must have proper accommodation at Grosse Isle. The immigration officers say that the work there will be proceeded with and that the expenditure of this $400,000 is imperative. I have not personally inspected the work at Grosse Isle, I am not even sure that my engineers or architects have been there. We certainly scrutinized this vote carefully, and we held it up last year because there were no immigrants coming to Canada. We did not care to expend this money while the war was in progress, but now that it is over I look upon the equipment of our quarantine station at Grosse Isle as a prime necessity. If I had time I might go down and look over the work myself.

10 p.m. Failing that, I can only say that the reports I have received from the Immigration Department and the officers of my department, in so far as they have made any report on the matter, are that it is an absolutely necessary work. I quite admit that a $400,000 plant is quite a plant. I have the plans and the full details before me, and they certainly indicate that if the work goes on the plant will be thoroughly up-to-date. There will be nothing in this country, or in fact on the continent, in the way of an immigration plant that will be superior to the one at the mouth of the St. Lawrence river. I do not know that I can say anything more with respect to the work. I certainly do not intend to expend any money unless it is necessary, but I am compelled to accept the report of the officials of both departments, who say that the present accommodation is not suitable and the expenditure of this money in providing better accommodation is therefore necessary.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The disturbing thing to my mind is the statement of an hon. member that over a million dollars has already been expended at Grosse Isle and there is absolutely no accommodation for the immigrants. It is beyond me to understand what has been done with all that money, if that is the condition of affairs at the present time, and whether it can be remedied or not by voting $400,000 I do not know. Surely there must be something wrong with the statement in question.

Mr. CARVELL: I will give my hon. friend a statement of the money which has been spent. The expenditure up to Confederation was $126,000, and from that time until March 31, 1918, $736,000. The balance of $180,000 is for the construction of wharves running away back to Confederation.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What have we got in return for the expenditure of that money?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know, because I have not been there. We have two wharves at Grosse Isle that were pretty badly shattered during the great storm in November last. We have buildings there and a hospital and disinfecting plant, but they are out of date; they are not fit for occupation. I wish I could give my hon. friends more information than I have done; if further information is desired I will endeavour to obtain it for them.

Mr. McMASTER: The complaint I make is not that the minister does not in a most complete and able manner lay before us the information in his possession. My complaint is that he should have much more information than he seems to have. He should be able to tell us, for example, whether he expects to be able to provide accommodation, under ordinary circumstances, for so many immigrants.

Mr. CARVELL: If the Apostle Paul were here he could not answer that question. I do not know what the conditions are going to be in the next few years. I do not know whether ten thousand or a million immigrants will come into Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: The Apostle Paul is being continuously drawn into the discussions in this House and this is not a theological seminary. If the minister has not any more idea of the number of immigrants that may be expected than he appears to have, why is he proposing to expend the sum of $400,000 for their accommodation? Surely he must have some idea; he is not going ahead in the dark without any definite ideas. It seems to me that he should be able to say whether or not the present equipment is inadequate.

Mr. CARVELL: I have said so.

Mr. McMASTER: Then he should tell us that we require to have a hospital there and that it will cost about so much; that there is need for so many waiting rooms, and they will cost so much. He should give us some idea of how he proposes to lay out this $400,000, and what the necessity for it is. It is easy enough to say that he wants to make adequate preparation. We all do, but what is meant by adequate preparation?

Mr. FIELDING: Does it mean that all the immigrants coming into Quebec will pass through these buildings and be detained there for examination, or does it mean that only those who are sick will go to these buildings? Which of these plans is to be followed?

Mr. CARVELL: As it is a quarantine station I suppose it means only those who are sick will have to be accommodated there; but of course if there happens to be an infectious disease on the vessel the whole passenger list will have to be accommodated. There might be times when there would not be one immigrant there; there might be times when there would be a thousand. That is how I understand it, and I think that is really the condition of affairs.

Mr. FIELDING: I have been on a ship when we were all ordered off at Grosse Isle, and I had a hard job in dodging the order myself. I can understand that for the detention of immigrants you would require a large amount of accommodation; but if only for cases of actual sickness you would not need so much accommodation. I am not complaining about the item, I only want to know what accommodation it is intended to cover.

Mr. CARVELL: Grosse Isle is the place where ships are held up for medical examination.

Mr. FIELDING: All passengers do not land there.

Mr. CARVELL: I know. If a ship comes up the river with a clean bill of health she is merely stopped while the examination is taking place, and then proceeds to Montreal. But if a ship comes in with smallpox or bubonic plague on board, then the whole list of passengers must be disembarked and taken care of at Grosse Isle.

An hon. MEMBER: It is not the intention of the minister to spend the money unless he finds on investigation that it is absolutely necessary?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. POWER: I find myself for once in full agreement with the minister. Grosse Isle station for the past few years has been in a disgraceful condition—in fact so disgraceful that it was no encouragement to immigrants. We want to build something which will impress immigrants with the feeling that Canada is an up to date country any way. There have been times to my knowledge when four of five ships have been held up at Grosse Isle to be examined, and passengers have had to get off. Some accommodation must be found for them. You cannot run up a camp in a few minutes. I do not know and I do not suppose the minister could tell the number of immigrants on those boats that may be accommodated in the future; but I think adequate accommodation should be provided.

Public buildings—Ontario—$1,982,716.20.

Mr. CARVELL: There are only two items in that amount that I think require more than passing notice. One is the construction of a public building at Hamilton, and the other at Toronto. The intention in the case of Hamilton is to build what I suppose you would call an addition to the existing public buildings. When it is completed it will be sufficient to take care of all the public services in the city of Hamilton. Now we are renting space in different parts of the city, the same as we are doing in many other places. As I have said a number of times, with the great deal of unemployment that is prevalent I think it is a very proper thing to go on with such work. The same can be said about the new building in Toronto. This has been under consideration for a number of years, and is located on the south side of Front street, just east of the new railway station. It will be about 500 feet in length—I am speaking now approximately—with a reasonable depth.

When this building is completed we will be able to house all our public services in that city.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will this complete it?

Mr. CARVELL: No, it will take $2,000,000. The work is in progress. We called for tenders simply for excavating and preparing the site for the erection of the building. I think Lyall & Son are the contractors. I do not know exactly what we will do next, but my present intention is to call for tenders for the foundation in order that no time may be lost. If we are able to have the place prepared so that we can call for tenders for the construction of the whole building and lose no time during the summer, we will do so; otherwise we will call for tenders and give a contract for the foundations, and that will give us plenty of time to complete the plans for the general structure. But the intention is to keep the work going and use as much labour as is possible in that very congested centre.

There is another item of $520,000, wh ch will complete the Government's portion of the new railway station now being erected in Toronto. Hon. members will remember that one end of that building is being constructed by the Dominion Government as a postal station.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, may I have the permission of the Committee and the minister to ask a question on the last item? What is this public building in Montreal, $500,000 ?

Mr. CARVELL: We skipped over that; I am sure I had no intention of doing so, but the Committee wanted to get along. That $500,000 is to build an extension to the new customs building that was erected some three or four years ago. The land was purchased, plans were prepared, and we are simply now taking up the work as we found it. There again we have called for tenders for the excavation and the foundations, and we will then proceed with the construction work on practically the same lines as I have described in respect to Toronto. In other words, we will keep men working on that building during the whole summer, and I hope it will be far enough advanced to keep them employed during the winter. It will cost probably a million and a half dollars when completed; $500,000 we figure is as much as can be economically expended during the present year.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Do we understand that these buildings, one in Montreal and another in Toronto, are being erected chiefly to provide employment for labour rather than as being necessary for the public service?

Mr. CARVELL: No; I say they are necessary for the public service. We are to-day renting space in Toronto as great as that provided for in the new building, and I think probably more in the city of Montreal than we are providing for. Therefore as these works are a necessity we are constructing them under the present abnormal conditions for the purpose of providing labour for unemployed men. I have no hesitation in saying that we could get along for a year or two, because we could continue paying the rentals which we are now paying, and possibly the cost of construction will go down and money might be saved if we waited for three or four years. But I hope I have made it plain from the beginning that we feel the burden is cast upon the Government to provide as far as possible for unemployment. I am afraid we are facing a pretty serious condition from the labour standpoint. It will not be so bad during the summer months, but when the winter comes I rather shudder at the prospect. I am rather afraid there will be a great many people out of work. Therefore I think the Government should go ahead as fast as it can so long as it proceeds on economic principles and construct works that will be of economic value. As long as we can do that I think we are justified in going ahead and providing work for the unemployed.

Mr. McMASTER: Is there a real want of employment for men engaged in the building trades in Canada?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, without a doubt.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it the policy of the Government to call for tenders for all public works?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, even in connection with the foundations; and invariably we accept the lowest tender. The difference between the highest and lowest tenders in some cases would surprise hon. gentlemen. In the case of the Toronto building the lowest tender was $17,000 or $18,000 and the highest was over $40,000. By calling for tenders in this way we can start work immediately on the first part of the building, and by the time the foundation is completed we have the plans and specifications ready for the whole structure. On the other hand, we may have the plans ready in time to call for tenders for the

construction of the whole building, including the foundation.

Mr. McKENZIE: In speaking of the foundation, does the minister mean both the excavation and the concrete foundation?

Mr. CARVELL: The contracts now running are for the excavation. We may call for tenders subsequently for the concrete foundations, to be built to the ground line or perhaps two or three feet above the ground line.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the excavation costing per cubic yard? The only way of telling whether the work is being done at a reasonable rate is by knowing the quantity that has to be removed and the cost of removing it.

Mr. CARVELL: Before calling for tenders a very careful estimate is prepared by officials of the department, and hon. gentlemen would be surprised to see how close the lowest tenders usually come to the official estimate. Up to the middle of last summer, when prices were going up all the time, the tenders usually ran above the departmental estimate, but during the last six months the tenders have been below the departmental estimate in the great majority of cases. In the case of the Toronto works the tender is a little below the departmental estimate.

Mr. LALOR: Is any principle laid down by the Government with regard to the class of labour employed in the construction of these buildings? People who are not citizens of Canada, who have not taken out naturalization papers, who are foreigners, should not be employed in these public works. The work should be given to Canadian citizens, especially to returned soldiers. That principle should be laid down by the Government so that the contractor will know the class of labour that he must employ.

Mr. CARVELL: We have not begun to lay down, when calling for tenders, the class of labour that must be employed. But we have had a chance now of studying the matter closely, and we find that returned soldiers are not willing to dig trenches; they dug all the trenches they wanted to in France. There is no disguising the fact that the returned soldier does not want to engage in such labour as the preparing of foundations.

Mr. LALOR: I agree.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know to what extent foreign labour is employed in this particular class of work, but I think there would be some difficulty in getting ordinary Canadians to go into the ground and help take out the foundation for a building. If the time should come when it would be necessary to exclude foreigners from work on the construction of these buildings, I would not hesitate to do so, but we have not reached that point yet. There is not such an abundance of that class of labour in Canada at the present time that we would be justified in drawing the line.

Mr. POWER: With regard to the Quebec Marine Department stores, what steps is the minister going to take to call for tenders? The building is an eyesore in its present condition, situated, as it is, directly under the terrace at Quebec. I hope the minister will do his utmost to have this work finished as rapidly as possible. I understand that more than a month must elapse in connection with calling for tenders, and this delay will bring us into November. If the minister can go on with this work at once he will be doing justice to the city of Quebec and to his department.

Mr. CARVELL: I imagine that the plans and specifications are already prepared. When the percentage of the Estimates was voted two or three weeks ago I instructed the proper officials not to wait for the passing of the main Estimates, but to get out the plans and specifications and call for tenders. Tenders for a great many works are being called at the present time, even before the money is voted. I realize the importance of starting this work as early in the summer as possible. There should be no difficulty in having it finished before next November. I assure my hon. friend that it will be attended to before the cold weather comes.

Mr. McMASTER: It may not be altogether desirable to spend too much money on building or excavating when such a tremendous need for agricultural labour exists throughout the country. Speaking for my part of the province of Quebec, I may say that farmers are complaining very bitterly of their inability to get farm labour. I know that it would be a very difficult thing to do, but if it is at all possible I suggest that currents of labour be deflected from the towns to the country, where labour is very much needed and where, under present conditions, it is not inadequately remunerative.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a very pious suggestion. Perhaps my hon. friend will point out some way of accomplishing it.

Mr. McMASTER: I suggest that in connection with the housing scheme the Government proposes to bring down, some money might very properly be spent in assisting farmers, at a low rate of interest, to put up labourers' cottages in the country. That would help very substantially to get farm labour on the land.

Mr. McCREA: The minister a few moments ago said that one of the objects in going on with public works in different places was to give employment to the idle. If there are so many idle people in Canada that we have to make special provision for them like this, at a time when the cost of labour and material is so expensive, I do not see how the minister can ask for $400,000 for the erection of an immigration building. Surely, if there are so many idle people in Canada we should not have immigrants coming in. Some weeks ago the minister was deploring the financial condition of the country and wondering how we were going to meet our obligations, but judging by the Estimates he seems to have forgotten his fears on that score. I admit that we must keep abreast of the times and put up buildings where they are actually needed, but I do not think it is good business to go on erecting public buildings for the sake of giving work to the unemployed and at the same time encourage immigration to this country.

Mr. CARVELL: Would my hon. friend name one item that he would like to see deleted?

Mr. McCREA: Yes; all the items on the list. The minister is asking for three times as much as he did last year. He is asking for money to construct new buildings and to repair old ones. Perhaps I should not complain, because I am producing and selling the materials used in construction, but it certainly is an expensive time to engage in construction work. I think the item for the immigration building should stand.

Mr. PEDLOW: I notice that a rural mail shelter is to be provided at Walkerton. Is this a new departure for the Government to provide rural mail shelters and what is the nature of the shelter?

Mr. CARVELL: It is only a shed for the protection of the horses of the mail carriers at the Walkerton public building. There are a number of places in Canada where this protection is provided for the carriers of rural mail.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. PEDLOW: Why is it more necessary to have a shelter at Walkerton than at other places in Ontario?

Mr. CARVELL: Wherever my hon friend finds an item of this kind, it has been requested by the Post Office Department.

Alberta—public works chargeable to income—$532,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. CARVELL: This amount is required for the erection of a general public building in Calgary. My hon. friend, I think, is acquainted with that part of the country and knows that the only post office accommodation they have in Calgary is in a wooden shack, which they have been occupying for four or five years. We have been compelled to rent space in the Lancaster block for two or three years. Now we are starting the construction of a public building, not a post office building, but a building that will be used by the post office and all other branches of the public service in the city of Calgary. I am absolutely opposed to the erection of a public building simply for the use of the post office or the custom house or anything of that kind. I find that once you hand over a building to the post office, you can never get anything else into it, and when it comes to the custom house, it is as easy for a camel to go through the eye of a needle as it is get other branches of the public service in there. I like to call them public buildings, so that they will be open to all officials of the public service in these cities.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is this a new building?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. It will cost $780,000 when completed.

Mr. FIELDING: You are calling it a post office building.

Mr. CARVELL: It will be used by the post office.

Mr. FIELDING: According to my hon. friend's statement, if the post office gets in there, nobody else will be able to get into it.

Mr. CARVELL: We will set apart a certain amount of space for the post office.

Mr. FIELDING: And they will appeal to the vote when you try to get anybody else in there.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the contract been let for this building, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CARVELL: No, but we shall be ready to call for tenders for the excavation almost immediately. I imagine we will carry out the same policy there that we did in Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. McMASTER: This policy of excavating the foundation has resulted, in Montreal at least, in having the foundation, which has cost tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars, remain without any superstructure upon it for several years, and the loss of interest through dead capital must have run into very large figures. I mention this merely by way of warning, but of course it may not be necessary with the present minister.

Mr. CARVELL: I am quite well aware of it, and I am also aware that there has been quite a war on since those foundations were put in.

Mr. McMASTER: We are reminded that there has been a war on altogether too often. That is no excuse for poor business. The war cannot be dragged in as an excuse for something that is otherwise inexcusable.

Mr. CARVELL: The war was a good reason for delaying construction.

Mr. McMASTER: The taunt about there having been a war on is thrown across this floor altogether too often, and I do not propose to continue to bear it with that equanimity which usually characterizes my conduct.

Mr. CAHILL: There is an item of $400,000 for Calgary and $100,000 for Edmonton, and the total is $532,000 on public buildings in Alberta. The population of Alberta is not as large as that of Saskatchewan, and the buildings in Saskatchewan are not any better than those in Alberta. I do not quite understand why we should have to spend over $500,000 on public buildings in Alberta when it is only necessary to spend $38,000 in Saskatchewan. I know that Saskatoon, Regina, and Moosejaw are no better equipped at present than Edmonton. Calgary has only a temporary building, and it seems an unusual thing that Alberta should have over $500,000 and Saskatchewan practically nothing when they require the buildings just as much. If the minister is spending the money in order to provide employment, I think there should be just as much need in one province as in the other.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope my friend does not entertain the idea that I am trying to spend money territorially. I do not purpose to spend a dollar anywhere unless it is necessary, if I can help it. It happens that they do not require public buildings in the large cities of Saskatchewan; they are well supplied, and as I have been in them all I know just as much about the question as does my hon. friend. There are many smaller towns in Saskatchewan where public buildings are needed, and I wish it were possible to grant them. I have explained the situation as regards that class of public buildings. It happens that in Alberta a different condition exists. There is no place for the post office, and there is no post office at all. As regards Edmonton, I was in that city last autumn and went through all the public buildings, and the congestion is serious. We have officials housed in half a dozen different places, and we must be paying, roughly speaking, $35,000 to $40,000 a year in rentals in the city of Edmonton. Something must be done to meet the situation. I have asked for a vote of $100,000. I am not sure that we are justified in erecting buildings. I think we could purchase a building in the city of Edmonton that would meet all the requirements and one that would be cheaper and very much better than any we could construct. I do not know, however, that we would be justified in spending money for the purchase of buildings to-day when we think it is our duty to spend it in such a way as will provide labour for employment. That is the difficulty that exists. I am very much at a loss to know what to do in the city of Edmonton. If I followed my own inclinations and viewed the question as a business proposition, there are two or three buildings I could buy at a great discount on what they cost, and probably for 50 per cent of what we could erect a building for.

Mr. JACOBS: Why not purchase then?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not said we are not going to. We will consider the matter carefully.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand it is the policy of the department to construct buildings wherever they are needed rather than to purchase, in order to give employment to those who are out of work, no matter whether the buildings will cost twice what they would if they were purchased. Is that a good business policy? Is this Government being run on business principles or as an eleemosynary institution?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think my friend is justified in such an inference. I have

not said that I purpose to construct buildings that will cost twice as much as if existing buildings were purchased. I have said that in some places—and have given the details—we will construct buildings because they are necessary. We believe they will cost more than in ordinary times, but we believe that it is necessary to provide work, in addition to the fact that the buildings are required. When we come to Edmonton, the situation is a little different from some of the other places. I do not know that there is the same necessity for employment there as elsewhere, and I am considering seriously whether we would not be justified in exercising the strictest business principles in purchasing rather than building. The matter is absolutely open and will have to be decided as one of policy before we are able to act one way or the other. We must come to a decision before Parliament prorogues.

Mr. JACOBS: This sum now asked for is for the purpose of purchasing.

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is for building.

Mr. JACOBS: The question of purchasing will not be taken into account?

Mr. CARVELL: No, unless we decide as a matter of policy to purchase, in which case we must come back for a supplementary estimate to get the money voted.

Mr. JACOBS: As I understand it, the cost of purchasing will be about half, so that it will not be necessary to have supplementary estimates.

Mr. CARVELL: You cannot buy a building in Edmonton that will be suitable to house the public services there for $50,000 nor $100,000. This is for an addition to the present post office building. If we decide as a matter of policy that we will purchase a building we will not require this money, and this vote will lapse, but we will have to come back to Parliament, set forth the facts, and have the money for purchase voted.

Mr. JACOBS: Is not this the proper time to tell us what the policy of the Government is with respect to the construction or the purchase of public buildings?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not had the opportunity of discussing this question with my colleagues and I cannot make a statement until I am authorized to do so. I have intimated to the Committee my views on the matter. I think there is a very grave question whether we should not purchase in Edmonton rather than build but nothing will be done until Parliament is apprised of it. If we decide to purchase we must come to Parliament.

Mr. JACOBS: Would it not be well to hold this item until the Government makes up its mind?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think there would be much use in doing that. If we do not purchase we must provide additional accommodation and this vote is for the purpose of providing that accommodation. If we do not require it we shall not use it.

Mr. CAHILL: Do the rentals that are being paid now in Calgary and Edmonton amount to much more than the interest on the capital invested in a new building?

Mr. CARVELL: I am not in a position to give the exact details. Speaking from memory I think we pay $35,000 or $40,000 a year for rentals in both Calgary and Edmonton. I shall be glad to bring the exact figures before the Committee. There is no secret about it. I am sure we are paying as much in rentals now as we would pay in interest on a new building in each one of the cities and every hon. gentleman must see a great advantage in having all the officials of the Government housed in one building with one janitor service and one control rather than have them scattered over a half dozen different places in each city.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: I hope the minister will go into this matter of public buildings in Edmonton very carefully. I heard with a good deal of pleasure his statement as to the possible policy of the department in connection with public buildings, particularly in Edmonton. The services of the Government in Edmonton are scattered over the entire city and from the point of view of the convenience of the public there the arrangement is a bad one. The rental the Government is paying in Edmonton for public service would pay the interest on a million dollar building, and the Government would be well advised to go into the question and consider whether it would not be advisable to buy a building and have the services all under one roof than to build under existing conditions.

Mr. CAHILL: The commission travelling throughout the West now report there is little unemployment in Calgary and Edmonton. Would it not be advisable to leave the Calgary building for another year?

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot agree with the suggestion of my hon. friend. I think we ought to go on with the construction of a

public building in Calgary. This work is of such importance as to demand that we shall proceed with it.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are two grounds which the minister could well take for the construction of this building and he has taken both. One is the public necessity for the use of the building, and the other is building in order to give employment for those who are looking for work. My hon. friend (Mr. Cahill) suggests that he is informed there is not much unemployment in the west. A couple of days ago I met a very distinguished westerner, an officer of the Grain Growers' Association, my good friend, Mr. Roderick McKenzie, a well known public character in the west, and he told me it was extremely difficult to get help. I asked him if the farmers were going to get their work done this spring and he said it was extremely difficult to get help on the farm. I do not think any man who can get work on the farm should be the subject of any worry to the Government with regard to providing work for him. We find a great many of our young men in the east willing to go out and work on the farm in what is known as harvesting and I suppose spring work, planting and seeding are not any harder than harvesting. If thousands of our young men used to be able to go out in the west in harvesting time and be serviceable at that season, I do not see why men, rather than being allowed to remain idle, should not be encouraged to go and work on the farm and be of use to the country generally. The minister said that he did not know of any means by which a man could be diverted from idleness in the towns to work on the farm. One good way would be to let them feel the necessity of getting work for themselves and employing their own energies for their own benefit. When I was a young man I had to look for work. I had no Government providing work for me; I had to go and look for it, to get it and then to go to work. I am afraid there is such a thing as too much solicitude on the part of public bodies to-day thus depriving many people of their own initiative and individuality in getting along. I think there is danger in that direction. No person will exert himself to provide for himself if he thinks the Government is going to do everything for him and there is nothing for him to do but to sit down and say there is no work. I do not think that is what our people are looking for. They are looking for a place where they can get work. I think they are willing to do it. If there is plenty of work on the farms of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, I do not think we should be erecting public buildings, building railways, or undertaking any public work, for the mere purpose of giving these men work, if they can get on the farm where their work will be far more productive than it would be in putting up a public building or building a railway. Of course, the building of a railway for the necessities of transportation is another matter. Rather than enter upon any public work for the mere purpose of giving people employment and putting money in their way, I think it would be well to encourage them to go to work on the farm. If conditions in the West to-day are as they are reported to me, and as the evidence seems to indicate before the Government commission that is now going through the West, there does not seem to be very much necessity for the minister to spend money in order to provide employment.

Mr. J. F. REID: With regard to this appropriation for a post office in Calgary, the minister has rightly stated that the building now used is a shack. It is a very ordinary shack at that. It is even worthy to be called a shanty. It is the kind of building that is used in Eastern Canada as a woodshed. If that condition existed in any eastern town, or in the Maritime Provinces, we would soon hear about it. Why should Calgary be discriminated against in this way? Calgary is a city of about 60,000 population and yet an ordinary woodshed is being used for the purpose of the post office.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I am sorry to hear that there is any difference of opinion whatever in regard to this building in Calgary. Arrangements were made for the erection of a new post office in 1914. The old building there was burned down with the result that the city was left without any building for the post office purposes. They had to occupy temporary quarters and when those temporary quarters became absolutely unfit for human habitation they moved into other temporary quarters where they are at present and which are crowded and unsuitable. There was trouble there in connection with the employees. They were very patient up to the time that they were removed to their present quarters. The work is distributed over the city and if there is any place in Canada where a post office is needed it is Calgary. It is one of the largest postal centres in the Dominion. A building is to be erected which will be

capable of being used for purposes other than those of the post office. The Government is absolutely justified in appropriating money for this work and I only hope that the Department of Public Works will proceed with the erection of the building as fast as they possibly can.

British Columbia—public buildings, $111,475.60.

Mr. PEDLOW: I notice one small item for taxes on a Government building in British Columbia. I do not notice an item of this kind in any of the other provinces. I would like to know why it is the Government pay taxes on a public building in Victoria and not in other municipalities?

Mr. CARVELL: This is an old post office building that has been abandoned. It is a public building but a new building was erected and this is now being rented. The policy has been adopted all over Canada that when the Government ceases to occupy a building, rents it and receives a rental, it should pay taxes to the municipality. This is a small item for the purpose of paying the taxes and as against it we receive a revenue.

Mr. PEDLOW: Are there no other public buildings throughout the Dominion of the same class?

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly, there are some in Ottawa. There are buildings on Wellington street in this city, in what we call the expropriated area, that are owned by the Government but are rented to other people. We receive a revenue from those buildings, and as a consequence we pay the taxes upon that particular property to the municipality of Ottawa, and we would do so under like circumstances anywhere.

Mr. PEDLOW: There is no item in the Public Accounts to show that.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know as to that. However, the facts are as I have stated.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Would the minister say what the revenue from this property in Victoria is?

Mr. CARVELL: I could not give the information offhand.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I want to see if we are making any money.

Mr. CARVELL: We are not liable to make much money on an old public building.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not quite see the force of the minister's philosophy in regard to this renting business. If he uses the building as a post office he gets a great deal more money from the use of it than he would if a person occupied it as a tenant. If the minister is getting $10,000 for the use of a building as a post office, he would not pay any taxes, but he does if some private individual leases the property and pays $100 rent. I do not see the force of that argument.

Mr. CARVELL: The policy may not be based on or be good logic, but it is one with which the present Minister of Public Works is very much in love. My hon. friend knows that under the terms of the British North America Act, the Government is not subject to the payment of taxes upon any of its property; and in every city and town in Canada in which public buildings have been constructed very valuable property is therefore withdrawn from taxation by the municipality. Sometimes I wonder if it would not be better to amend the British North America Act so that the Government would pay taxes to the municipality in which its property was situated the same as any other property owner does. However, it is not necessary for me to express an opinion upon the point, because it is not an issue to-day. At the same time I have a very strong feeling in regard to this matter, and the moment the Government acquires a piece of property which it is not occupying for Government purposes but is renting to some other person who pays a rental, I think we are bound to comply with all the municipal regulations, even as to the payment of taxes. There may not be any legal justification for that, but to me it certainly seems only fair and just to the municipality concerned.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think that the position taken by the minister with regard to a case of the kind he mentions is right and proper, but I would like to know why this item in regard to the public buildings in British Columbia is treated very differently in the matter of book keeping from the buildings in Ottawa?

Mr. CARVELL: I can only say that it is a system which has been followed for some time. In the case of Ottawa the buildings were only purchased three or four years ago, but we are paying taxes just the same, and I shall be only too happy to bring down all the details. If the hon. gentleman will refer to item 120, which is set forth at page 72 of the Estimates, he

will find the designation there "Dominion Public Buildings Generally." Now we are paying the taxes on this Ottawa property and other properties throughout the Dominion out of that vote.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think as a matter of book keeping the item should be designated in the same way as respects all Government buildings.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend may be right, I think perhaps he is, but I will only be too happy to furnish all the details required. We are certainly paying taxes to the city of Ottawa on those buildings which we own and are renting to private individuals.

Mr. McKENZIE: I say at once to the minister that he should stop paying taxes; the Crown is not called upon to pay them under the law. The Crown, or the Government, owns property in every part of Canada, and I think in every part of the Empire, which is exempt from taxation. Why should we make any sympathetic arrangement which is applicable to any one part of the country more than to another? There is no law for that, and it should not be done. The law provides that the property of the King shall be exempt from taxation, therefore, the minister in paying taxes on such property is paying that money out without any authority.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as I am concerned, it is not a question of sympathy; it is absolutely a matter of cold justice as I view it. There may possibly be some question as to whether we have a right to pay these taxes under the British North America Act. All I can read into that Act is that we are not compelled to pay taxes; but if we have a piece of property in a municipality which we are renting and receiving a revenue from I cannot see how the hon. gentleman can argue that we are not compelled to pay the municipal taxes upon it.

Mr. McCREA: What becomes of the rent?

Mr. CARVELL: It goes into the consolidated revenue of the country, of course.

Mr. McCREA: You do not pay the taxes with it?

Mr. CARVELL: No, the money goes into the consolidated revenue and we pay it out in the ordinary way.

There is another thing which I think I must tell my hon. friend: All over the country for years the Dominion Government has been paying to municipalities local improvement taxes. If there is a street, or a sidewalk, being constructed in front of, or alongside Government property, we pay our proper share of the cost of that work, just the same as any ordinary property owner does, and we ought to do so. We owe that duty to the municipalities. I think we are just as much called upon to pay the taxes on a property from which we are receiving revenue, as we are to pay the special taxes for local improvement.

Mr. McCREA: Does the minister not think we are entitled to know the amount of rent we are receiving?

Mr. CARVELL: I shall be only too happy to furnish to my hon. friend to-morrow, or whenever he wants it, all possible information.

Mr. PEDLOW: There is another feature in connection with this vote as to which I would like to make inquiry. I have noticed in the press recently that the Mayor of Ottawa has been expressing dissatisfaction with the annual grant made by the Dominion Government towards the taxation of this city—

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will only wait until we reach the votes for Ottawa public buildings he will be in order in raising the point. Ottawa is very far from British Columbia.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understand that, and I am only referring to the matter generally in connection with this item.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman had better wait until we reach the next item.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I think the Minister of Public Works is absolutely justified in the stand which he has taken. Let us assume for a moment that the Dominion Government has two or three buildings in any city in Canada which it rents out and receive revenue from. If it fails to pay its share of the taxes that burden is distributed over the other local taxpayers. So long as the Federal Government owns property which it is using for Government purposes, and is receiving no revenue from, the principle of tax exemption applies and should apply. But there is no reason why this Government should acquire property in any municipality and, in competition with other property owners, derive a revenue therefrom, and not assume its fair

11 p.m.

share of taxation. I think that is absolutely unjustified.

Mr. McKENZIE: The law, as was pointed out some time ago by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), may be an ass, but the law nevertheless is that the King does not pay taxes. If the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) finds fault with the law it would be better to change it, and enact that the King, or the Government representing the King, shall pay taxes on Government property wherever it is. But while it is the law that the King does not pay taxes, we are not called upon to make such payment. It is preferable to adhere to that law rather than to sidetrack it and from sympathetic ideas, or any notions we may have, pay taxes on a piece of property the moment we receive any revenue from it. The idea of local taxation is that a man gets his children educated, enjoys the benefit of street lighting, police protection, and all the advantages of the machinery of local government in the place where he lives; consequently he pays taxes. If he does not live in the town where his property is located, but in some other place, he should contribute to that general fund which extends to him the general benefit and protection of municipal and provincial institutions. But the King does not enjoy any of these benefits from property and therefore he does not pay any taxes. The King nominally holds this property. At all events, that is the reason why he does not pay taxes, because he does not in those various places enjoy those benefits which come from local taxation. And while it is the law that Government property is not subject to taxation it is better that we stand by the law.

Mr. PROULX: I understand that Government property is not liable for general taxes; but for local improvement rates, such as a sidewalk along Government property, I think the Government should pay its share.

Mr. CALDER: It is not liable.

Mr. CARVELL: We do pay it any way.

Mr. PEDLOW: Discussing this item 119, I would like to call attention to the fact that there is a payment of taxes due the city of Victoria for 1918 amounting to $1,475.60. I inquired as to why this item was there and why a similar item was not in the Estimates for the other provinces, and the minister said that certain Government buildings in the city of Ottawa were paying taxes. The question I wanted to ask before was: What amount of taxes the Government is paying?

The CHAIRMAN: I ruled that question out of order a moment ago, and I hope the hon. gentleman will abide by my ruling.

Public buildings—Generally—$185,000.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I see in connection with this item a charge of $5,000 for flags for Dominion public buildings, and I would like to make a few observations thereon. First of all, I would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that a great number—perhaps I should say most of those who are concerned in the caretaking of public buildings seem to take very poor care of the flags, and you will find the flags left up in all sorts of weather and flying by night as by day. I think this is a matter which should be brought to the attention of those who are in charge of our public buildings: first, on the ground of economy; second, on the ground of showing an example of thrift to the people; and, third, out of respect for the flag itself.

Now, there is another matter I wish to bring before the Committee, and I think it may properly be brought forward in connection with this item. We have a national flag for marine purposes. Our merchant marine flies the Canadian flag; our navy flies the British ensign on one mast and the Canadian marine ensign on the other.

Mr. DUFF: They were made to take it down.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not know that. But my submission to the Committee is that we should have a national flag for land purposes. The great Commonwealth of Australia has a national flag; I think the Commonwealth of New Zealand has a national flag, and it seems to me that the Dominion of Canada also should have a national flag. I think it would help to create a national spirit, and I believe that in the creation of a sound and sane national spirit lies the cure for many of the racial and religious troubles which are a curse to the Canadian people. The matter has received some attention in the press. I remember reading in the Montreal Weekly Witness a poem by a young lady about the necessity and desirability of a national flag. I would recommend the matter to the patriotism of the Minister of Public Works, who is apparently in charge of the flag department. I would like to see a strong and sound national spirit arise in Canada as

characteristic as the flavour of our maple syrup, and I think the matter deserves public attention. Our soldiers who fought across the seas so gallantly were proud not only of being British soldiers, but they were proud of being Canadian soldiers. As we are proud to belong to what I prefer to call the Associated British Commonwealths rather than the British Empire, I would like to see our national flag, a national flag for land purposes, floating over our public buildings.

The CHAIRMAN: In order that I may not have to call any hon. member of the Committee to order, I must point out that the discussion of the adoption of a national flag is certainly not open on the item before the House at the present time, which item is for the purchase of flags for public buildings. It may be very well, and I expected that was the idea of my good friend from Brome, to discuss what kind of flag will be purchased, whether a British flag, a Canadian flag, or a marine flag; but it is certainly not within the power of the Minister of Public Works to make a new flag for Canada at the present time. Therefore it is not in order to discuss the adoption of a national flag on this item.

Mr. CARVELL: I realize that my hon. friend from Brome has brought up a very important subject. I do not propose to answer him as to the kind of flag we are going to purchase; I think that is a matter that somebody else must decide. I quite agree with him that these flags should be taken care of, and I do think for the last three or four years there has not been the amount of care exercised that should have been. The instructions we send out from the department to the caretakers is that the flags shall be put up in the morning and be taken down at sunset, which is a proper and sensible custom. But I am afraid that during the war people wanted the flag up after those hours, and in many cases it was easier for the caretaker from his standpoint to leave the flag up all the time rather than take it down and put it up again.

Mr. FIELDING: Without dissenting from the view of the hon. member from Brome—that is a general question—may I ask the minister what flag is distributed officially for use on the public buildings? The reason I ask the question is that we are using improperly everywhere in Canada a red ensign, which is the flag of the Canadian merchant marine. It is not a land flag, but it is very widely used throughout Canada at any public function; in fact, you will see one-half or more of the flags displayed for decorative purposes will be the British red ensign with the arms of Canada in the corner. That is distinctly a sea flag and is properly used by all our Canadian merchant marine. The British red ensign is the flag of the British merchant marine; the British red ensign with the arms of Canada in the corner is the flag of the Canadian merchant marine; but neither flag is a proper land flag, and yet there is an almost universal use in Canada of the red ensign with the arms of Canada in the corner. Hence I ask the question of my hon. friend, whether that flag is distributed, or whether only the Union Jack is distributed ?

Mr. CARVELL: We distribute only the Union Jack.

Mr. FIELDING: That is correct?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. COPP: I want to inquire of the minister if he has a memorandum before him as to what improvements he is going to make in the experimental farms in connection with the item of $150,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. The item I have is "Central Farm, Ottawa, $35,000." Then are given all the details; for instance, animal husbandry, $16,600; bees, $300; botany, $3,000; cereals, $300, and so on. Then we have branch farms and stations. Tobacco curing stations, $3,525; Charlottetown, P.E.I., $10,510; Kentville, N.S., $3,500; Nappan, N.S., $5,425; Fredericton, N.B., $2,900; Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Que., $4,450; Cap Rouge, Que., $4,000; Lennoxville, Que., $5,650; Morden, Man., $7,300; Brandon, Man., $3,600; Indian Head, Sask., $2,000; Rosthern, Sask., $3,800; Scott, Sask., $3,450; Lethbridge, Alta., $16,175; Lacombe, Alta., $4,650; Summerland, B.C., $20,200; Invermere, B.C., $4,550; Agassiz, B.C., $5,200; Sydney, B.C., $3,300.

Mr. COPP: I want to protest, as I protested every session that I have been here, against the throwing away of money on these experimental farms. The Central Experimental Farm is a very delightful place to go to for a picnic, but particularly at this time we should not be spending money on a place for picnic purposes. Nobody likes to go there better than I do; I like looking at the things to be seen there. But it is high time that some better method was adopted to encourage agriculture. The farmers do not get any practical benefit

from these experimental farms. They are kept as picnic grounds, and to supply certain individuals with hothouse stuff—which is all very nice, but produces no revenue for the country. I simply wish to register my protest against the maintenance of these experimental farms.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is there any amount in the Estimates to provide for an experimental farm station at Baie St. Paul in Charlevoix county?

Mr. CARVELL: No. We are simply the agent of the Agriculture Department in connection with the construction of these buildings, and I can only answer for what is placed before me. As to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Copp), I have criticised in days gone by some of the expenditures in connection with these farms. I could pick out some of them with regard to which I have very strong views. But I cannot agree with my hon. friend's remarks in regard to the Central Experimental Farm. I realize that the farmer cannot reproduce what he sees there, because he has not the financial means. But the object of the experimental farm is not so much to show farmers how to carry on their work as to make experiments which may be valuable to any man who wishes to learn. I myself go to the experimental farm very frequently for information, and have always been able to get it. I am sorry that the people do not read and digest as thoroughly as they should the reams of information that are sent out annually from that farm as a result of the experiments that are carried on.

Mr. COPP: Could not my hon. friend get the information he desires if the farm were not there?

Mr. CARVELL: No, they must make the experiments in order to get the information. Theoretical information is no good to the farmer; he must have information that is based on actual experience.

Mr. COPP: I have no doubt that every member of the House received to-day a circular from the Agriculture Department containing a photograph of a corn crop that a grub was destroying. I am not much of a farmer, but I know all about the matter dealt with in this circular, as does every farmer in our part of the country. If that is what we are paying for at the experimental farm—it costs something to print these things and send them out to members of Parliament and to farmers throughout the country—we are getting mighty little for our money.

[Mr. Copp.]

Mr. KNOX: I am surprised at the expression of opinion which comes from the East in regard to the experimental farms. We in the West appreciate the benefit that is derived from the farms in the West as well as from the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I point out the great benefit that has come to the country through the development of Marquis wheat, a variety developed by Dr. Saunders, which has been worth millions of dollars to Canada.

Mr. CANNON: A few years ago there was a by-election in Dorchester county in which a member of the then Borden Government, Mr. Sevigny, a Cabinet minister, was a candidate and was elected by a substantial majority. This gentleman made a formal promise to the electors of that county that if he was elected an experimental farm would be established there. No experimental farm, however, has been established in Dorchester county, and I have received several letters from my electors asking that an experimental farm be established there. I see no difference between this Government and the former Government; therefor I say that the Minister of Public Works is bound by the promises that were made a couple of years ago by a member of the Borden Cabinet. Dorchester is an ideal spot for an experimental farm. It is quite close to the city of Quebec and is in the neighbourhood of the constituency of Beauce, represented by my distinguished friend (Mr. Beland) and I think it would be beneficial to the public generally if a farm was established there. The member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) says that in many cases the expenditure on experimental farms is a waste of money. I think it would not be a waste of money if a farm was established in my county. It was promised by a member of the Cabinet, and I think that a promise made by a minister of a government which is not different from the present one ought to be redeemed. I would suggest that if no provision has been made in the Main Estimates for this farm, the minister should provide an item in the Supplementaries, because he surely will agree that a promise should be kept.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not find any such item in these Estimates, but of course I am merely acting as the agent of the Minister of Agriculture, and I do not know why it has not been included. I have a recollection, however, that according to a Return brought down in this House some two years ago the then government distributed a large quantity of very valuable thorough-

bred animals throughout the county of Dorchester, but the people appreciated them so little that they at once proceeded to convert them into benevolent neutrals, and I think the department came to the conclusion that the people of the county of Dorchester really did not appreciate them. If I were called upon to give a reason, I would say that that is the reason why the minister has not included an item in the present Estimates for such a farm.

Mr. BELAND: This promise of an experimental farm which was made to the electors of Dorchester by a former minister has not been carried out, but I understand that the promise was made by a minister of the preceding Government, and not of the Government of which the Minister of Public Works is a member. In view of the fact that a good deal of money was spent in the county of Dorchester during that famous election, and the fact that the county of Beauce is contiguous to the county of Dorchester, that no money was spent in the county of Beauce either during the last election or the previous one, that the county of Beauce, which was at one time mostly a timbering region has of late years been converted into a most successful agricultural district, and the further fact that Beauce county has within its borders the richest maple bushes in the whole Dominion of Canada, with an average yearly crop of some million and a half pounds of maple sugar—in view of all these considerations I really think that the county of Beauce would be an ideal spot for the establishment of an experimental farm. I do not in the least wish to convey the impression that the county of Dorchester is not a rich and fertile county, but it cannot possibly compare with the county of Beauce. The county of Beauce is one of the richest counties in the whole Dominion, both from an agricultural standpoint and in some other respects. It is ideally situated. The county of Compton, the fame of which has gone far beyond the limits of the province of Quebec, the county of Megantic, also of great repute, and the counties of Levis, Montmagny, Bellechasse and L'Islet form around the county of Beauce, as it were, a crown, and I would strongly urge the minister to impress upon his colleague the Minister of Agriculture the real urgency of establishing an experimental farm in Beauce county. It has the best location in the whole province of Quebec, and it is the best riding by far. One has only to think of the maple bushes of the county of Beauce, of its dairying, of its lumbering, and of its cereal cultivation, to come to the conclusion that no other part of the Dominion of Canada can begin to compare with my county.

Mr. CARVELL: I shall be very glad indeed to convey to the Minister of Agriculture the beauties and necessities of the county of Beauce.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am afraid the hon. member for Beauce has not travelled very extensively through the county of Renfrew or he would have a different opinion of the merits of his own county. How much taxation has been paid by the Government to the city of Ottawa on properties owned by the Government and rented out?

Mr. CARVELL: I am sorry I cannot give that information to-night, but I shall be very glad to bring it down, and my hon. friend need not trouble to put a question on the Order Paper. There are a number of places in Ottawa on which we pay taxes. I have a few figures here of the taxes we pay outside of Ottawa: Bowman, $64.60; Estevan, $46.83; Ingersoll, $223.72; Montreal postal station B, $74.79; postal station H, $126.24; postal station S, $100.85.

Mr. PEDLOW: These are taxes on buildings owned by the Government and rented?

Mr. CARVELL: I presume so. We pay these taxes in those places.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There is an item here of $30,000 for "Dominion public buildings—generally." I would think this item unecessary, because we have already provided for Dominion public buildings in all the provinces. Item No. 113, for instance, provides for Dominion public buildings, improvements, repairs, etc., in the Maritime provinces generally, $25,000. We have voted for Quebec, $35,000; Ontario, $35,000; Manitoba, $18,000; Saskatchewan, $15,000; Alberta, $3,000; British Columbia, $17,000. So as we have passed a general vote for repairs and improvements to public buildings in every province in Canada, I think we might dispense with the item of $30,000 for Dominion public buildings generally.

Mr. CARVELL: My friend is an old enough parliamentarian to realize that it is almost humanly impossible to provide for every emergency that may arise. There may be a storm or fire and it has always been the custom to include these small amounts for emergencies. So long as I have been in Parliament these amounts

have been voted and I think they are necessary. There might be a fire or some accident and you would be absolutely tied up because the Auditor General would not pass the account unless there was some item from which it could be drawn. There is no sinister motive in this. It is only carrying out a custom of long standing and one that is absolutely necessary. Last year a building was burnt down on Partridge Island in St. John and something had to be done. There is a vote in the Estimates now, but we were called upon at once to put up something in the way of a temporary building. I do not think there is any room for genuine criticism of this item.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: We have $25,000 of a vote to meet cases of that kind in the Maritime Provinces. I am quite aware that accidents will happen, but why should we make provision twice over?

Mr. CARVELL: There is a vote for the province of Ontario of $35,000. All the public buildings we have in Ottawa are of course in Ontario, and we provide for what we can reasonably assume may be necessary. I do not know that there is a special vote for Ottawa, but it is just a question of emergency. Suppose the vote of $25,000 in the Maritime Provinces were exhausted and accidents happened. Unless we had something like this we could not meet the situation.

Public works chargeable to Income—Rents, repairs, furniture, heating, etc., $3,595,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does not the minister think we have done very well to-day? It is now 11.40 p.m.

Mr. CARVELL: I should like to get through with this item if possible.

Mr. McKENZIE: It will provoke considerable discussion.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, I have no objection to letting it stand. We have done a good day's work.

Mr. McKENZIE: When we come to discuss this item I shall have something to ask about the Supreme Court Building. There was a talk of a new building, and I would like some information as to whether it is the intention to do anything in this respect. The present building is not worthy of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. CARVELL: As far as I know, there is no provision for the construction of a new Supreme Court Building. I feel like agreeing with my hon. friend, but they seem to be getting on well as they are. There is a scheme on foot for the provision of new quarters for the Supreme Court when the next attempt is made at erecting public buildings in Ottawa. It will be across the street on the expropriated area. We are just preparing plans and models and getting ready for it, but it is not the intention to ask for an appropriation during the present year.

Mr. McKENZIE: As a nation we are proud of our public buildings, but we are never very proud to show strangers the Supreme Court Building.

Mr. CARVELL: I quite agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is the most important court in Canada and should have a building becoming its dignity.

Mr. CARVELL: While there is no item providing for a new building I may say that if my hon. friend will go to the Public Works Department to the office of Mr. Ewart he will find material which will interest him. I think he would be pleased to go over the models of the buildings which are being designed for erection at some future date on Wellington street. One of the first buildings he would come across in the plans and specifications and in the actual models is the new Supreme Court Building in conjunction with other buildings. It would be well worth the while of any member to spend two or three hours in Mr. Ewart's office looking over the models of buildings which it is hoped some day to erect on that portion of the Government property in Ottawa.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I notice in the item which we do not intend to discuss to-night a large sum for the rents of buildings, I suppose in Ottawa, amounting to about $1,000,000.

Mr. CARVELL: That covers the whole Dominion.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The city of Ottawa is included in that?

Mr. CARVELL: I think so.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: When this item is considered next I would like to have details as to the buildings that are rented in Ottawa, and the amounts paid.

Mr. CARVELL: I could go on to-night and give those details if the Committee desired.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am only suggesting this for the next meeting.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 11.45.

Wednesday, May 14, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON TITLES, HONOURS AND DECORATIONS.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston) presented the report of the special committee on Titles, Honours and Decorations.

House of Commons of Canada,
Ottawa, May 14, 1919.

The Special Committee appointed to consider and report upon the propriety of presenting an Address to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, praying that His Majesty may be graciously pleased to refrain hereafter from conferring any titles upon such of his subjects as are domiciled or living in Canada, except such titles as have reference to professional or vocational appellations conferred in respect to commissions issued by His Majesty to persons in the Military or Naval Services of Canada, or to persons engaged in the administration of justice in the Dominion; and that His Majesty may also be pleased to consider the question of taking measures to ensure the extinction at the death of the present possessors of the hereditary titles at present in existence in the Dominion; and further that His Majesty may also be pleased to take into consideration the question of in future conferring honours, titular distinctions and decorations upon subjects of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada, including those who have performed overseas, in Canada, or elsewhere, naval, military and civilian services in connection with the war, beg leave to present the following as their report.

Your committee are of the opinion and recommend that an address be presented to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, in the following words:—

"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty,

"Most Gracious Sovereign.

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty, praying that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased:—

"(a) to refrain hereafter from conferring any title of honour or titular distinction upon any of your subjects domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada, save such appellations as are of a professional or vocational character or which appertain to an office.

"(b) To provide that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to ensure the extinction of an hereditary title of honour or titular distinction, dignity or title as a peer of the realm, on the death of a person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada at present in enjoyment of an hereditary title of honour or titular distinction, dignity or title as a peer of the realm, and that thereafter no such title of honour, titular distinction, dignity or title as a peer of the realm, shall be accepted, enjoyed or used by any person or be recognized.

"All of which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into your favourable and gracious consideration."

A suggestion was made that the titles of "Right Honourable" and "Honourable" be discontinued, but the suggestion did not meet with the approval of the committee.

Your committee, however, do not recommend the discontinuance of the practice of awarding military or naval decorations, such as the Victoria Cross, Military Medal, Military Cross, Conspicuous Service Cross, and similar decorations to persons in military or naval services of Canada for exceptional valour and devotion to duty.

Your committee further recommends that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to provide that hereafter no person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada shall accept, enjoy or use any title of honour or titular distinction hereafter conferred by a foreign ruler or government.

All of which is respectfully submited.

W. F. Nickle,
Chairman.

Mr. BELAND: I understand that at this stage we cannot discuss the report of this special committee. May I ask the Government whether a day will be set for its consideration?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was the desire of the Prime Minister and of the Government that this question should be considered as promptly as possible by the committee and their report discussed in the House. I shall be glad to set Friday or Monday next for the discussion of the report.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Friday "and" Monday?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Friday "or" Monday. I shall make an announcement to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING: Monday is a day when many members are absent, and I do not think it is the best day for the discussion of this important matter.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: May I suggest that I should within a few days make an announcement as to when an opportunity will be given for discussion?

Mr. FIELDING: If the minister and the chairman of the committee arrange it, that will be satisfactory.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER POWER COMPANY.

REPORT OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): I beg to lay on the table of the House report of the hearings of the International Joint Commission—

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I beseech the minister to speak out more clearly? Nothing empties the House and drives people to madness quicker than lack of hearing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BURNHAM: Will the ex-minister (Sir Sam Hughes) repeat his remarks? I could not hear what he said.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: I lay on the Table report of the hearings before the International Joint Commission in the matter of the application of the St. Lawrence River Power Company, as printed by the International Joint Commission. It gives the evidence taken on the hearings and includes certain maps and diagrams which the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) inquired about the other day. I have arranged that copies of this report, about fifty of which are available, be placed in the distribution office, and hon. gentlemen who wish to have copies may obtain them there.

BIOLOGICAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 106, to amend the Biological Board Act. He said:

The object of this Bill is to change slightly clause 5 of an Act that was passed on the 1st of April, 1912, in order more clearly to define the jurisdiction that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his departmental officers have over the Biological Board. There is no difference of opinion between myself or any of my officials and the Biological Board; this clause in the Act of 1912 was rather ambiguously worded, and the object of the new Act is to make it clearer.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROHIBITION.

BILL TO CONFIRM ORDERS IN COUNCIL PROHIBITING IMPORTATION, MANUFACTURE AND TRANSPORTATION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 107, to confirm the Order in Council of the 24th day of February, 1919, prohibiting the Importation, Manufacture and Transportation of Intoxicating Liquors and the Order in Council of the 12th day of April, 1919, in amendment thereof. He said: This Bill is founded on the resolution which was adopted by the House yesterday.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAYS.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Is the Government aware that goods have been stolen from freight cars at Charny, on the Intercolonial Railway between November, 1918, and the 15th April, 1919?

2. If so, has the Government reimbursed the owners of said stolen goods, and how much was paid therefor?

3. Has the Government investigated these thefts? If so, what is the result of the investigation?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What amounts have been paid by the Government to all persons who were appointed to represent the Minister of Justice, or the military authorities before the Tribunals of Exemption and of Appeal, respectively, at Montreal, Quebec and Ottawa, during that period when the provisions of the Military Service Act of 1917 were being enforced?

2. What are the names of the said persons, and how much was paid to each?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: 1 and 2. The following are the names of and the amounts paid through the Military Service Branch, Department of Justice to the "Public Representatives" attached to tribunals at Montreal, Quebec and Ottawa. This list does not include the "Military Representatives" appointed by the Minister of Militia and Defence and attached to the above tribunals, who held office until superseded by the "Public Representatives" on February 4, 1918, by virtue of P.C. 196, dated January 26, 1918:

Montreal: T. Brosseau, $180; H. R. Mulvena, $555; N. A. Millette, $240; E. R. Angers, $150; H. St. Pierre, $640; E. Beauchamp, $830; A. Yvon, $750; L. St. Denis, $740; A. C. Rondeau, $145; O. Thibault,

$127; J. MacDonald, $122; T. O. Bernard, $176; P. Surveyer, $385; L. Choquette, $589; T. Fortin, $644; J. Jette, $153; C. H. Berard, $136.80; P. Dore, $141.25; A. Dupuis, $534.25; W. M. Couper, $660; A. Chasse, $195; W. Laliberte, $98.50; A. J. E. Leonard, $113; B. Marchand, $177.85; G. Allard, $200; J. A. Piette, $294.64; L. A. E. Godin, $70; H. Parent, $103; R. G. Delorimier, $515; G. McNaughton, $390; I. Westover, $520; J. H. Michaud, $520; F. Desrochers, $580; R. M. Brown, $150; A. Dufresne, $400; J. H. David, $475; H. Tucker, $310; R. A. Drapeau, $40; A. Lamothe, $230; total, $13,290.34. Quebec: E. R. Alleyn, $60; J. D. Lavergne, $42; F. Campbell, $100; E. H. Cimon, $20; Wilf. Laliberte, $164.65; A. C. Dobell, $226; Raoul Fafard, $99; Emile Gelly, $90; Honore Grenier, $30; A. P. Caron, $150; C. V. Darveau, $280; Ovide Mayrand, $187; Jules Langlais, $97.54; Ernest Legare, $639.20; Chs. Fremont, $90; V. A. DeBilly, $278.45; A. J. Bender, $180; Lt.-Col. T. Rinfret, $250; F. X. Dufour, $213.50; Jos. Roy, $260; F. O. Drouin, $150; William Montgomery, $91; Lt. P. C. G. Gruchy, $107.55; P. J. Jolicoeur, $70; total, $3,875.89. Ottawa: Central Public Representative, John H. Moss, no salary as public representative.

STEAMER T. J. DRUMMOND.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. At what date was the steamer T. J. Drummond purchased by the Government?
2. From whom was she purchased, and at what price?
3. Was this vessel inspected prior to purchase? If so, by whom?
4. Was a commission paid to any agent or broker? If so, how much?
5. When was this steamer built, and what was the original cost?
6. What is her net and D. W. tonnage?
7. How much has been expended on repairs, refitting and insurance since date of purchase?
8. What is her net earnings from date of purchase to date of the last voyage in which the accounts have been adjusted?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. April 18, 1917, under authority of an Order in Council.
2. The Great Lakes Transportation Company: $515,000,
3. Yes. The steamer was to be delivered subject to Class A1, Lloyds, or British Corporation Registry, which is equal classification. One of Canadian representatives, Jas. I. Bales, surveyor to the British Corporation for the survey of registry and shipping.
4. No.
5. (a) 1910; (b) No information.
6. (a) Net tonnage, 1,664.43; (b) Dead weight tonnage, 3,400.
7. $50,778.68.
8. Net earnings, $257,032.06.

STEAMER A. J. McKEE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. On what date was the steamer A. J. McKee purchased by the Government?
2. From whom, and at what price?
3. Was this vessel inspected prior to purchase? If so, by whom?
4. When was she built, and what was her original cost?
5. What is her net and D. W. tonnage?
6. How much has been expended on repairs and refitting this vessel since date of purchase?
7. What is her net earnings from date of purchase to date of last voyage in which the accounts have been adjusted?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. April 18, 1917, under authority of an Order in Council.
2. Algoma Steel Corporation: $500,000.
3. Yes: The steamer was to be delivered subject to Class A1, Lloyds, or British Corporation Registry, which is equal classification. One of Canadian representatives, J. B. Foote, surveyor to the British Corporation Registry.
4. 1908. No information as to original cost.
5. Net tonnage, 1,374.79; dead weight tonnage, 3,400.
6. $386,554.52. This vessel was seriously damaged in the Halifax explosion, and later met with an accident in running on the rocks outside the port of New York.
7. Net deficit due to causes mentioned in No. 6, $254,697.58.

TRAWLER No. 30.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Did the Sydney Foundry Company do any work on Trawler No. 30 during the summer 1918?
2. If so, what was the nature of the work done?
3. What was the cost?
4. What officer of the department certified to the account?
5. Did the Government pay the account of the said Sydney Foundry Company?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes, by local authority.
2. Caulking and pitching decks.
3. $284.16.
4. C. H. Wellsford, Wt. shipwright.
5. This account was received in Ottawa on April 19, 1919, and is now in way of payment.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the Government to make use of the Transcontinental Railway between Winnipeg, Quebec, Halifax and St. John?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes.

COST OF HALIFAX TERMINALS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What has been the total cost to date of the Halifax Terminals, including the construction of the branch railway connecting the terminals with the main line?
2. How much more will be required to complete the work?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Total expenditure to March 31, 1919, was $14,802,655.11.

2. To complete first unit of nine berths, including permanent station train shed, passenger landing and immigration facilities, two-storey permanent sheds at berths not now equipped with sheds and leaving four temporary wooden sheds as they are, grain elevators and conveyers, tracks, roadways, subways, etc., and completion of existing contracts, together with new engine facilities at Fairview, is estimated to cost $8,000,000 at present prices.

RIDEAU JUNCTION TOWNSITE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

Has the townsite of Rideau Junction been taken over by the Canadian Government Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: No.

INSPECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has H. C. Blair, Customs Inspector, been superannuated?
2. If so, who has been appointed to his position?
3. How long has Bryson MacDougall been in the Customs Department?
4. What position did he fill previous to H. C. Blair's superannuation?
5. What are his duties now?
6. What salary does he receive?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Mr. H. C. Blair was granted leave of absence with pay for a period of six months from July 1, 1919, and to be superannuated at the expiration of such leave.

2. No person.

3. Mr. Bryson McDougald has been in the Customs Department since July 1, 1912.

4. Inspector of Customs.

5. Inspector of Customs.

6. $2,400.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

MR. JOHN RIDLEY.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Was one John Ridley, of the town of Cornwall, in the employ of the Customs Department during the year 1918?
2. If so, when did his services begin?
3. When did they end?
4. What amount did he receive for said services from the department.

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4 answered by No. 1.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. How many motor cars have been purchased by the Government for the use of the ministers and high officials since 1914?
2. How many of said cars were for use in Ottawa and how many in other places?
3. Is the Government aware that certain ministers and high officials have allowed their family to use these cars for social and calling purposes?
4. If so, what are their names?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LEGISLATION PROMISED IN SPEECH FROM THRONE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): I desire to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that at the opening of this Parliament on the 20th February, the speech from the Throne mentioned certain legislation, namely, a Bill to amend the Franchise, a Bill for the construction of Highways and a Bill regarding Vocational Education. We have now been in session almost three months. The resolution regarding Highways was brought down on the 24th March, but has not been proceeded with. I think the Government will acknowledge that we on this side have not unduly hindered the passage of Supply; that we have not taken advantage of opportunities to move amendments on going into Supply. For instance, we might have moved for the repeal of the War-time Elections Act, but we have not done so as yet. Yesterday evening, in answer to an inquiry by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) made this statement:

The Acting Prime Minister requested me to say that to-morrow we shall take up the Estimates of the Public Works Department and the Post Office, and if we take up the Supplementary Estimates for the last fiscal year there are a number of items we might put through, after that we would proceed with other Estimates.

It will be observed that we are rapidly approaching conditions where the right of the Opposition to move amendments on going into Supply will be exhausted, and I ask, on behalf of the Opposition, that we have a statement from the Acting Prime Minister, either to-day, or at least this week, as to when the Franchise Bill will be brought down.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): My view is that, through the co-operation of hon. gentlemen opposite and diligence on the part of the Government, we have been making extraordinarily rapid progress with regard to legislation. Although I have been a member of this House for eight years, I have never known a period in which more legislation has been dealt with by the House than during the past month. From my hon. friend's remarks, one would gather that he fails to appreciate the importance of consideration by the House of the Estimates. I do not know of any function which the House discharges of greater consequence than the careful consideration of the Estimates involving as they do the expenditure of immense sums of money, and I do not regard the time of the House as wasted in giving consideration to these Estimates.

As regards the point mentioned by my hon. friend of the Opposition exhausting its opportunities of moving resolutions upon going into Supply, there is no ground for apprehension, because there are in the Main Estimates many remaining items to be dealt with; then there are the Supplementary Estimates of 1918-19, and the Supplementary Estimates of 1919-20 have to be brought down, In addition, there are one or more special Estimates before the House.

The legislation mentioned in the speech from the Throne is all before the House with the exception of legislation relating to vocational education and that relating to to the franchise which has been mentioned by the hon. member. Legislation relating to technical education has been fully considered by the Government and will be introduced within a few days by the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) who has it in charge. The Franchise Bill is an exceedingly important piece of legislation which has been and is receiving the careful attention of the Government, and it is the intention to introduce it at the present session of Parliament.

Mr. ROBB: The Acting Prime Minister apparently forgot the Highways Bill.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is before the House in a resolution.

Mr. ROBB: There is no Bill.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is sufficiently informed as to Parliamentary procedure to know that the passage of the resolution precedes the Bill.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

ADMINISTRATION IN WRIGHT COUNTY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): I wish to raise a question of considerable public interest, one of which I have already given the minister notice, and I raise it with a certain amount of reluctance. I refer to the matter of dealing with the administration of justice in Canada at the present moment. I do not wish to refer to the Military Service Act unduly, and I do not want to raise any of the nightmares of the war, but there has come to my notice a certain matter which I do not think bears out the principle upon which our constitution is founded, namely, those of freedom and justice to all the provinces of the Dominion. Certain young men who voluntarily reported and were granted exemption by the Military Service tribunals failed to renew their application for exemption after the Order in Council had been passed in the month of April, 1918, cancelling all previous exemptions. When they reached the city of Hull, which is the judicial centre, they found themselves in this peculiar predicament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret very much to have to call the hon. member to order, but he is in effect entering into a discussion. If he wishes to submit a question to the Government it will be quite in order for him to do so, but not to enter into a discussion of the merits of the case.

Mr. DEVLIN: It seemed ridiculous to put the question before giving the minister the necessary information. However, I have already spoken to him about the matter over the telephone, and I shall now simply ask him to give the House the reason why the judicial district of Hull, which is in the province of Quebec, should have been declared not competent to deal with any matter respecting the Military Service Act, and why young men coming before the tribunals in that judicial district have been ordered to go to Kingston for court-martial or else be tried before a court in the province of Ontario.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): Through the courtesy of the hon. member (Mr. Devlin) I have been able to make inquiry as to the point he brings to the attention of the House and in respect of which he asks a question. I apprehend his question to be one demanding the reason why certain defaulters under the Military Service Act whose residence is in the province of Quebec, and, I think, in the county of Wright, have upon apprehension been ordered to appear before a court-martial, or before a magistrate in Ottawa rather than before a magistrate in the county of Wright.

The name of the magistrate in the county of Wright is Mr. Goyette. The House will recall that when, three or four months ago, an Order in Council was passed under the authority of the Military Service Act and the War Measures Act, whereby the prosecution was empowered, should a magistrate by his conduct reveal a lack of appreciation of the meaning of the Military Service Act and of his duties under that Act, to refuse to take any more cases before that magistrate, but to take them instead before a court-martial. That Order was found to be necessary by reason of the idea prevalent in the minds of certain magistrates at all events, that there was in reality no substantial offence in the violation of the Military Service Act demanding more than a merely nominal punishment. I am sorry to have to say that the Department of Justice came to the conclusion that the case of Magistrate Goyette was one that demanded action under that Order in Council, and they refused longer to take cases before him.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understood that that referred to cases where the magistrate had already taken action. In this case the young men were not apprehended, but voluntarily gave themselves up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a case in which the magistrate has taken action, and by the character of his action has shown that he is not a magistrate before whom other cases of that kind should be taken.

Mr. DEVLIN: Was any report made by the Justice Department to the Attorney General of the province as to the conduct of the magistrate in question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: None that I know of in the case of Magistrate Goyette. There was one made in the case of a magistrate in the city of Quebec, which I am sorry to say was not very fruitful of results. As to Magistrate Goyette—I speak now with moderate, but not with absolute certainty—some time ago it was considered by reason of his conduct that these cases should be taken elsewhere. Subsequently, evidence was brought forward that he would better discharge his duty, and return to his jurisdiction was made. This month, however, by reason of his action in a series of cases it was determined that we could no longer submit the administration of the Act to him as a magistrate. In this connection I cannot do better than read a report made to the Acting Chief Commissioner of Police at Ottawa by an official of the Dominion Police in respect of the action of the magistrate this month. The report is dated the 9th of May, and reads as follows:

> Attached copies of several reports from my inspector with reference to cases recently prosecuted before Magistrate Goyette at Buckingham, Que., and also at Hull, Que.
>
> I wish specially to draw your attention to the cases which were dismissed by Magistrate Goyette on the grounds that the men were sick at the time they were ordered to report, and that they did not recover until the armistice was signed. These men had been ordered to report as far back as March 18, 1918, and it is unreasonable to suppose that they were sick all this time. These cases were remanded previous to the sentence being passed, and I am of the opinion that this was done to give these men an opportunity to put in a defence so that the magistrate could have some grounds to dismiss them.
>
> Further, I wish to draw your attention to the several cases which were dismissed in Hull today on the grounds, my inspector informs me, that the magistrate considered that these men were farmers and were doing their duty much better as such than they would as soldiers.

In other words, he was assuming the jurisdiction of the tribunals under the Act, instead of acting as a magistrate sitting upon the case of a defaulter. The report continues:

> In connection with these cases, none of the accused appeared in person, but Mr. Fortier, M.P. defended them, and it looks very much to me as if he has considerable influence with the magistrate in regard to his decisions.
>
> In view of the large number of cases which have been dismissed where there is really no legitimate excuse or defence made, do you not think it would be advisable to again turn over the defaulters apprehended in this district to the A.P.M. for court-martial?

To this report the Acting Chief Commissioner of Police appended his note "Submitted for approval," A. J. Cawdron, and Mr. Newcombe appended his note "Yes, court-martial." In support of that, I shall read some subsidiary reports on individual cases:

Ottawa, May 7, 1919.

Memorandum for Chief Inspector A. H. Holden.
Daily Report for the 6th instant.

Re: Joseph Hamelin, SC 253364, Buckingham, Que., Group 3.

I beg to report that the subject appeared before Judge Goyette at Buckingham.

This case was dismissed through affidavits that he was sick at the time he was supposed to report, and when he got better the armistice was signed, so he thought all was over.

The date this man was ordered to report was May 2, 1918, so he has been in default something over a year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who made that report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Arthur J. Dumais, Inspector of Dominion Police. The other cases are as follows:

Ovide Robitaille, Buckingham, Quebec—I beg to report that the subject appeared before Judge Goyette at Buckingham. This case was dismissed through affidavits that he was sick at the time he was supposed to report, and when he got better the armistice was signed, so he thought all was over.

William Laberge, Masson, Quebec—I beg to report that the subject appeared before Judge Goyette at Buckingham. This case was dismissed through affidavits that he was sick at the time he was supposed to report, and when he got better the armistice was signed, so he thought all was over.

Oscar Goulet, Masson, Quebec — I beg to report that the subject appeared before Judge Goyette at Buckingham. This case was dismissed through affidavits that he was sick at the time he was supposed to report, and when he got better the armistice was signed, so he thought all was over.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is going pretty far in his criticism of the Bench, and in that connection I wish to refer him to Bourinot, page 358, as follows:

All references to judges and courts of justice and to personages of high official station, of the nature of personal attacks and censure have always been considered unparliamentary and the speakers of the British and Canadian Houses have always treated them as breaches of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand that the reference has anything to do with the Bench whatsoever; it merely concerns a magistrate.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand the criticism is made in regard to a magistrate sitting as a judge on the Bench.

Mr. SPEAKER: That rule has never been held applicable to magistrates; only to judges.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The next case is that of Hyacinthe Dubien:

Hyacinthe Dubien—I beg to report that the subject appeared before Judge Goyette at Buckingham. This case was dismissed through affidavits that he was sick at the time he was ordered to report and when he got better the armistice was signed, so he thought all was over.

Napoleon Lavergne, Masson, Quebec—I beg to report that the subject appeared before Judge Goyette at Buckingham. This case was dismissed through affidavits that he was sick at the time he was supposed to report, and when he got better the armistice was signed, so he thought all was over.

These are the cases of protracted, chronic illness. Then, there is another class of cases that came before this magistrate, as shown by the report of the inspectors, dated the 9th May:

Athanase Durocher, Angers, Quebec—I beg to report that the above-mentioned man appeared before Judge Goyette and his case was dismissed. Reason that he was a farmer's son and that he was doing his duty working on the farm and that he did not see any reason why he should not be discharged. He said when Mr. Bywater was here he said Mr. Fortier had a list of young farmers' sons that were exempted by him through Mr. Fortier, M.P. Mr. Fortier said that on his honour that he had given a list of these young men to Mr. Bywater but Mr. Bywater said he did not really think he had the list so the judge said that he did not think Mr. Fortier would lie about it.

Mr. DEVLIN: May I ask the hon. gentleman if he is reading the judgments of the court or simply a report by one of his officers; an inferior officer of the department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am reading the reports of the inspectors of the Dominion police on each individual case, which reports came before the chief inspector and were submitted to the Justice Department as a ground for the transference of future cases from Judge Goyette.

Mr. DEVLIN: Are these all the cases which were tried by Mr. Justice Goyette, or are they the exceptional cases?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not understand that there is a "Mr. Justice Goyette." I understand he is a magistrate in the county of Wright. These are not all the cases. These are cases that latterly were brought to the attention of the Justice Department as grounds for the course which was taken. I presume there were other cases to which objection was not taken. But I understand that they produced a list of cases some time ago to which objection was taken and which I am reading here.

Rene Philion, Angers, Quebec—same report.

Jean Baptiste Durocher, Angers, Quebec—same report.

Dolphis Durocher, Angers, Quebec—same report.

Romeo Roberge, Lac Ste. Marie—same report.

Donat Philion, Angers, Quebec—same report.

Arthur Lavernois, Hull, Quebec—I beg to report that the above mentioned man appeared before Judge Goyette in Hull and was remanded until May 14th on their personal bail. I told the judge I wanted this man to be held under at least $300 which he declined to do. I saw the judge before court and told him about the record he had at the Hull police station. He told me he knew he was a bad boy but he said he came by himself this a.m. He will be here on the 14th inst.

Joseph Lavernois—same report.

By reason of the submission of these cases, action was taken.

Mr. DEVLIN: What induced the department to go to another magistrate in the province of Ontario and not to another magistrate in the province of Quebec?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Newcombe, the deputy minister, on the submission of the matter to him, recommended recourse to court-martial. I gathered from the hon. gentleman's remarks that they were given the option of coming before the police magistrate in Ottawa, the neighbouring city, instead of going before a court martial. The Justice Department recommended a court martial.

Mr. DEVLIN: That is perfectly correct but there is where I find fault with the department. Why not have a reference to another magistrate in the province where these young men resided whether in the county of Wright or in other counties?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In these matters the department is no respecter of provinces. Hull and Ottawa are all in the military district the centre of which is Kingston. They were permitted to appear before another magistrate or a court martial.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is not Wright county in the 3rd Military District?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

RETURN OF OUR SOLDIERS; PORT OF DEBARKATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) to a despatch that was published in all the papers of Canada to the effect that 55,000 Canadian troops were to be landed in Canada during the month of May. Those 55,000 were to be loaded on some 25 or 30 boats, of which three were to come up the St. Lawrence. The remainder were to go to Quebec and Halifax. Is it a fact that of these troops, some 9,000, if I remember the figures correctly, are to come to Quebec and Montreal and the remainder to go to Halifax? Without saying anything derogatory of the ports of Halifax and St. John, is it possible for the department to find railway and sleeping car accommodation sufficient within one month to ship 40,000 or 50,000 troops from Halifax and St. John?

Major-General MEWBURN: I have no definite information as to the actual number of troops to arrive at Halifax, Quebec, or Montreal. I announced to the House several days ago that we had made arrangements with a large number of vessels for the opening of navigation, and that we expected that the bulk of the troops for the province of Quebec and for west of the Great Lakes and Ontario would disembark at Quebec and Montreal. I said that the troops for the Maritime Provinces would disembark at Halifax, and that in order to meet the situation created by that movement of troops in the Maritime Provinces and possibly through some portions of Ontario, we would have to use day coaches. We have secured a number of extra boats, and we have also got the Aquitania, the Mauretania, and the Olympic. These large boats object to proceeding up the St. Lawrence.

Mr. POWER: For what reason?

Major-General MEWBURN: The only information I have is that the Minister of Shipping announced that these large vessels will disembark the troops at Halifax and then proceed to New York.

Mr. POWER: And these boats are chartered by the Dominion Government?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, they are not. These boats immediately return to New York to carry back cargoes from that port. It was with a great deal of difficulty that we got these ships. Wherever possible we have asked that troops for west of the Great Lakes and Quebec should disembark at Montreal.

SUPPLY.

NON-SECTARIAN NATIONAL SCHOOL SYSTEM.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White for Committee of Supply:

Mr. JOHN WESLEY EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, before you submit the motion to go into Committee of Supply

I desire to occupy a brief period of the time of the House in discussing a matter which I consider as of vital importance, having regard to the future peace, prosperity and well-being of Canada. Early in the session I placed the following resolution on the Order Paper:

> That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the British North America Act should be amended so as to secure the establishment of a non-sectarian school system throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Being unable to reach that motion in the ordinary course of the transaction of the business of the House, it was finally withdrawn from the Order Paper, and I now wish to make it the basis of such remarks as I shall offer this afternoon. I am well aware that in approaching this subject I shall encounter the opposition of some who seem to regard with the gravest apprehension any attempt to interfere with the British North America Act. In general, such apprehension might be well founded, having regard to the constitutional usage of our country. Yet there have been times when the British North America Act has been amended at the request of this Parliament; I think I shall be able to show before resuming my seat that there have been occasions when that Act has been violated, both in the spirit and the letter, as a result of the action of the Canadian Parliament.

A short time ago—to be exact about the second or third of April—an article appeared in the Montreal Gazette, which was reproduced from another paper published in the same province called Le Pays. The article in question deals with compulsory education and in part reads as follows:

> In face of the hostile attitude of the clergy and the manner in which the debate on the question of obligatory instruction was closed, we have no further hope for any educational reform from that quarter. In order to obtain anything we must turn our eyes towards Ottawa, as the central Parliament, by amending the British North America Act, would take over the control of educational matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that the idea of transferring the control of educational matters from the provinces to the Federal Parliament does not originate from myself; there are some in the adjoining province of Quebec, who hold that that is the proper course to take. I do not go that far. I do not say, nor do I wish to be understood as saying, that I think the full control of matters of education should be taken from the provinces and vested in the Dominion Parliament. That is not my idea of what should be done; but I do say, Sir, that in my opinion little can be done here towards the formation of a homogeneous Canadian people without the direct intervention of the Federal Government in matters of education. As to how far that intervention should go, would, it seems to me, be a proper subject for consideration by the Dominion Parliament and the several provincial legislatures.

The matter of the establishment of non-sectarian national schools is not by any means a new one. Such a system of schools exists in the United States and in Australia; and some fifty or sixty years ago a non-sectarian national school system was introduced into Japan. I might also say that France, Belgium, Italy and Portugal have all brought education under the control of the State, and I have only to mention in contrast such countries as Spain, Austria, and Mexico, and the South American Republics, where the schools have for centuries been under ecclesiastical control, to justify me, if any justification were necessary, in advocating a change in our present educational system.

I am well aware, Sir, that in raising this matter I shall be subjected to criticism from different people based on varying grounds. One class of critics there are who, I suppose, will honestly differ from me in regard to non-sectarian national schools. For those who honestly and sincerely differ from me in that regard I wish to say that I have the greatest respect. I direct my appeal especially to such men who sincerely hold views opposed to mine, and I invite the consideration by them of the arguments which I shall attempt to advance in this House to-day in favour of doing something to improve the conditions in regard to education which exist at the present time in Canada.

There is another class of critics who perhaps agree in the main with my viewpoint, but regard the present time—in fact any time for that matter—as inopportune for a discussion of this question. They are men who are fearful of arousing antagonisms in this country, and while holding perhaps just as strong views as I do in regard to this matter, are afraid to broach the subject for fear of giving offence to some person. Well, Sir, I confess I do not clearly understand how a public man can take a position of that kind. There are certain Canadian journalists who regard any discussion along this line as a menace to the well-being of the country. They offer no reasons for holding such a view, and the only reason that occurs to me is that they are afraid as newspaper men of a fair and free discussion of what I regard as a very important matter.

I wish to draw the attention of the House for a while to past history in connection with educational affairs in Canada, and I purpose to do so very briefly, going back to 1841. At that time the population of Upper Canada, was 78,119 Roman Catholic and 351,837 Protestants; the population of Lower Canada was 99,553 Protestants and 572,643 Roman Catholics. So in the two Canadas the Roman Catholics were in a majority of about 100,000. I mention this fact because I think it has a direct bearing upon the subject, for you will understand that the minority was not the same religiously at the time of the Act of Union as is the minority to-day. I believe I am right in stating that Lord Durham in suggesting the Act of Union had in mind the bringing of Upper and Lower Canada under one code of laws and a common language. I am not going to discuss the language question to-day; that is not my purpose; I want more particularly to direct the attention of hon. members to religious instruction in our schools.

The advocates of dogmatic religious teaching in schools had the principle recognized in the first Common School Act passed by the Union Parliament in 1846. May I mention here that the Union Parliament of 1841 was composed of 42 representatives from each of the provinces? Up to 1852 only 50 separate schools had been established in the province of Ontario, and 32 of these had lapsed. But in that year the Roman Catholic Church started a very active campaign for the extension of separate schools, and by 1858 there were 100 such schools in the province.

In 1860 the Hon. R. W. Scott introduced into the Union Parliament a Separate School Bill, which was defeated on three different occasions, but in 1863 it finally passed, the vote, so far as the Ontario members were concerned, standing 26 against the Bill and 16 for it. That is, there was a majority of 10 from the province of Ontario opposed to a Bill which, I desire to impress upon the House, concerned only the province of Ontario, not in any way the province of Quebec. The point I wish to emphasize is that separate schools were fastened upon the province of Ontario against the wish and will of its people as expressed in the Union Parliament.

In 1864 a conference was held in the city of Quebec, at which the late Hon. Oliver Mowat moved that the provincial legislatures should have control of educational matters. The Hon. D'Arcy McGee added to the motion these words: "Saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the Constitutional Act goes into operation." I maintain that from this it is clear that the constitutional limitations were only meant to apply to Ontario and Quebec.

In 1867, when the Scott Separate School Act was incorporated in the British North America Act, there was no system of separate schools in the province of Quebec as there was in the province of Ontario. I know it is frequently said that this was a compromise, that separate schools were given to the Roman Catholics in the province of Ontario, and separate schools were also given to the Protestants in the province of Quebec. I wish to say, Sir, that that statement is not a statement of fact. I assert that there is no such thing, and there never has been such a thing as a Protestant separate school in the Dominion of Canada. You may tell me there are Protestant separate schools in the province of Quebec. I say; No; there are Protestant schools in Quebec, but those schools are non-sectarian; Roman Catholic children can attend those schools without any detriment to their religious beliefs. But that is not the case where Roman Catholic separate schools are established either in Ontario or in any other province; Protestants are excluded from those schools because of the fact that they are strictly religious schools.

4 p.m.

Mr. THOS. VIEN (Lotbiniere): Will the hon. member allow me to put him right on this point? There are a number of Catholic schools in the province of Quebec which receive Protestant children with no interference in so far as their religious teaching is concerned. I might cite in Montreal the Ville Marie school, the Sault au Recollet school, the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Montreal College, Lévis College—where I received my own education—and St. Mary's College. A number of Protestant students attend those schools without being obliged to receive any religious teaching.

Mr. EDWARDS: I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the public schools of the province of Quebec which are under the control of the dominant church in that province are schools to which the Protestant population cannot send their children because of the fact that religious dogma with which they do not agree is taught in those schools. It may be that there are some schools in that province where they make provision for

religious instruction during a certain part of the day.

Mr. BUREAU: None whatever.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, there is no use mincing matters in regard to this. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well, as does every person else in this country, that a Roman Catholic separate school is separate for religious purposes. What is the use of trying to get around that?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. gentleman allow me a word at this point? If I thought I could convince the hon. gentleman that he was wrong—

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to speak when I have concluded. I do not propose to allow half a dozen hon. gentlemen opposite to interject remarks when I am speaking.

Mr. VIEN: State the right facts then.

Mr. EDWARDS: I hope that they will discuss it as fairly as I intend to. I make this assertion, Mr. Speaker, believing it to be true—

Mr. BUREAU: It is unfounded.

Mr. Edwards: —that there are no places in the province of Quebec where no provision is made for the education of isolated Protestant children. And I make this further assertion, that there are no places in the province of Ontario where no provision is made for the education of isolated Roman Catholic children. That is what I mean to say—

Mr. BUTTS: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. EDWARDS: No, I will not. My hon. friend may speak when I get through.

Mr. BUTTS: Just one simple question.

Mr. EDWARDS: I repeat that wherever you have a Protestant public school system such as we have in Ontario, it is open to Roman Catholic children just as it is to Protestant children; there is no possibility of embarrassment in the matter of their religious belief. But where you have a majority in a community conducting a separate school, the few Protestant families who may be in that community are precluded from getting an education because of the fact that that school is a Roman Catholic separate school. Let me give an illustration of that, taken from my own county. We have in the county of Frontenac a small island known as Howe Island, all the families on which, except four or five, are Roman Catholics. Up to a number of years ago the three schools on that island were public schools, attended alike by Roman Catholic and Protestant children, who grew up together without any trouble arising between them. No religious instruction was given in the schools; they were conducted as other public schools were conducted. But the archbishop demanded of the Ontario Government that these three schools be converted into separate schools on the ground that nearly all the population was Roman Catholic, and to-day the three schools on that island are separate schools. The result is that as soon as the children of the four or five Protestant families there become of school age they must be sent to Kingston, Gananoque or some other place in order to receive their education. You cannot point to a single place in Canada where Roman Catholic children who happen to be in the minority are subjected to that kind of treatment. That is manifestly unfair; it does not make for peace and unity. So long as you have such a condition of gross injustice as this, you have something which rankles in the hearts of the people who are subjected to it; you have something which makes for antagonism and hostility among the people. It is in the interest of peace and harmony and unity in this country that that condition of things should pass away and that we should have a common system of schools where Roman Catholic and Protestant children may be educated and grow up together, side by side, leaving to the priests, the clergy and the parents the imparting of religious instruction.

In 1866 Sir A. T. Galt resigned from the Government because of failure to get legislation securing to English Protestants in Quebec a fair share of public funds for the Protestant schools. About the same time the Protestant teachers of Quebec sent a petition to the Imperial Government. What was the general tenor of that petition? They said to the Imperial Government that the Protestants in Quebec were deprived of the benefits of a general system of education such as the Protestants of Ontario enjoyed; that the Protestants of Quebec were liable to a tax to support Roman Catholic schools; that it was difficult for them to establish non-denominational schools or seminaries for themselves; that the settlement of Protestants in Quebec was discouraged and many families were forced to leave; and that they would prefer

a general non-sectarian school system. It was not until 1869 that the legislature of Quebec gave statutory recognition to Protestant schools in that province. Section 93 of the Confederation Act reads as follows:

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:
>
> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the Union.

Of all the provinces now forming this Dominion, Quebec and Ontario alone had separate schools at the time of the union in 1867—existing by law in Ontario and in practice in Quebec. Section 93 applies only to Ontario and Quebec, and was inserted in the Act to preserve rights or privileges created by these provinces when they were separate sovereignties. With regard to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, no restrictions or conditions were imposed; therefore, those provinces are free to legislate regarding education as they may deem proper. I maintain that the same is true with regard to Saskatchewan and Alberta. Both the spirit and the letter of the British North America Act were violated by the Parliament of Canada when they passed the Autonomy Bills in 1905. A distinct attempt was made at that time to fasten upon Alberta and Saskatchewan separate schools for all time. Since then certain provisions in the Autonomy Bill have been referred to by advocates of separate schools as something which the province could not get over. I am going to take a little time in regard to this matter, because in my judgment it is within the jurisdiction of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan either to have or not to have separate schools, just as they like, notwithstanding anything contained in the Autonomy Bills of 1905.

Saskatchewan and Alberta were carved out of territory acquired from the Hudson Bay Company in 1870. As there were no white inhabitants in that territory at that time, no provision was made for the government of the territories until 1875, when the Northwest Territories Act was passed. The legislative powers conferred by the Northwest Territories Act were temporary and entirely subject to the guidance, control and supervision of the Dominion Parliament. Section 11 of the Northwest Territories Act made provision for separate schools. But I would have you remember this: at that time there were only about 500 white people in that territory. These people had no representation in the Dominion Parliament and therefore had no say in regard to a matter in which they were more interested than any one else.

When the Act came before the House in 1875 Hon. George Brown protested against the extension of separate schools to the Territories. He said:—

> This provision is contrary to the British North America Act. Nothing is more clear than that each province should have absolute control over education.

In 1892 the Territorial Assembly passed an Act which was called the Haultain School Ordinance Act, under which all schools, public and separate, were brought under control of the Territorial Government from 9 in the morning until 3.30 in the afternoon. That is to say, by that Act, they established in the Territories national, non-sectarian schools, from 9 a.m. to 3.30 p.m., the teaching of religion being restricted to half an hour per day between 3.30 and 4 p.m. At that time the Roman Catholics claimed that their rights were impaired and they appealed to the Federal Government, but Sir John Thompson, who was then Minister of Justice, declined to interfere. I call attention to that, because that was an admission on the part of the Federal Government in favour of local control of education.

In the session of 1894, Dalton McCarthy moved in the House a resolution to repeal section 11 of the Northwest Territories Act, that is, the section providing for separate schools in the Territories, his idea being that with such a law on the statute book of Canada, it might afford the Dominion Government at some future date an excuse for perpetuating separate schools when new provinces were created. Subsequent events have proved that Dalton McCarthy had at that time considerable foresight. Sir John Thompson, at that time, made use of these words in discussing the resolution moved by Dalton McCarthy:

> What the constitution of the future provinces shall be, in view of the pledges which have been referred to, or in view of any other set of circumstances, will be for Parliament to decide when it decides to create those provinces.

I want to give the House this expression of opinion by a man well known by reputation to every hon. member, namely, the hon. David Mills:

> When the people of the territories, or any portion of the territories, are sufficiently numerous to constitute a province, when, in fact, they attain their majority in regard to local matters, and when they propose to set up for them-

selves, this Parliament has no right to exercise control over them, no right to exercise any authority; it can give good advice, but it has no right to give commands. But we are not dealing with the future. When the territories have a sufficient population to entitle them to become a province they must decide for themselves whether they will have separate schools or not.

So far as the Territories were concerned—I do not at all admit that the introduction of separate schools there stands upon the same footing as the introduction of separate schools in the province of Ontario, or of the dissentient schools in the province of Quebec. In these provinces they were protected under the constitution; they cannot be interfered with by the local legislature. But in the Northwest Territories, as the hon. minister has said, it has been a matter not of right, not of guarantee to any particular class of the population, but a matter of policy. They were introduced with the view of preventing conflict in this House upon the subject of separate schools, and for the reason that they were introduced there they should be maintained as long as these Territories are under the control of this Parliament. When this Parliament has discharged its duties and the people of the Territories have received the population to entitle them to enter the union, they must assume the responsibility for deciding for themselves under the British North America Act how far they should maintain the principle of separate schools or maintain the non-denominational system.

I also wish to place on Hansard the opinion of Sir Louis Davies, given at the same time:

My opinion is now and has been for years that when that time comes you cannot withhold from the provinces so erected the right to determine for themselves the question of education one way or the other. I would be the last to favour this Parliament imposing upon the people there any system of education, either free or separate. I only claim that when a Bill is introduced to erect those Territories into provinces that the Bill should contain a provision enabling the people of the different provinces so created to decide what system of education they should have.

In accordance with the view I have always held and hold now, I have no hesitation in expressing, respectfully, that the people of those new provinces should have the right to determine what system of education they shall have.

Next in chronological order is the memorable struggle which took place in Manitoba for national schools, a struggle which began with the Manitoba School Act of 1890 and resulted in the defeat of the Tupper Government in 1896, the defeat of the Roblin Government in 1914, and in the final repeal by the Norris Government in 1916 of the Laurier-Greenway Settlement of 1897. Perhaps I had better put on Hansard what that agreement was. It is contained in section 258 of the Manitoba School Act and reads:

When ten pupils in any schools speak the French language or any language other than English, as their national language, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French or such other language, and English, upon the bilingual system.

I am not going to follow that any further because, as I said before, my remarks are going to be concerned more with the religious aspect of teaching than with the language question.

In 1905, this Parliament passed the Saskatchewan Act and the Alberta Act, otherwise known as the Autonomy Bills. When the Autonomy Bills were being considered, the Hon. Robert Rogers, and the Hon. Mr. Campbell, of the Manitoba Government, came to Ottawa to urge the extension of Manitoba's boundaries. The Papal Ablegate sent for them and suggested, that if the province would agree to re-establish separate schools, there would be no difficulty regarding the boundary question. I protest against that sort of thing, and I leave it to the judgment of hon. members that if the Imperial Government or the King himself had undertaken such an interference with legislation in this House as was undertaken by the Papal Ablegate, there would have been a howl that would have been heard from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The people would not have stood for it for a minute. We need not stand for that sort of thing, and I have a right to express my opinion in regard to it, and in doing so I am not making an attack on any gentleman's religion.

Mr. PROULX: What is the hon. gentleman's authority for such a statement?

Mr. EDWARDS: My authority is one which might not appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite. The statement was made without contradiction in this House by one of the gentlemen to whom I have referred, namely, the Hon. Mr. Rogers. Does the hon. gentleman say that was not the case?

Mr. PROULX: I do not think Mr. Rogers was in the House at the time.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman was ready to ask a question but he is not ready to answer one.

Mr. PROULX: I doubt very much whether it is the case.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not doubt it and therefore I will give it. In 1905, when the Autonomy Bills were before the House, Sir Wilfrid Laurier made this statement regarding the language question. I want to put these words on Hansard because I want to make an application of them:

The fathers of Confederation did not pretend to authorize the French language in any part of the Dominion except in this Parliament and in the province of Quebec. Everywhere else the people were left free to deal with the matter as they saw fit.

I mention that because, if the principle of local control is sound as regards language, why should it not be in regard to religious instruction? It should be as good in the one case as in the other.

As regards the Autonomy Bills, I want to refer to the educational clauses of the Saskatchewan and Alberta Acts of 1905, because I think I can show that while some people in this country are ready to hold up their hands in horror at any thought of interfering with the British North America Act, the Parliament of Canada did lay violent hands on that Act and did violate it in principle and in letter in passing the clauses I am going to read. Section 3 of the Saskatchewan Act, which is the same as the Alberta Act, reads as follows:

The provision of the British North American Acts, 1867 to 1886, shall apply to the province of Saskatchewan in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the provinces heretofore comprised in the Dominion, as if the said province of Saskatchewan had been one of the provinces originally united, except in so far as varied by this Act, and except such provisions as are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment may be held to be, especially applicable to or only to affect one or more, and not the whole of the said provinces.

Why the exception in that clause? What is the purpose of it? The purpose is more clearly shown in the succeeding sections. Section 17 says:

Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said provinces, with the substitution for paragraph 1 of the said section 93, of the following paragraph:

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act under the terms of charters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901: or with respect to religious instruction in any public or separate school, as provided for in the said ordinances.

2. In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the province of any moneys for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with the said chapter 29, or any Act passed in amendment thereof or in substitution therefore, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in the said chapter 29.

3. Where the expression "by law" is employed in paragraph (3) of the said section 93, it shall be held to mean the law as set out in the said chapters 29 and 30: and where the expression "at the union" is employed in the said paragraph, it shall be held to mean the date at which this Act comes into force.

[Mr. Edwards.]

That was in 1905. Here we have, in effect, an amendment to the British North America Act of 1867, because it inserts certain ordinances passed by the Northwest Territories Assembly in 1901 under a delegated authority from the Parliament of Canada. The provisions of the constitution are departed from and are only to apply "except in so far as varied by this Act." Subsection 1 of section 93 is abolished, and subsection 3 is amended by placing upon it an interpretation it could not otherwise bear.

What does the expression "in the province at the Union" mean? If it means 1905, then no amendment was required for the purpose of separate school establishment. If it does not mean 1905, by what authority did the Parliament of Canada change that Imperial Act? "At the Union" means when the territories were united to the rest of Canada and became a part of the Dominion, namely in 1870. There were then no white people in the territories, and consequently no schools, separate or public. The Saskatchewan Act and the Alberta Act were designed to perpetuate certain privileges created by the Act of 1875, and this was done by over-riding the constitution. Let me quote the opinion of Hon. Edward Blake in 1869:

It is perfectly clear on great and obvious principles that the basis of union settled by the British North America Act is not capable of alteration by Parliament.

Yet the spirit and intention of the Act was unquestionably altered by these Autonomy Bills passed in 1905. Mr. Clement, in his work on "The Canadian Constitution," says (page 352):

Can a new province be established with a smaller sphere of authority than that occupied by the provinces named in the British North America Act, 1867? . . . . . It is submitted, therefore, that any new province created must be given full provincial autonomy and powers as defined in the original British North America Act, 1867.

On March 22, 1905, on the second reading of the Autonomy Bills, Sir Robert Borden said:

In establishing a new province, can this Parliament wholly or partially alter the basis of Confederation? Can it change the distribution of legislative powers? That, I submit, can only be done by the Imperial Parliament. Surely it cannot be contended that in giving to a new province the constitutional rights conferred by the British North America Act we can reverse the scheme framed by the Fathers of Confederation and embodied in an Imperial statute. Yet that is what the right hon. gentleman seeks to do to-day by the provisions contained in section 17 of the Bill. I submit we have no duty, nay we have no right or power to shatter the foundations then laid

or to re-write the compact into which we then entered.

Sir Robert Borden moved an amendment, but it was voted down. Mr. Speaker, I have referred to these Autonomy Bills and to the history leading up to their passage by this Parliament for a purpose, which no doubt has already been plainly indicated. I say that the power lies within the legislatures of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, notwithstanding the special provisions in the Autonomy Bills of 1905, to establish in those provinces a nonsectarian school system whenever they feel disposed to do so. I want to place a few statements before hon. members, and to ask them to consider them fairly and to meet them with argument if they have arguments to refute them.

I say that as regards privileges, all our citizens should stand on the same level regardless of the church they are connected with. I say that an educational system founded upon special privileges fosters disunion and disintegration, and leads ultimately to national disaster. I sincerely believe that, and I invite hon. gentlemen who do not agree with me to present their arguments in refutation. I say that all classes of our people without regard to race or creed should share equally in the responsibilities of citizenship. Will any person object to that statement? I say therefore that there should be sufficient uniformity in our systems of education to ensure a uniform and common knowledge of what the responsibilities of citizenship are. If any hon. gentleman objects to that statement, I shall be pleased to hear his objection.

Mr. BUTTS: May I ask a question?

Mr. EDWARDS: Not until I get through.

Mr. BUTTS: I thought the hon. member invited questions. Oh, bigotry where is your blush?

Mr. EDWARDS: Am I then to be charged with bigotry because I say that one class of the community should have no special privileges over another class? That is the assertion I have made. Am I to be charged with being an enemy of religion because I say that I favour a non-sectarian school system? Am I to be charged by the hon. gentleman with intolerance because I say that the church of which he is a shining ornament should have no special privileges above any other denomination in this country?

I want to tell him and any other hon. members of this House, if there are any who share his view, that if it means being a bigot to say that one class shall not have special privileges over the other, I am willing to be called a bigot and I will not have as much reason to blush for being called a bigot as the hon. gentleman will have reason to blush for some of the sentiments that he is hiding behind the newspaper that he is holding up before his face.

When there are widely different standards of education, there are bound to be widely different conceptions of patriotism and national duty. That seems to be an obvious and reasonable statement to make. The great war has made it abundantly clear that some of the peoples of Canada have no proper conception of their duty to the State and can not be relied on in a great national crisis. The responsibility for concerted action in the war which has just closed rested where?—on the Provincial Governments or on this Government? The responsibility for concerted action rested on the Dominion Government and not upon the Provincial Governments. The Dominion Government has no say whatever in regard to the matters which, I say, make for the unity or disunity of this country. Sir William Peterson, former principal of McGill University said:

> By what I think a most regrettable provision of the Constitution of Canada, the Federal Government is not supposed even to know that Education is being carried on in the Dominion. Education is remitted by the practice of the Constitution of the country to the Provincial Governments.

He adds:

> Now against that I have always protested.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the greatest human agency for eliminating the differences which divide the Canadian people is a non-sectarian national school system. I want to repeat that as being my earnest conviction and my warrant for speaking this afternoon. I say that in my opinion the greatest human agency for eliminating the differences which exist in this House, and which divide the Canadian people today, is a non-sectarian school system. I believe that is true and, believing it to be true, I think I am entitled to credit for my sincerity even if some hon. gentlemen do not agree with my statement. Canada is filled by peoples of all races and creeds and if each chooses to have its own peculiar system, harmony and concerted action are impossible and confusion is inevitable. Unwise concessions have been made resulting in bitterness and strife. Are they to be perpetuated? Are we to perpetuate these unwise concessions? Surely no person is

going to say or to assume that those who undertook to establish the school systems of this country fifty or sixty years ago are to determine the character of our institutions for the millions who live in Canada to-day and the greater number of millions who will live in Canada in years to come? To give you an expression of opinion from another distinguished Canadian, let me quote what Sir John Willison says:

> We have had in the educational clause of the British North America Act a source of misunderstanding and confusion which has not made for national solidity and more than once has filled the country with the angry clamour of violent sectarian controversy.

Is that not true? Yet I suppose Sir John Willison is to be charged with bigotry by the hon. gentleman because he gives expression to what is an undoubted fact. He continues:

> We have had during the whole period of Confederation a resolute and unceasing effort to read into the Constitution a guarantee of sectarian schools for every province of the Confederation and a steady denunciation of those who insist upon a different interpretation and contend for the right of the provinces to control over education subject to their conception of the constitutional limitations.

We have passed through a great testing time which has shown Canada's greatness and also its weakness. We have—I want to inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Butts) before he goes——

Mr. BUTTS: I have paid too much attention to you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: We have in this country a divided allegiance the fatal danger of which must have been brought home to every thoughtful man. No country can possess the peace and harmony necessary to stability whose people are not of one mind as to where the sovereign power resides. The fact is we have been trying to get along under two governments, the one at Ottawa and the other a self-constituted authority claiming the right to regulate federal and provincial legislation in regard to education. I have never meddled in my life with the doctrines, dogmas or ceremonies of any church. I have never had any desire to do so. I have never had any desire to interfere with any man in his right to worship as his conscience dictates. The last thing that would occur to me would be to interfere with him in the exercise of that right. But surely I am not guilty of intolerance when I assert that the Government should not favour one creed more than another. Is that intolerance? Is it fanatical to say that public money should not be spent on sectarian education? Is it bigotry to assert that all citizens stand on the same level as regards privileges? Should I be charged with a desire to destroy religion because I believe that a system of national, non-sectarian schools will conduce to harmony and national unity?

We often hear it said that our differences in this country are due to misunderstanding. I dissent from that statement at once. I say our differences are not due to misunderstanding. We understand perfectly. It is because of the thorough understanding that we do have the differences that we have to-day. Do you mean to tell me that a man who resides in a certain section of the country and finds himself in the position that his children cannot attend the only school that there is for them because of certain religious dogmas being taught that he does not agree with, feels a sense of injustice because of misunderstanding? Not at all. He understands that he is not getting a square deal. There is not a man in this House who can argue successfully that he is getting a square deal. It is not a question of theology or of doctrine or religious dogma but it is a question of civil rights and a square deal for every man in this country.

Let me ask this question: Is a Government justified in conferring special privileges on any one section of the people? That is a fair question. If not, if you answer that in the negative, if you say that the Government is not justified in conferring special privileges on one section of the people, then you must agree with me that separate school laws are wrong in principle because they are a violation of the equality of civil rights which is the basis of free government.

What do I suggest in regard to this matter? I know that education in so far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned is fixed by the terms of Confederation. I do not wish to be understood as saying that I think this Parliament should take away from these provinces the rights which they have under the constitution. But surely that does not prevent us from discussing the question here as to whether another system would be preferable. We have had over fifty years of Confederation and the idea of the Fathers of Confederation was unquestionably in the main to try and unite the people.

I leave it to any hon. gentleman here who has studied past history and who reads

the press to say if he is satisfied with the conditions which exist in this country at the present time. After over fifty years of confederation have we got unity in this country? Not by any means. We have not got unity, and why have we not? Because, Mr. Speaker, we have had in the public life of this country in times past men who were willing to put party expediency and party exigencies before their duty to Canada; that is why. Because we have had in this country men calling themselves statesmen and posing as being especially broad-minded who have been too cowardly to deal with questions such as this on their merits. That is why—at any rate it is my own opinion.

Now, Sir, I would suggest that this matter of education does concern the Federal Government and does concern this Parliament. Surely we have some interest in a democracy in Canada which is getting its ideas of Canada and of Britain, and of Canadian and British history, through the medium of half a dozen different foreign languages? Surely some right is vested in the Federal Government as to the kind of democracy we are creating in this country? Is it not true that under existing conditions to-day we have less efficiency all over the country in regard to educational matters in our primary schools than we would have, had there been only one system of national education? You cannot dispute that for a moment. A short distance from where I live, in a good settlement, there are two schools, one a Roman Catholic separate school and the other, three-quarters of a mile away, a public school. The taxes of the people of that community are going to maintain two schools. It must be manifest to every person that the combined taxes of those people would maintain a far better school if there was only one; that both Roman Catholic and Protestant children would enjoy better educational advantages if there was only one school than they do at present with two schools. There is not only waste of money at present, but what is of more importance still, there is less efficiency in our school systems, because of this division. What choice has the family of a man got who happens to be living in a section of the country where nine-tenths of the people, we will say, happen to be Roman Catholics, and where the only school in the community is a separate school? What choice in the matter of education have the two or three Protestant families got who chance to be located there? The children are excluded from that school unless the parents are willing to allow them to go there and hear religious dogma taught with which they do not agree. I am not discussing whether that dogma is right or is wrong, but I do say that the opinions of the minority should be respected and that the Protestant children are excluded from that school. What choice is open to the parents in such case? They must either send their children miles away from home and pay their board, or sell their farms and move to some other part of the country. How in the name of Heaven can you expect to obtain unity in this country when the children from two families—one a Roman Catholic family and the other a Protestant family, are going to different schools—one to this school and the other to that? Why, from the time they emerge from the cradle these children of opposite religious faith are taught to look with hostility and antagonism upon each other. How can you expect when they grow up to manhood that they can work together for the general welfare of this country? It is absolutely impossible; hon. gentlemen in this House, whether they favour separate schools or not, know that it is unfair and unreasonable to expect that they should.

I would favour first of all, Mr. Speaker, the creation of a Dominion bureau of education, because I believe the Dominion Government should have some voice in regard to educational matters. I would favour the holding of a conference in the city of Ottawa of leading educationists from the various provinces of Canada. Surely such men can come together on something which would promote the desired object, and surely they should come together. Surely we are within our rights as members of Parliament in advocating a condition of affairs where there will be some semblance of uniformity in teaching, because that uniformity in our public school teaching is necessary if we are to produce a united people in Canada animated by common national ideals.

This question, Sir, is one which affects, and very seriously, the people in Western Canada. According to the census of 1911 there were in the four Western Provinces 412,995 persons representing five nationalities,—Germans, Austrians, Russians, Poles and Scandinavians. Nearly half a million people of those five nationalities in those Western Provinces in 1911, and there are more than that number there now. We know to what extent we can rely upon those people in a crisis such as the one through which we have just passed. Should we not in the interests of the future welfare

of this country, try and devise some system whereby we will have some hope of Canadianizing these foreigners who come to our shores? But, Mr. Speaker; it is not only in regard to the West that I am speaking. May I call your attention to something very much nearer, something, it seems to me, that we ought to have at least a right to protest about? In 1912 a certain book was authorized for use in the schools in a part of this country. That book referred to Quebec as the capital of Canada, Toronto still figured as York, and Ottawa was not mentioned at all. Winnipeg did not even figure as Fort Garry; it was not even mentioned. The four Western Provinces are referred to in that book as "regions unknown except under the designation of New Caledonia, a wild region of no importance except for its furs." That is only an extract from the book in question. I could give the House other illuminating extracts if it was desired, but fancy a book being used in any province of Canada which issues such stuff as that to the children of this country at as recent a period as 1912. I do not know whether that book is still in use at the present time or not. Mr. Speaker, I believe it can be shown that text books have been used in the schools of this country lauding and praising Germany and Germans to the skies during the last four and a half years, while our boys have been overseas in France and Flanders giving up their lives in the struggle against those very people. Will any person tell me that the Federal Parliament has no right to intervene in a matter of that kind, and at least offer advice? I am perfectly well aware that there are some people in this country—like the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. Butts) who interrupted me a while ago—who will not attempt to present any arguments on a question of this kind, who will not attempt to argue the subject on its merits, who will not advance any reasons at all in support of their views, but will simply shout " bigotry " because they know it is the only expression which is applicable to themselves beyond the slightest doubt. I do not care, Mr. Speaker, a snap of my fingers for the opinions of such people either in this House or outside of it. I have been honest in giving my views on this matter, because, Sir, I am a Canadian, and as a Canadian I would like to see a better state of affairs existing in this Dominion than has existed for many years. I would like to see more unity, more harmony, more peace. I would like to see our people of different races and creeds working shoulder to shoulder for the future well-being and upbuilding of this Dominion. It is because I do sincerely wish to see that desirable condition that I have given expression to these views this afternoon, and I trust that hon. gentlemen either on this side or opposite will not find in anything I have said any attack on their religion. I have never in my life attacked the Roman Catholic faith.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: Hon. gentlemen are free, of course, to offer the insult of a laugh. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for the last ten or eleven years, and I defy any hon. member to point to one single word, line or sentence of mine uttered in this House reflecting on any man's religion. Now, laugh if you have got a laugh in you.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: If hon. gentlemen opposite instead of laughing possess the quality of courage, let them get busy and present to me any statement of mine in this House or outside reflecting on any man's religion. I have never, Mr. Speaker, had any desire to reflect on any man's faith—never in my life, and I have never done so. But I will say to members of this House that when the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, or the Anglican Church, or the Presbyterian Church, or any other religious denomination through its ecclesiastical dignitaries sticks its nose into public affairs, I, as a public man, am going to hit that nose as I think it ought to be hit. Will any hon. gentleman tell me that on educational matters, on which the Roman Catholic Hierarchy have very distinct views and have given expression to them—and they have a perfect right to do so—will hon. gentlemen tell me that as a public man I have no right to express my views? That is what I would assume from the attitude of at least one hon. gentleman judging by his expression a while ago. I have endeavoured to present this matter—which I repeat again I regard as of very great importance to the Dominion—in a series of statements very deliberately thought out, and again I invite hon. gentlemen to direct their attention and their arguments to some of those statements, which have been delivered with the best of intentions and without any ill-feeling towards any person, class or creed in this country.

Mr. JAMES A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Mr. Speaker, we upon this side of the House did not have notice from my hon. friend that he was going to bring

up the resolution to-day. Indeed, it had been so long on the Order Paper that we had concluded that it might, like the Highways Bill, have fallen by the wayside. With his plea for national unity we upon this side are in common accord. There may be places in some of the provinces where there is not national unity, but I wish at once to assure my hon. friend that in the province of Quebec in which I live we have national unity.

My hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) seemed to be concerned more particularly regarding the school system in the province of Quebec, and for that reason I purpose to devote a few moments to an expression of my experience as a school trustee covering a period of perhaps twenty or twenty-five years—longer than I care to remember. A few moments ago when my hon. friend was charging that there were schools in the province of Quebec which Protestants could not attend because of the religious training imparted, it brought to my mind a matter that I would rather not speak much about under these conditions, but in justice to my fellow citizens I am going to mention it. My only child for a number of years attended a Roman Catholic convent. As she was without a mother, naturally I watched very closely to see if any influence was brought to bear upon her, and I never was able to observe the slightest attempt to sway her religious feelings.

5 p.m.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I ask the hon. member a question? Did not the hon. member for Frontenac make it clear that he was speaking of primary schools?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ROBB: I am dealing with the question generally. I have no knowledge that primary schools are any different in that respect from other schools. I have in mind places in the province of Quebec where there is perhaps only one school, a Protestant school, or a Catholic school as the case may be, and both Catholic and Protestant children are attending it. I was told not long ago by a prominent public man that all the education he had ever received was in a Roman Catholic school in the province of Quebec. That man is a Protestant and to-day occupies a very high position among the judiciary of the province of Ontario.

I do not want to get away from the main point. As I said, I have had an experience of from twenty to twenty-five years as a school trustee in the province of Quebec. We have at the opening of our schools in the fall two difficulties: one difficulty is to provide sufficient space for the Roman Catholic French children who want to attend; the other difficulty is to get the newly-arrived Englishman to send his child to school instead of putting him in the local mill. In the town in which I live the local Roman Catholic college has three hundred boys in attendance, and there are many Protestant boys among them,—they go there because they wish to acquire the two languages,—and I have never heard that any attempt ever was made to influence their religious opinions.

But my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) destroys his whole argument. He states that Article 93 of the British North America Act guaranteed separate schools to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Surely after all these years we are not going to reopen this question? If the hon. gentleman is sincere in his desire for peace and harmony throughout this country, I ask him in all fairness: can we accomplish that by reopening the question of religious training in schools? My hon. friend said that there might have been a better condition of things in this province of Ontario if the public men of the past had not been so cowardly In making that statement my hon. friend made a very serious attack upon that great statesman of whom he is a follower and admirer, and of whom we all are admirers, the late Sir John A. Macdonald. Sir John A. Macdonald had no such views as those entertained by the member for Frontenac. Listen to these words of that great statesman with regard to this school question, spoken in the House of Commons of Canada:

> I have no accord with the desire expressed in some quarters that by any mode whatever there should be an attempt made to oppress the one language or to render it inferior to the other; I believe that would be impossible if it were tried and it would be foolish and wicked if it were possible. The statement that has been made so often that this is a conquered country is "à propos de rien." Whether it was conquered or ceded, we have a constitution under which all British subjects are in a position of absolute equality, having rights of every kind, of language, of religion, of property and of person. There is no paramount race in this country, there is no conquered race in this country, we are all British subjects, and those who are not English are none the less British subjects on that account.

That was the statement of a man who desired unity in this country, and it has the ring of true statesmanship. I submit in all seriousness that no good can be served by bringing this question up from time to time. My hon. friend seems to

think that Protestants in the province of Quebec are suffering. Let me, as a representative Protestant, assure him that we are perfectly satisfied with the system we now enjoy, and that we see great dangers ahead for us if the idea which the hon. gentleman presents to-day should prevail. Let me ask him, should we have national schools? Should we have one school as he suggests? What would be the language in the province of Quebec were his idea adopted? Where would the Protestants in that province stand? We are satisfied now with our school system; how would my hon. friend improve it?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not see any reason why the question of language should be brought in or how it affects the matter at all. If you had non-sectarian schools in Quebec, you would get along just as well so far as language is concerned. My idea is that the primary schools should be non-sectarian.

Mr. ROBB: Very well; then the majority will rule. Only two or three years ago my hon. friend argued in this House that the schools in the province of Quebec were inferior, particularly that the Roman Catholic schools were inferior; and that the Protestant schools in that province were much superior to the Roman Catholic schools. Does he want to put us back to the position he said we were in when he made that argument three years ago? If so, as a Protestant from Quebec, I cannot agree with him. Let me refer my hon. friend, who seems to be somewhat ignorant of the school laws of the province of Quebec, to the Acts upon which our school laws are founded. There is a Council of Public Instruction, composed of Roman Catholic and Protestant members. In the performance of their duties the members are subject to the lawful orders and instructions given to them by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The Council of Public Instruction is divided into two committees, one composed of Roman Catholic members and the other of Protestant members. The Protestant Committee may associate with themselves six persons and the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers may each year at their annual meeting elect one of their members to be also an associate member of the Protestant Committee for the following year. The persons so added shall not form part of the Council of Public Instruction, but shall have in the Protestant Committee the same powers as the members of such Committee. School questions in which the interest of Roman Catholics and Protestants are collectively concerned are under the jurisdiction of the Council of Public Instruction and shall be decided by it. That is fair; we are satisfied with that.

My hon. friend may think I am advancing a prejudiced idea; that I am making an argument simply because I am on the opposite side of the House. Let me put in evidence here a statement of the Inspector General of Protestant schools in the province of Quebec. In 1914, in a pamphlet written by Dr. G. W. Parmelee the English or Protestant Secretary of the Council of Public Instruction, and Mr. J. C. Sutherland, Inspector General of Protestant Schools of the province, my hon. friend will find, at page 41, the following:

> A perusal of the previous pages has probably made it clear that the Roman Catholic majority and the Protestant minority work harmoniously by dividing the educational regulations and administration into two separate parts in regard to all matters that would give rise to a conflict of opinion between them.
>
> Inasmuch as these regulations include courses of study and provisions for religious instruction, and inasmuch as each committee approves of the textbooks for use in the schools of its own faith, ample guarantee is thus given to the Protestant minority that in vital matters the control of Protestant education will remain in Protestant hands, and at the same time the Roman Catholic Church is assured that religion in accordance with the tenets of the church shall continue to be inculcated as the basis upon which true education rests.

An annual meeting of the Dominion Educational Association was held in Ottawa in February, 1917. Mr. J. C. Sutherland, Inspector General of Protestant schools in the province of Quebec, attended that convention, and met there representatives from various parts of Ontario. At that convention he said:

> There has never been a particle of friction in the department in this respect since Confederation or before that date. . . . . We (the Protestant minority) have wonderful freedom, and whatever is needed is given. We never have any trouble. . . . . We have a complete system of reporting for the census, and also for the school attendance. . . . . .

That is the evidence of a public servant who travels throughout the province of Quebec, covering a territory extending from a point 180 miles north of North Bay away down to the Gulf—Quebec is a big country. I am bound to say, therefore, that he has greater opportunity of learning the true feeling throughout the province of Quebec than has the member for Frontenac, who devotes most of his time to this House. As a Protestant from the province of Quebec, therefore, I certainly am not in favour of the resolution proposed by my hon. friend. Like him, I desire national unity. If

national unity does not prevail in the other provinces of Canada, we wish to do all we can to bring it about. But in our province we get along very well, and we look with disfavour on any attempt to introduce anything that will change the good feeling now existing between the English-speaking and the French-speaking people, the Roman Catholics and the Protestants of my province.

Let me remind my hon. friend that as the basis of representation for all the provinces, Quebec is entitled to sixty-five members in this Parliament. Has it occurred to him that almost twenty-four per cent of the representation in Parliament is English-speaking? That proves, it seems to me, that we get along fairly well from the school right up to manhood when we get into larger walks of life. So that I ask my hon. friend not to press a resolution which, in my judgment, can do no good and may do much harm.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I do not wish to add anything to what has been so well said on this subject by the member for Chateauguay-Huntinglon (Mr. Robb) except to thank him, on behalf of his French Canadian colleagues in the House of Commons, for the fair statement that he has made. As for the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) I am sorry that he thought it proper, having had his motion on the Order Paper since the beginning of the session, not to give notice to some of us that he would bring it up this afternoon.

But after all, it is just as well that the question came up as it did, because, while I do not wish to be unjust to my hon. friend, nor would I like to be severe on him, I do not think he has added much to his reputation by bringing, at this particular juncture, this irritating question before the public. It is more academic than anything else, if, indeed, it is anything else. The question of separate schools or non-sectarian schools was settled long ago, and I do not know, unless one has some special motive to serve, why one should start another school agitation at this very trying time in the history of our country.

The facts are, it seems to me, very simple. My hon. friend expresses the wish that we should have in Canada a non-sectarian school system, but the fact stares him in the face that the constitution of Canada, which he should respect as I respect it, settled that question in 1867, and if it may be said without offending my hon. friend, his study of Canadian history should lead him to know that long before Confederation the question had been settled between fair-minded Canadians of both races and creeds. My hon. friend, a moment ago, said that Lord Durham had come to Canada with a very high mission and that he favoured the idea of having one set of laws, one language and one system of schools for Canada.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not mention schools in connection with Lord Durham.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But my hon. friend, speaking of what was in Lord Durham's mind and what runs through his famous report, said that Lord Durham's idea was that we should have national unity in Canada, and Lord Durham, in his report, speaks of one language and of one law for Canada. My hon. friend added, if I followed him well, that if at that time we had had, pursuant to Lord Durham's mission, one system of schools, we would have had national unity in Canada. Indeed, Lord Durham had a very important mission when he came to Canada and he succeeded but only partly in his mission. One who reads his report must admit that in his now famous report he laid for us Canadians and members of the British Empire, the foundation of responsible government. In that he succeeded, but when Lord Durham, radical though he was, expressed the opinion that there should be one code of laws and one language for the country, he made a fatal mistake, and that mistake is still very apparent to-day. Under the conditions which made this country British it cannot be expected that we shall ever have in Canada one system of laws for all the provinces, because the question was settled by the Act of Quebec in 1774, which Act we of the minority regard as our Magna Charta. We must expect that as long as there is a French Canadian province in the Dominion there will be a different system of civil laws for French Canadians within their own province. That is an Imperial Statute, and we shall adhere to it. There is no danger that French Canadians will fall short in population; they are increasing yearly, and in so doing they are observing the command of God and of their conscience. As regards their language, let me say this without any boasting: As long as there beats a French heart we shall maintain intact the language which was given to us as a sacred legacy by our forefathers. It is a language of which any civilized man must be proud, because the French language, the language of Joffre, of Foch, of world diplomacy, is too noble a

language to be abandoned by those of us who represent French traditions and ideals in North America. My hon. friend said that if Lord Durham had insisted upon a system of non-sectarian schools—my hon. friend shakes his head—I take my hon. friend's denial in good part, and I say that the inference that I drew from his speech was that if Lord Durham had insisted at that time upon a system of non-sectarian schools we would have had true national unity in Canada. Sir, in 1841 French Canadians were in the majority in Lower Canada, but there was also in Lower Canada, the old French province, a respectable minority of English-speaking Protestants, as there was also in Upper Canada quite a minority of Catholics, both Irish and French. The common sense of the people of those early days settled the question without any statutory enactments. In Upper Canada there was a system of public schools, but the fair sense of the people agreed that there should be a separate school for those who wanted Catholic tuition for their children under Catholic supervision. In Lower Canada, notably in the Eastern Townships, there was, as I said, a Protestant minority, and there again the common sense and fairness of the people, without any special statutory enactment, decided that those Protestants should have their own schools. In 1841 the Union took place. It was not a success. The only thing which Union secured to Canada was responsible government, which had been fought for during and before the rebellion; and after 1841, thanks to the alliance of liberal-minded people from both Upper and Lower Canada, responsible government had to be conceded by, first, the Governor General, and finally by the Imperial authorities. But all those who are familiar with that period of our history know the wranglings that took place between both provinces and both parties during the period which elapsed between 1841 and 1867. Hon. Louis Joseph Papineau was then just back from exile. He had been brought back from Europe by Sir Hippolyte Lafontaine, and it is to his credit that in order to repatriate Hon. Louis Joseph Papineau he went even so far as to lay his resignation in the hands of the then Governor General of Canada. Mr. Papineau came back again and began at once to agitate in favour of representation by population, because in his opinion the French representation should have been the largest, as the population of Lower Canada was the more numerous of the two.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. Lafontaine, who afterwards became Sir Louis Hippolyte Lafontaine, took issue with Mr. Papineau, on the ground that the flow of British immigration would soon give Upper Canada the majority, and when that happened we could not expect a larger representation for Lower Canada. Later on, events proved that Mr. Lafontaine's attitude was the right one, but in the meantime the school question became very acute. The School Act of 1855 was first passed, and then the Act of 1863, an Act which had been fathered by Mr. Scott, who later became Secretary of State under the Laurier Government, which position he also occupied 18 years before under the Mackenzie Government. The legislation of 1863 enacted practically what was later embodied in the Act of Confederation itself. Mr. Brown was then a member of the legislature, and he tenaciously opposed the separate school system. Long and acrimonious discussions took place, and as my hon. friend said a moment ago the leader of the Conservative party, Sir John Macdonald, himself favoured a system of separate schools for Upper and Lower Canada in order that the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec and the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario might be protected. Later on, when Government under the Union became a failure, because every ministry changed after three or four months in office, Mr. Brown again took up the question of representation by population and advocated Confederation as the only solution compatible with the principles which had been advocated by Mr. Papineau. The English minority had then become the majority. Mr. Brown was so insistent on the question of Confederation that I think I am within the mark when I say that he was really the man who did most to achieve the anactment of 1867, but in order to succeed, Mr. Brown, nobly I must say, accepted a compromise on the vexed school question. In 1863, and in fact all throughout the regime of the Union from 1841 to 1863, Mr. Brown had been the most vigorous opponent of the separate school system and had carried with him the bulk of his party in Upper Canada. But Mr. Brown knew that in order to achieve Confederation he had to make some sacrifice of opinion, some concession, that he must accept a compromise. And what was the nature of that compromise? I would point out to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that at times, especially in a country like this with its two great races, where there are different creeds and languages it is fair, it is well that there should be com-

promise. Mr. Brown, who was a statesman, understood that. I dare say there has never been a man in Canada who was more insistent on non-sectarian schools than the late Hon. George Brown. Indeed, his paper, the Toronto Globe, and before that the Leader, every day contained articles written by Mr. Brown advocating his view of non-sectarian schools. But in 1867, in order to achieve the higher ideal of Confederation Mr. Brown accepted a compromise. I have here his very words which I shall read, in part, to the House. Speaking on clause 6, which read as follows:

Education, saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.

Mr. Brown said:

I need hardly remind the House that I have always opposed and continue to oppose the system of sectarian education, so far as the public chest is concerned. I have never had any hesitation on that point, I have never been able to see why all the people in the province, to whatever sect they may belong, should not send their children to the same schools to receive the ordinary branches of instruction. I regard the parent and the pastor as the best religious instructors—and so long as the religious faith of the children is not interfered with, and ample opportunity afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their flocks, I cannot see any sound objection to mixed schools.

Further on he says:

Now, it is known to every hon. member of this House that an Act was passed in 1863 as a final settlement of this sectarian controversy. I was not in Quebec at the time, but if I had been here, I would have voted against that Bill because it extended the facilities for establishing separate schools. It had, however, this good feature, that it was accepted by the Roman Catholic authorities and carried to the Parliament as a final compromise of the question in Upper Canada.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does my hon. friend say that the conditions now surrounding the separate schools are the same as under the Scott Bill which was incorporated in the Confederation Act of 1867?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Practically the same. I am citing the opinion of Mr. Brown in order to show how he compromised on the separate school question, in order to achieve the higher ideal of Confederation. He went on:

When, therefore, it was proposed that a provision should be inserted in the confederation scheme to bind that contract of 1863 and declare it a final settlement, so that we should not be compelled, as we have been since 1849, to stand constantly to our arms, awaiting fresh attacks upon our common school system, the proposition seemed to me one that was not rashly to be rejected. I admit that, from my point of view, this is a blot on the scheme before the House; it is confessedly, one of the concessions from our side that had to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But assuredly, I, for one, have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of union, and doubly acceptable must it be in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, who were the authors of the Bill of 1863.

The opinion of Sir John A. Macdonald has already been quoted by my hon. friend, and I have now given the opinion of his great antagonist and rival, the Hon. George Brown. The one had already committed himself in favour of separate schools for the sake of national unity, and the other accepted them by force majeure, I must say, but in order to achieve Confederation. I hope my hon. friend will accept these two high authorities in favour of the system which has obtained in Canada since.

But my hon. friend went further, and though I will follow him in his arguments, in doing so I do not intend to re-open the debate on the famous Autonomy Bill. He seemed to make a special appeal on behalf of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Sir, what are the facts of the case? In Manitoba the system of separate schools was established when that province entered Confederation. By a judgment of the Privy Council in 1895 the Government of the province was reminded that the legislation which had been passed in the nineties was contrary to the constitution and that remedial legislation was necessary in order to give the minority in Manitoba the rights to which it was entitled. We all remember the agitation which followed. We know that those who represented the minority in Parliament and outside sought to obtain justice for the Catholics of Manitoba. Finally a settlement was arrived at known as the Laurier-Greenway settlement. It was, indeed, a settlement based on the minimum of rights and yet the minority accepted it, some with loud protests and others in the hope and expectation that the majority would at least live up to the agreement. I regret to say that twenty-three years after, a so-called Liberal Government in Manitoba has thought it wise to wipe out the Laurier-Greenway agreement and to treat the French Canadian minority in that province on a footing of equality with the foreign immigrants who have no such constitutional guarantee as has the minority which joined Confederation with Manitoba.

Mr. EDWARDS: Did not the Laurier-Greenway settlement put the foreigner on the same footing as the French?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, but was it just, was it fair that the Norris Government as they did three years ago should enact legislation wiping out all such moderate terms as were agreed upon in the Laurier-Greenway agreement? To-day, Sir, the French Canadian Catholics of Manitoba, notwithstanding the terms of Confederation, are treated on a footing of equality with the foreigners who settle in that province, coming as they do from Europe and all parts of the world without the guarantee which had been given to my fellow countrymen at the time when Manitoba joined the Union.

I leave it at that. History will pronounce judgment on the action of the majority. History will say if it was the true British spirit which instigated Mr. Norris, and before him Mr. Roblin and the others, in curtailing every year, until they wiped them out entirely, the minimum rights which had been secured under the Laurier-Greenway agreement. I leave it to history, Mr. Speaker.

As regards the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, my hon. friend knows that in 1905 legislation was passed by this Parliament to implement the legislation of 1875, when the Northwest Territories were created. When those Territories were created, guarantees were again given to the minority. I promised you, Mr. Speaker, that I would not weary the House with any long quotations, and if I refer for a moment to a now historic debate it is only to answer with facts and data the assertions made by my hon. friend; I do not wish to be at all controversial, nor carried away on this question.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Was not the issue which was fought out in 1896 by the Liberal leader and the Liberal party in Quebec antagonistic to the demands made by the then Liberal-Conservative government to give what they considered justice to the minority in Manitoba, and did not the great Liberal leader, backed up by his colleagues from the province of Quebec, fight to a finish on that issue?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. In 1896 Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his friends contended that Parliament should not pass any drastic legislation which Manitoba would not accept and would ultimately lead to civil war. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as I have stated already in this House in another debate, acted under the inspiration of Mr. Edward Blake, who, with Mr. Ewart, K.C., of Ottawa, had nobly represented the Catholic minority before the Privy Council. Mr. Blake suggested that it would not do to apply remedial legislation to Manitoba, but that through friendly proceedings between both governments the same object might be attained; and it was under that suggestion of Mr. Blake, and with the conciliatory spirit of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that the Laurier-Greenway agreement was arrived at. But I was referring to the condition of things in 1875, when the Northwest Territories were created. In the Bill passed by the Dominion Parliament, during the session of 1875, we have the foundation laid of the rights of the minority in the two later provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Upon the creation of the Territories a system of separate schools was established, and again the eternal question of separate schools came up before the House of Commons and the Senate. There again the powerful voice of the late Hon. George Brown, who throughout his life had been an opponent of the sectarian school system, was raised in favour of the Northwest minority as a matter of compromise. Mr. Brown spoke as follows:

> Hon. Mr. Brown said he concurred with what had fallen from his friends on the treasury benches, and from hon. gentlemen who had spoken on the amendment, with respect to the propriety of allowing separate schools. But the question was not whether those schools were right or wrong, good or bad, but as to whether it was wise for this country to deal with this question. He quite admitted the importance of the issue which had been raised—whether this matter should be referred to the province interested for settlement, or be brought to the Dominion Legislature. The moment this Act passed and the Northwest became part of the union, they came under the Union Act, and under the provisions with regard to separate schools.

Mr. Brown therefore admitted that the separate school system had to be established in those Northwest Territories by the terms of Union. We are aware of what happened when the Autonomy Bills were presented to this House in 1905. They contained the exact status quo which had obtained in those territories since 1875. We remember what an agitation took place in 1905. Amidst such storms, racial or religious, the experience is—and history is a great teacher in these matters—that the minority has to suffer and has to submit to compromises and accept concessions. Minimum rights were agreed to by clause 16 in those two Bills; and I am happy to say that the legislatures

of Saskatchewan and Alberta have observed those minimum rights. I know that attempts have been made of late to curtail whatever rights were granted under section 16 of the Autonomy Bills; I also know that encroachments have been violently advocated. If they are accepted by the religious authorities of those provinces I have nothing more to say; but I appeal to the sense of honour of my hon. friends from Alberta and Saskatchewan. Let it not be said by history that their provinces have not lived up to that spirit of British fair play which we are so often called upon, we of the minority, to respect and to revere.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) alluded a moment ago to the minority in the province of Quebec. It is the first time I hear that there are localities in that province where the Protestant minority do not get the means of sending their children to school. I have been myself at various colleges and schools, and have rubbed elbows with young Protestant friends who have remained my dearest friends throughout my career. My hon. friend from Chateauguay and Huntingdon has referred to the case of his only daughter, who had been educated in a Catholic convent, Sir. I had an only son who as a lad was educated at a Catholic college, but, who during the last three years of his life was a student at Bishop's college, Lennoxville, an Anglican institution. I can say for Bishop's university, as my hon. friend said for the Catholic convent at Valleyfield, that the religious faith of my son was never so well protected as during the happy days he spent at Lennoxville. Mr. Speaker, we have no such bickerings and no such quarrels between Protestants and Catholics in the province of Quebec, and I wish no better brief than the statement made the other day by the Protestant educational authorities in Quebec with regard to our school system. I have here a statement made by Mr. Sutherland, the Inspector General of the Protestant schools of the province in 1914. Speaking of the regulations in regard to those schools, he made the following statement:

> Inasmuch as these regulations include courses of study and provisions for religious instruction, and inasmuch as each committee approves of the textbooks for use in the schools of its own faith, ample guarantee is thus given to the Protestant minority that in vital matters the control of Protestant education will remain in Protestant hands, and at the same time the Roman Catholic Church is assured that religion in accordance with the tenets of the church shall continue to be inculcated as the basis upon which true education rests.

154½

At the annual meeting of the Dominion Educational Association held at Ottawa in February, 1917, the same Mr. Sutherland made the following statement:

> There has never been a particle of friction in the department in this respect since Confederation or before that date. . . . . we (the Protestant minority) have wonderful freedom, and whatever is needed is given. We never have any trouble.

Dr. Carter, who was present, put the question:

> You are getting along very harmoniously and you seem very optimistic?

And the answer of Mr. Sutherland was:

> We never had any trouble; we are as happy as clams down there.

I wish again to emphasize the statement he had made prior to that:

> We (the Protestant minority) have wonderful freedom, and whatever is needed is given. We never have any trouble. . . . . We have a complete system of reporting for the census, and also for the school attendance. . . . . .

The other day, Mr. Speaker, the most influential English paper of Canada, the Montreal Gazette, commented as follows on a letter written by Mr. Howard Murray, who, by the way, had extolled our Quebec school system:

> Mr. Howard Murray, a member of the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, writes a letter giving his views on some recent propositions having in view the establishment of a federal educational system throughout Canada. He holds that under the system of administration adopted at Confederation the idea is not justified. So will think the great majority of those who give study to all the factors in the situation. By the constitutional law education is made a matter of provincial duty. The considerations that moved the framers of the British North America Act are as strong to-day as they were in 1865 and 1866. No wise man would start an agitation to re-open the issue and bring about a change in the federation compact, that would be resented by such a large minority of the people that years would not heal the sore that would be created. And it is not sure that a federal education law would be an improvement on those now in force. Quebec is not the most illiterate of the provinces; and those who have followed the development of its schools know that through the efforts of earnest men, of both languages, the advance in educational status has been steady and notable. The same quiet work that has been effective so far will be effective in the future. The talk about putting the schools under federal control should cease. It is mischievous; and it is doomed to be ineffective.

I wish to say en passant, and only as a matter of history, that the separate school system was established under the Union Government in 1863 by a majority vote of the representatives of Upper Canada. If I

cared to worry the House I would give names and dates.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What Government was then in power?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I forget.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Sandfield Macdonald-Sicotte Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, you are right. But the majority of the Upper Canada representatives voted in favour of the system of separate schools which was then established.

Mr. HOCKEN: No, no.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have the evidence here, but it is too long to quote and, besides, it is beyond the question. As Sir Richard Cartwright once said in 1896, in answer to Sir George Foster, who had referred on several occasions to the subject then under debate as an accomplished fact: "The hon. gentleman has made a very elaborate and eloquent speech, and has proven beyond a shadow of doubt that an accomplished fact is an accomplished fact." Well, the separate school system is an accomplished fact. Whether or not it was carried by a majority or a minority vote of Upper Canada does not really matter, although I have here with me the evidence to show that it was carried on first and second reading by a majority vote of the representatives of Upper Canada. However, as I said, that is only a matter of history.

Mr. HOCKEN: I think that is very pertinent evidence.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, one word more. My hon. friend says that he advocates a non-sectarian system in order to attain an ideal, that ideal being national unity. I suppose he means Canadian unity. If he means that, we who belong to the French Canadian minority—I say it with all deference—have no lesson to receive from him. We are Canadians, our ancestors sleep their last sleep in God's acres not only of the province of Quebec, but indeed of all parts of Canada, and our record goes back over more than three hundred years. We are Canadians to the core, aye Canadians first, last and always. But if it is an Imperialistic ideal he is striving to achieve, then we must part company with my hon. friend. We remain Canadians, we remain British —not even Anglo-Saxon, no. I want my English-speaking friends to drop the "Saxon." It has a German flavour. Let them be British. We are British, and just because we are British we remain Canadians. Mr. Chamberlain on one occasion was speaking at the University of Edinburgh and was extolling before the young students what he called Anglo-Saxon civilization. He was interrupted three times for using the expression "Anglo-Saxon," and was told by the Scottish students, "Drop the word 'Anglo-Saxon' and speak of British civilization." And, Mr. Speaker, he was tactful enough to take their advice, hard-headed as he was.

I am convinced that the separate school system is the only one suitable to our conditions, historically it is the best, and if we value our national existence we should see to it that in every school of Canada, whether Catholic or Protestant, there is religious tuition. I am a layman, I hold no brief for the church, but I tell my hon. friend that in the years to come, if the Bolshevistic wave should reach the shores of Canada—but God forbid that it should—the strongest bulwark against that wave will be the old province of Quebec, with its system of sectarian schools, wherein religion is taught the children at an early age. Religion is needed in the world, Mr. Speaker. Human agencies alone will not be able to stop the fury of the revolutionary tide that is sweeping Europe to-day. I repeat, religion is needed. Let my hon. friends take that advice from a humble layman.

But one more word before I resume my seat. My hon. friend stated that the Papal Ablegate told Mr. Rogers at Ottawa, in 1905, that the Manitoba boundaries could be extended if the Roblin Government would agree to a separate school system in the Keewatin Territory. That story is not new; we have heard that old fable and it was denied long ago. A letter was read in Parliament denying the absurd charge made by Mr. Robert Rogers, who was not then a member of the House. My hon. friend apparently has a very short memory. Some in this House think that Roman Catholic diplomacy may err at times, but surely, Sir, not to the extent imagined by Mr. Robert Rogers and by my hon. friend from Frontenac. The Papal Ablegate denied that legend. He should have ignored it, because the wild statement having been made by Mr. Robert Rogers carried its own refutation.

I am through, Mr. Speaker; I regret to have spoken at such length. I hope I have raised no bitter controversy. I wanted simply to state that there are on this vexed

question facts which have to be presented in their true colours.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROBERT KING ANDERSON (Halton): Mr. Speaker, the resolution introduced this afternoon by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is a very important one. In rising to address the House as its seconder, I realize that many people in this country will consider it as not belonging to the arena of federal politics. They will say that the question of education is entirely provincial, and that the Federal Government has nothing whatever to do with it. But the Act passed by the Fathers of Confederation in 1867 can hardly be said to stand for all time with regard to education, when conditions in the country are changing. The Fathers of Confederation scarcely had a glimpse of the great progress which had been made since that time in all affairs, especially in the scientific world. We are living to-day under different conditions; we are not the same people that we were in 1867; consequently, this question of national non-sectarian schools is very appropriate at the present time.

Public opinion must first be educated to accept measures which are vital to a country's growth before popular support will warrant their incorporation in the statutes. There must be a demand, a compelling force behind a movement in order to make it a success. That there is such a demand—a growing demand—all over this country for non-sectarian national schools, no one will deny. That demand has been growing for a number of years; it has become intensified during the period of the war. Great events change the current of the people's thoughts and suddenly illuminate the public mind to popular defects that act as barriers to national progress. The day has gone by when the British North America Act is regarded as unchangeable, like the laws of the Medes and Persians; if it contains clauses which are inimical to our progress and our unity, those clauses should be removed.

The British North America Act passed in 1867 by the Imperial Parliament, is the constitution of the Dominion of Canada. That constitution was brought about by a compromise between the two races living in this country at that time, and who came together on an agreement under which Confederation was made possible. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to advocate that that agreement should be dealt with as only a scrap of paper. I believe that it is possible that all the provinces of this Dominion can come together on a system of national, non-sectarian schools which will be satisfactory to all. Such a consummation of this question is eminently to be desired.

A great national spirit has been born out of the travail of this war and Canada has burst into nationhood. Our sphere has suddenly become larger and we stand before the world to-day as one of the great nations of the future, where yesterday we were unknown. We are no longer a loosely connected system of provinces, largely interested in provincial affairs, jealous of one another, fearful of our special prerogatives, looking to the Federal Government for preferment and acknowledging it as our only tie of union. A great unifying national spirit pervades all the people of the various provinces. A trail of blood crosses this country from ocean to ocean, uniting the many diverse elements in our population with a tie that the lapse of time can only serve to strengthen. The war brought us one of the greatest opportunities in our history, if we but utilize it to the full. What this country needs in the present critical hour is a man, a statesman with a vision, who can give the people a common objective and a lofty ideal of national life. Every nation has a destiny, a destiny which is founded upon the character of its people, guided by the will of God. Every nation that is worthy of the name has a soul. It cannot, properly speaking, be called a nation until it manifests that soul. Canada has a soul; the war revealed it. It is the collective soul of her people, and as the people are, so is the nation. The individual characteristics of a people find expression in their national life and determine the nation's status in world affairs. If Canada is to take a high place among democratic peoples, we must have leadership of a high order to concentrate public sentiment and public service on well-defined lines of national endeavour.

The average man and the average woman should be enabled to visualize our future. This implies education of all the people on broad, national lines; education in everything that goes to make the name "Canadian" mean character. Canada has the nucleus of a national character now. When our soldiers and nurses appeared on the European battlefields, they were quickly recognized as

representing a distinctly Canadian type. This was not noticeable twenty-five years ago; when we were submerged in the general term "American." Owning the same cosmopolitan parentage as our cousins to the south, we are not like them. That difference is growing more marked year by year. Neither are we like the Europeans, from whom we have sprung. Climate, environment, the blending of nationalities and the natural obstacles with which we cope, have left their impress upon our character and mark us out as a people having a distinct destiny of our own. In the working out of that destiny the elementary schools of our country will take a high place. Our public school is the most vital factor in the formation of Canadian character. It is the crucible into which the polyglot population of this country is thrown, mixed together, ground up and moulded into the finished product of Canadian citizenship. Peoples of all languages, races and creeds go into that crucible and must be subjected to the moulding process in order that Canada may work out her destiny among the nations.

Our public school, then, is a national issue, and should be made a national institution, purely Canadian, and undenominational in its character. Anything that interferes with its efficiency in turning out Canadians imbued with a love for home and country is detrimental to the future of Canada. Any influence that favours segregation, that divides our population into classes on any claim of expediency, of self-interest, of community interest, or of denominational interest, is dangerous and obnoxious and is bound to re-act to our national dishonour and our national disintegration.

This country has a great future. We have all the elements of a great nation—a vast extent of territory, illimitable resources of a diversified character; millions of acres of arable land stretching from ocean to ocean; a large system of inland waterways of great commercial importance; vast stretches of forest country; great areas of lands containing minerals of all kinds; a climate which is conducive to a hardy, virile race, and a dominating Canadian personality that has placed its hall-mark on our native-born population. This country is in the eye of the world as never before, and an ever increasing stream of immigrants from war-swept Europe will continue to find its way to our shores. These people will come here with pre-conceived opinions of freedom of government, and with revolutionary ideals.

They will come here with social and religious opinions as varied as the people themselves. They will come here representing all grades of humanity, the fit, the unfit, and the misfits, asking for an opportunity to live out their allotted span on the virgin soil of Canada. If we admit them—and I submit, Mr. Speaker, we must admit them, by a selective process, if you will—then we must shoulder the responsibility for their education, future protection and support.

The North American continent has been the melting pot for the surplus population of Europe for two centuries. As has been so well said, the nineteenth century belonged to the United States, and the twentieth century will belong to the Dominion of Canada. The words of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), that within fifteen years we may have a population of 20,000,000 people, are prophetic. I believe it is within easy distance of this country to attain by a progressive immigration policy. These surplus peoples have been and will be flung promiscuously into the arms of Canada that she may take them to her broad bosom and make them her own. They do not come here by accident, not by any mere chance, but in the fulfilment of a Divine plan. The hand of destiny directs their course, and the finger of destiny points the way for Canada to link her future with theirs.

How best to assimilate them, to transform them into good, law-abiding progressive citizens, is the problem this country must solve; and we expect Union Government to adopt a national policy on this question, to throw down the barriers of race and religion and to unite our people in a common national ideal that will consolidate this country from coast to coast into a permanent Canadian entity. The Dominion Government cannot shirk the issue by delegating it to the provinces, but should co-operate with the provinces in co-ordinating our school system on a national basis, having for its object the assimilation of the foreigner, the blending of nationalities, and the formation of a permanent Canadian type that will stamp its mentality forever on the Land of the Maple.

Education, then, is the imperative duty of the State. We may as well face the situation that confronts us to-day and prepare for eventualities. Everything points to further disturbances the world over. There is no permanent peace in sight. The world is in a dangerous mood; Europe is seething with revolution, and our foreign element is restless in sympathy with their home coun-

tries. Nothing prevents Bolshevism from raising its ugly head in this country but the scattered condition of its votaries, and the sane attitude of our industrial class, combined with the efforts of the Government to give employment to the masses. I compliment the Government on its progressive policy in this respect. It is worthy of the support of every man who has the welfare of his country at heart. Bolshevism is autocracy in reaction. We have had many examples of it in the world, but the latest one is Russia. A people held under the leash of autocratic restraint for centuries suddenly find their bonds are severed and rush to the opposite extreme of lawlessness, rapine and murder. Every man his own lawmaker; human passions unrestrained, surge and flow in the widest confusion, reducing the immortal soul of man to a depth of degradation beneath the lowest grade of the brute creation. Russia to-day exhibits to a shuddering world the most beastly spectacle of human depravity that ever stained the pages of history. Nothing remains but to confine them within their own boundaries until their passions recoil in horror from their terrible excesses. Bolshevism is rooted in ignorance. Ignorance is slavery, a slavery that fetters the intellect and stunts the soul. Let this country rise to the occasion and baffle this mediæval monster masquerading under the guise of freedom. Education on broad lines of justice and truth is the remedy. Education of all our people without regard to the restraints of race or religion is the only hope of democracy. We often hear the statement made that democracy must be made safe for the people, but, Mr. Speaker, democracy is the people, and the people must be educated in order to be safe for democracy. The greatest guarantee for the security of life and property is education. If you inculcate into the youthful mind a love for the eternal principles of truth and justice, democracy will take care of itself.

There is more illiteracy on the North American continent than most people believe. By illiteracy I mean inability to read or write in any language. According to Secretary Lane, the United States had 700,000 men of draft age who could neither read nor write a military order, while in the whole population of the United States there were 7,700,000 people over ten years of age who could neither read nor write in any language, or 7.7 per cent of the total population. In the Dominion of Canada, according to the census of 1911, there were 663,453 persons over five years of age who could neither read nor write in any language. By provinces, the percentages are as follows, and I am giving these with the lowest percentages first:

	Per Cent.
Ontario	6.51
Prince Edward Island	7.61
Nova Scotia	10.04
British Columbia	11.61
Quebec	12.66
Alberta	12.72
Manitoba	13.31
Yukon	13.58
Saskatchewan	13.70
New Brunswick	14.05

According to a census of 1916, there were in the Prairie Provinces 102,425 people who could not speak English, and it was found that when foreigners were allowed to settle en bloc there was the greatest illiteracy and least knowledge of English. It was found by the educationists in those provinces that segregation prevents education and retards assimilation.

According to the census in 1911, we find that of people over five years of age, the following percentages were illiterate:

	Per Cent.
Canadian-born males	11.45
Canadian-born females	9.81
British-born males	3.78
British-born females	4.13
Foreign-born males	16.89
Foreign-born females	16.97

Hon. members will see from this that those coming from the Mother Country show the least amount of illiteracy; they are better educated than the people in this country, and 11.45 per cent of the total Canadian-born over five years of age is a rather high percentage for the Dominion of Canada. It must, however, be remembered that quite a number of these people had foreign-born parents and that would give a certain reason for their illiteracy, but we should not have such a large percentage of the second generation of our foreign people unable to read or write. The same census shows the following percentage of illiteracy amongst those over twenty-one years of age:

	Per Cent.
Canadian-born males	9.55
British-born males	3
Foreign-born males	16.56

That shows that when they grew up to manhood, quite a large number of these illiterates still retained their illiteracy. In other words, of 107,366 men over twenty-one years of age who were illiterate, 37,745 were Canadian born and 57,389 foreign born. This would indicate that we really need

a more progressive policy with regard to the education of the foreign-born people in this country, and especially for the children of the foreign-born who are allowed to grow up in an illiterate state. For the information of the House I will give a few percentages of the illiteracy the world over: Austria, 18.7 per cent; Belgium, 12.7; France, 14.1; Greece, 57.2; Italy, 37; Portugal, 68.9; Rumania, 60.8. Russia, where Bolshevism is at present running riot, is the most illiterate country in Europe, and possibly in the civilized world, with 69 per cent of illiterates.

Mr. BELAND: Has my hon. friend the figures for Sweden?

Mr. ANDERSON: No.

Mr. BELAND: I ask because it is generally understood that Sweden has no illiterates at all. I do not know whether that is true, and I only ask for information.

Mr. ANDERSON: Perhaps that is why Sweden is not in the list I saw. Australia's percentage is 1.8; New South Wales, 2 per cent; New Zealand, .9 per cent; Queensland, 2.5 per cent. I believe that these figures will indicate that the countries that have national non-sectarian schools have the least illiteracy. The percentage of illiterates in Australia, which has non-sectarian schools, is 1.8, while North America—the United States and Canada—we have as high as 7.7 and 11.45.

The census of 1911 shows that there was a total population in the Dominion of 7,206,643, of whom 54.08 per cent were British, 28.5 French, and 17.41 foreign born. There were 752,732 foreign-born in Canada in 1911, and of these 62 per cent were in the four western provinces. Of these foreigners, 45.77 per cent were naturalized, and 54.23 per cent were aliens. The percentage of foreign-born in the leading cities is as follows: Toronto, 8.8; Montreal, 9.2; Hamilton, 9.4; Calgary, 20; Edmonton, 22; Regina, 22.6; Winnipeg, 24.2; Vancouver, 27.6, and Fort William, 28.2. This will demonstrate that the larger part of our foreign element is in the country west of the Great Lakes.

From the same census I find that the people belong to religious denominations as follows: Presbyterians, 1,115,324; Methodists, 1,079,892; Anglicans, 1,043,017; other Protestants, 457,470, making a total of 3,735,703. Roman Catholics, 2,833,041; Greeks, 88,507, a total of 2,921,548. This does not take into consideration the other denominations which can scarcely be classed as Protestants or Roman Catholics, and which make up a small part of our population. These various people were divided among 72 religious denominations.

From these figures it will be seen that the bulk of our foreign-born immigrants are in the Western Provinces. Of the naturalized foreigners, 71.85 per cent are in the Western Provinces; that is, more are naturalized in the Western Provinces than in the East; 16.01 per cent in Ontario and 2.19 per cent in the Maritime Provinces. It will also be seen that Canada is overwhelmingly British in its population, and it is likely to remain so on account of the sane immigration legislation introduced by the present Government. I believe it is in the interests of this country that that should be so. The Anglo-Saxon race has placed its mark indelibly on the North American continent. The language, the customs, and the habits are theirs. English is spoken by 110,000,000 people on the North American continent, and by four-fifths of the people in the Dominion of Canada. It is essential to the economic and social welfare of every citizen of this country that he should be able to speak that language; otherwise, he will be under a very serious handicap. This does not mean the exclusion of other languages from our public or private life. I believe that the French language which has a hold in this country should be taught; it is a beautiful language, and I am only sorry that I cannot speak it myself. I do not think any person in this country should be debarred from speaking or studying that language, and there should be no objection to it being taught in our national schools.

A national non-sectarian school is not a question of religion or of race, but a question of what kind of education in the interests of the country as a whole shall the State provide for the children in our public schools, for the maintenance of which all the people are taxed without regard to race or creed. Experience tells us that this education should be of a harmonizing, unifying character, blending the children of our cosmopolitan population together with common aims and common hopes. That being the case, has the State any duty to perform in regard to education in our public schools. That question will be answered in the affirmative by four-fifths of the people in this country.

As we have at least 72 different religious denominations in Canada, it is not in the interests of this country that any one of those denominations should be singled out for special privilege. Such special privi-

lege is a signal for distrust and attack. The system is vicious in principle, and dangerous in practice. To give concessions to a minority because it is a minority is entirely wrong. What is good for the majority should be equally good for the minority. It is claimed that the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec have been granted the same privileges as the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Ontario in their public schools; I think hon. gentlemen opposite have said so today, and I believe it is correct. I believe that the Protestants have the same privileges in the schools of the province of Quebec as the Roman Catholics have in the province of Ontario. This may appear fair on the surface, but it works out rather to the disadvantage of the Protestants. In Ontario the Roman Catholic children have the privilege of going to the public school if there is no separate school in their parish. There they receive a good common education on secular subjects without any interference whatever with their religion; there is no attempt whatever to give them any religious instruction. But in the province of Quebec, if the Protestant sends his children to the Roman Catholic school, they are always hearing the religion of that faith taught in the school. They are not compelled to study it, but they are young and their minds are impressionable, and when they hear this religion taught repeatedly they gain a certain insight into a faith which their parents are not in sympathy with. Consequently, it works out rather to the disadvantage of the Protestant.

The parochial, or separate, or confessional, schools—call them what you will—are getting some hold in the Canadian West, particularly among the foreign element which have these schools in their own country. These schools are a relic of the past, and it would be a retrograde movement to have them established in this country. The struggle for secular schools has been long and bitter, and the fruits of that struggle should not be endangered. The parochial school is usually under the control of some particular denomination and is inclined to be narrow in its character. It places too much stress on the teaching of religious subjects without teaching religion, and its main object is to perpetuate ecclesiastical control.

Parochial schools favour segregation and prevent that social intercourse which is productive of friendly relationship. They are productive of class interests and class hatred. They divide the people on racial and religious lines and retard assimilation. The parochial school, as we have it in this country, is almost entirely racial and in that sense is unnational. It favours disruption rather than unity. Unless under strict supervision by the education authorities it is a menace to the future peace and progress of this country. This is more clearly seen in relation to the great tide of immigration which is coming to our shores. In the Canadian West there are foreign communities, people coming from foreign lands, from the autocratic countries of Europe, living in communities where they have their own churches, papers, schools, and stores, and speaking their own language to the exclusion of the French and English languages. Democracy can have no chance in a community such as that. These people are the representatives of autocratic countries in Europe and they are propagating the ideas they imbibed there. There is no Canadianization going on amongst them, assimilation is at a standstill, and it is not by that means that they can be made into good Canadian citizens. You will find these communities in different parts of the West. Communities of Ruthenians can be found in Manitoba near Gimli, Sifton, Starbuck and Shore Lake; in Saskatchewan near Kenora, Rosthern and Vonda, and in Alberta near Starz and Pakan, northeast of Edmonton.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that it is a difficult matter to prevent these communities from forming. These people want to live together and our own Canadian element is not desirous of living amongst them. But I contend that these people should be compelled to have our public schools in their midst, that they should be taught the English language, and the responsibilities of Canadian citizenship and be made acquainted with our laws. If we ever want to make them citizens of this country we must exact these conditions. We are handing out to these people the vote when they have absolutely no knowledge of what a vote means. They are simply parts of autocratic Europe scattered over our Canadian West and living in the heart of a democratic country.

The British North America Act, as I said before, was a compromise between the two dominating nationalities inhabiting this country at the time of Confederation. The object of this Act was unity; the intention of the Fathers of Confederation was to effect such a confederation of the provinces

as it was fondly hoped would unite the various parts of British North America on terms of equality and unity. It was hoped that the races would in time amalgamate into common entity and become what they must ultimately become, a distinctly Canadian type. Neither race should dominate the other; in fact, neither race will dominate the other but all races represented in this country must fuse imperceptibly into each other so that Canada may fulfil the great destiny intended for her in the civilization of the world. There is little use to kick against the pricks; an inexorable fate shapes our course. Time and the tide of immigration coming to our shores will ultimately break down all barriers and leaven the whole into one common mould.

That leavening process has gone on and is making considerable progress; so much so in fact that there is a Canadian type easily recognized now. But so far as the two dominating races are concerned, there is no fusion and there is only the semblage of unity. The British North America Act is a failure in this respect. After fifty years trial this must be admitted by any impartial judge. The alignment of this House proves it. The cause of the present cleavage is significant and demands an explanation. Unless the cause is found the remedy cannot be applied. I believe it to be in our educational system. Our schools are too narrow in their scope. They are too provincial. They fail to take that broad national character which can visualize Canada as a whole and which is productive of sound Canadian citizenship. The main object of our schools is to produce Canadians worthy of their greatest heritage, Canadians pure and simple, not Englishmen or Frenchmen, not Protestants or Roman Catholics, but Canadians without regard to race or creed. The public school then is a national issue. It is imperative that we have a national policy on education.

In the working out of our school system the personalty of and the equipment of the teacher should not be overlooked. The teacher is the greatest benefactor in the land —the school-mistress and the school-master are the pillars of civilization—without whom this old world would soon revert to barbarism; and yet there is no class of public servants so shamefully underpaid. There is very little to tempt them to begin and nothing to induce them to remain.

During this reconstruction period when old superstitions and social fallacies are being swept aside with such astonishing swiftness, something should be done to raise this important profession to the high financial standard its usefulness deserves, so that our returned soldiers many of whom have already nearly qualified may be tempted to enter the profession. I would respectfully draw the attention of the Government to the importance of giving these men every assistance to induce them to enter the teaching profession. None are so capable to give our public schools and high schools that patriotic atmosphere which is so essential to the production of sound Canadian citizenship.

There will be many monuments erected by a grateful people to the memory of our heroic soldiers. These monuments will be placed in the most prominent positions in every city and town across this broad country. They will represent the local ideas and will be representative of the community characteristics of the people. They will take many forms in accordance with the diversity of opinion in the various sections interested. An effort should be made to make them as beautiful in form and as lasting in material as skill can erect.

Canada is a young country but already rich in inspiring traditions which should be kept well before the notice of our growing population. These monuments will have a great educational value. Their importance in this respect should not be overlooked. The creation of a patriotic national sentiment is inseparable from them. They point to our part played in the great struggle for human liberty which has just been brought to a successful conclusion. They will inspire future generations to emulate the heroic self-sacrifice and loyalty to the Empire of our young men who so promptly came forward to offer their services in defence of human liberty.

A day should be set apart as a national holiday for the decoration of these monuments. A suitable day for this purpose would be the day on which peace is signed by the great powers. It will come at a time of the year when flowers are available and the weather suitable for outside celebration, a day on which it is fondly hoped the dove of peace on expectant wings will slowly settle down on a blood-stained world. Veterans of the Great War could have reunions, and the public could meet to hear patriotic addresses having for their purpose the intensifying of a national sentiment, in which this country is deficient.

The graves of our heroic dead 3,000 miles away cannot be decked with the flowers which loving hands would fain place on them. These monuments could be decorated

"In Memoriam" of them with flowers, and this would give the occasion that touch of solemnity necessary to deep, abiding sentiment. Canada is commencing a new era of untold possibilities. We can only glimpse our wonderful potentialities by taking a mental vision of the years ahead. A hundred millions of people will inhabit this country in less than a century, and they will be a people which only a northern clime can produce, a people who will sway the civilized world with their wealth and commercial power. The foundation is now being laid, and it is the supreme duty of the hour for all our people to unite in giving up racial and religious differences and in laying the foundation on the rocks of truth, justice and honour.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): In the discussion of this subject I have already been criticised adversely by many friends who say that by national schools we aim a blow at civil and religious liberty; that we seek to increase the influence of the Dominion Government; that we are unconstitutional; and those who know my constituency best say that I am, by speaking on the subject, sealing my political damnation. I do not propose to argue any of the objections made to national schools unless those objections are supported by sound arguments. So far as the unconstitutionality of this question is concerned, the consent of the province will remove all difficulties in the way; and so far as my political damnation is concerned in my own constituency, if to occupy a public position means that a man is going to sacrifice his personal conviction and be a slave to factions moved by personal interest, bias, bigotry or religious narrowness, then somebody else can be the slave, for I prefer not to have the unenviable distinction.

We have heard in this House during the present session a number of men who have been wont to speak of the Society of Nations as though Canada was a nation, when, as a matter of fact it is not, in spite of what may be said by opportunist politicans who seek to foist upon us as realities the dreams of their political and speculative imagination. Granting, however that Canada enjoys the status of a nation, I am going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, the following question: Does it constitute a nation to have a collection of warring provinces? I am willing to grant you, for the sake of argument, that we have the full status of nationhood. Are we then a nation when you find various provinces viewing important questions of public life in Canada through different glasses? What then, you may ask, is a nation? It is defined as an agglomeration of men, of people, who have had the same love and the same hatred; who have tasted the same joys, and undergone the same reverses; who revere the same great historical figures; who salute the same flag, and interpret its meaning in the same way, because they have received in the same school the same mentality; in other words, an agglomeration of men whose intellectual, moral and political formation is the same. Sir Martin Conway defines a nation as follows:

> What in fact is a nation? It is not merely a number of individuals dwelling within a particular geographical area, nor a population talking a common language, nor is it to be defined by the possession of a common stock or blood-relationship. A nation is the whole population of an area, organized into a single crowd by the possession of a common ideal. It is patriotism that makes a nation, not vice versa. Thus Africanders will be a nation, if they are not so already, when their feeling of unity overpowers and submerges their attachment to their component race-crowds. There is no reason even to desire an individual to forget whether he is of British or Dutch origin. That is an immaterial detail once the passion of the over-crowd is stronger than that of the section. When that has been brought about a nation exists; and the common ideal once created is liable to grow into that kind of passion which, as Mr. Tim Healy informed Mr. Winston Churchill, can be recognized when it shows itself to be 'something that men willingly die for.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, geographical location, language, race, religion, and economic conditions are not essential factors in the formation of a nation. The Jewish nation is as real as any, yet it is scattered all over the world. Switzerland speaks many languages, and no one will deny that Switzerland is a nation. Two religions hold equal sway in Germany without menacing the existence of the German nation. Two absolutely distinct races inhabit Belgium, and yet we salute with respect the Belgian nation. So far as the economic side is concerned, were not the Germans more attached to their own people than to the Poles, with whom they had the most lucrative commercial relations? The essential primordial factor in the formation of a nation is mentality; and no matter what may be the geographical location, religion, race or economic conditions of the Canadians, if they possess the same mentality, then, and then only, will they be a nation. The national school, according to my view, is the instrument with which to accomplish efficiently and successfully this object. How can the people of Ontario, Quebec, the western provinces, and the Maritime

Provinces discuss harmoniously the rights and the duties of the citizen, the family, and the state, if they possess three or four different mentalities; the flag of Canada means a different thing to each group. Let me give you a few examples of this most perplexing question. In 1884, at the time of the Sudan war the flag meant one thing to the French and another thing to the English. In 1889 at the time of the Boer war the same thing occurred. In 1914 the message of the flag was heard for the third time, and you know the results as well as I do. A certain author says:

> Narrowness, provincialism, bigotry, describe a personality in which unity of purpose is won at the sacrifice of breadth, outlook and sympathy. The highest type of personality grows out of many far-reaching selves which have been selected and organized into unity by a dominant purpose. It is no easy task to unify often divergent and conflicting impulses, habits, memories and ideals into a harmonious heirarchy of aims. But such singleness of ideal and effort creates power. The ideal personality includes many selves organized by a masterful purpose and unified by a spirit of harmony.

Ruskin says:

> Education does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know—it means teaching them to behave as they do not behave.

The French are probably more fortunate in the use of language. They have two words for the English "Education". In French the word education means the bringing up, the conduct of people in the sense referred to by Ruskin, and they use the word "instruction" for the learning which a person may gain. "I will do it," promises a South African. "On the word of an Englishman?" inquires his friend. "Yes, on the word of an Englishman". That is the finest tribute to the English public school and the English university that the country affords. That emphasizes absolutely what we should have in this nation when I speak of mentality, that people should so conduct themselves that their word is their bond, that it means everything.

Let me ask you candidly this question: Are you going to profit by the triple experience of 1884, 1899 and 1914 and lay the foundation of a school system, the result of which will be that my boy in the western provinces will have the same mentality as the boys of Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces; or, far from changing your views with regard to the primordial factor in the formation of a nation, will you continue to invade our western provinces with your retrograde mentalities because they are provincial and so create unfortunate reactions?

[Mr. Mackie.]

I do not agree entirely with previous speakers when they refer to a national non-sectarian school. Why is it that the eye of God to-day, the only sanction of true morality, has been replaced in some of our western schools by the eye of the world,—a Pharisaical sanction; unless it be on account of the machinations of opportunist politicians who seek to place on our children the yoke of their respective religious organizations? Is there in this country a single thinker who would not be willing to make provincial sacrifices in order to endow the whole Dominion with a school system based on knowledge, respect and love of God? All nations that have achieved greatness, which still lives although the nations themselves may have disappeared, and whose thought still enchants the world—the Greeks and the Romans,—taught in their schools their children the knowledge, respect and love of God, who punishes the nations and individuals who transgress and rewards those who observe the principles of right and justice. If the non-sectarian school means that you are to ignore these fundamental principles, I could not support it.

Mr. Speaker, some people say that it is a question of the preservation of laws. I say it is not, for laws are merely the expression of facts, and, consequently, are transient. It is not a question of clinging to this or that organized church. We all know in what sect we were born and initiated, but after twenty, thirty or forty years can any man state with certainty to what creed he adheres? To quote the great Newman: "To live is to change; and to be perfect is to have changed often."

One of the previous speakers has given the key-note of what is expected of Canadians so far as the future is concerned, and in that connection I would like to read you what a returned soldier said regarding education. I quote from an article written by Capt. L. H. Lang in The Western Veteran of November 16 last:

> That means to say that the real task that lies before Canada to-day is the building up of a free and vigorous national spirit which will bring to her a great position amongst the nations of the world. No greater task has ever faced a country before. The days, too, of sectarianism are over and gone. Those of us who have been out to the Front are appalled and disgusted by the sight of churches whose duty it is to bear witness to a God of Love, dissipating their energy upon their little points of difference rather than presenting a united front against the powers of evil and self-centredness. The churches exist not for their own advancement or material success, but they exist to show the world at large the

road to a higher, deeper and more beautiful conception of human fellowship.

That is true of men who have been abroad and witnessed for themselves the political organizations which reside within their own churches.

It is said that national schools imply a question of language. I wish not to be misinterpreted in this regard because I state that it is not a question of language. Nature has settled that question in the valley of the St. Lawrence for all time to come with all its political, social and economic consequences. But, of course, it would be imprudent, it would be unpardonably clumsy, yes, it would be politically suicidal to allow certain affective, mystical and collective illusions to die out in Canada. I stated some time ago in this House that I knew a constituency in Alberta where there are three absolutely distinct national mentalities supplied by three different school systems, thanks to the methodical issue of permits. The member for that constituency has a triple political organization—English, French and Russian. When the fight is on they go forth with three battle cries. When among the English at Boyne Lake and Ashmount it is "Long live the British Empire"; then at Plamondville and Lac Labiche it is "Long live Quebec"; and when at Cache Lake and other Ruthenian centres it is "Russia for ever." You can quite understand that the member himself does not stoop to these religious and racial prejudices, but his organization is doing this work. There you see this system in all its crudity, and you appreciate how full of turpitude it is. If the school system in Alberta, for instance, permits this kind of thing, what can you expect of the rising generation? If to-day you have the Ukrainians of Western Canada petitioning the Dominion Government to establish national schools, it is because they were told they could have their separate schools just as the French have their primary course in the schools of the West. It is because the Government of each province has exploited the people for political reasons and has left them to-day under the impression that they are to be deported. When those people ask why they should be deported the answer is, that they have not become assimilated. They are not Canadians. The result is that having been cajoled into this unfortunate position by politicians, they are asking the Dominion Government to take hold of this question and to give them national education so they can become Canadianized.

9 p.m.

The Western Provinces differ somewhat from the Eastern Provinces in the matter of education. We have a large number of Americans coming in there, and often those men get permits to teach school the same as men from other provinces receive permits to teach in different languages, sometimes carrying on a French school entirely, sometimes a Russian. If you wish to keep the provinces united, if you wish to keep Confederation intact, it is necessary that something should be done in the way of education for our Western Provinces. We are being Americanized at a rapid rate, as will be admitted by every member from the West. At the present time if you go through the streets of some of our Western cities you will find the boys wearing a button on the lapel of their coats with the words, "We did it." Do you think any Canadian would be allowed to wear such a button on his coat in New York or in any of the other large cities of the United States?

The American would see that the bottom was removed. But out in the Western Provinces we do not pay any attention to these things. We are being Americanized, and it is not necessary that we should have a national school or some sort of schools to replace those of the present day.

I do not know whether all the facts have been given in connection with the literacy of the Western Provinces and of Canada as a whole, but something of interest struck me the other day when I was reading one of the local newspapers. It was the statement that four million American-born children never learned to read and write. The article goes on to say:—

> 100,000 of our public school teachers are only 19 years old.
>
> 50,000 of them are without high school education.
>
> The salary of a graduate teacher is no more than that of a milliner's apprentice while she is learning her trade.

An article by H. Addington Bruce deals with the American situation so far as teachers are concerned. I venture to say that what is true of the United States is true also of Canada, and more particularly of Western Canada. Young girls receive from $60 to $80 a month to teach in a school which is 150 or 200 miles from any large centre. Probably she is from sixteen to nineteen years of age, possessing only a permit, or sometimes the requisite diploma. How can children of this age—because they are children in reality—impart Canadian mentality to the younger men and women of the country? A girl of sixteen or eighteen

has to teach boys, Russians and Ruthenians, of twenty-two and twenty-three. These young people require more than the attention of a girl of sixteen to nineteen.

Again, how can you expect education in the Western Provinces to be properly carried out by teachers who do not intend to make teaching a profession? It is a fact that most young men and women who teach do not intend to make teaching a profession. With the man, it is a stepping-stone to the study of medicine or of some other profession; with the girl, it is only an interim occupation which she is prepared to give up at any time for a suitable marriage. In my opinion, the Government of Canada has as much to do with the education of its people as it has to do with its national defence. If the State is the fountain of all rights, on that principle I would say that it is the source of all duties, and it is the duty of the Government to make some arrangement with the provinces whereby the teaching profession shall be made one of permanency, whereby an inducement shall be given to men and women to remain in the teaching profession and whereby such remuneration shall be given to teachers that they may be anabled to travel and themselves acquire that education which they have not been able to acquire and can never acquire except by travelling.

I ask you, Sir, if the suggestions made in this House by hon. members do not constitute the proper way of building up a nation? One thing that disgusts me every time I hear it is the question which is often put by a French-Canadian or an English-Canadian whenever there is a disturbance of any consequence in the political, social or economical life of Canada: "Why should we not become part of the United States?" In 1775 Franklin offered us that national status, and we refused it because we knew what it meant. At the rate we are going now, it would appear that Canada can never be all English, nor yet all French, and if the motive is ever to perpetuate affective, mystical and collective illusions, then let them be French in Quebec and English in Ontario. That is the last resource of our patriots. Let us not forget that both the English and the French lost America through political and religious narrowness. The former withheld freedom from the thirteen colonies; the latter withheld refuge from the Huguenots. To-morrow the West will predominate. Is it not imperative to solve the problem of the school and to base our educational system on lines essentially Canadian and religious? We all want the system to be democratic. Let us take the first step in that direction by making it uniform.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (Toronto West): Mr. Speaker, the very deep interest that has been taken in the question of national schools in Western Canada has made it inevitable that the subject should at some time be discussed in this House, and it seems to me that this is the most appropriate time for its discussion.

I learn that in August next there is to take place in the city of Winnipeg the largest educational convention ever held in Canada. His Excellency the Governor General is to preside, and educationalists will be gathered together from all over the continent of North America. That being the case, it is interesting, as I think it is opportune, that some expressions of opinion should be given in this House upon the principal points that will be raised at that conference.

I compliment the mover of the amendment (Mr. Edwards) upon the courage that he displays in bringing before the House a question of this kind. I knew before he started that he would be charged with bigotry and intolerance. I do not think that he was animated by any such sentiment as that; I am quite certain that I am not when, following in his footsteps, I advocate the establishment in this country as soon as possible of a national non-sectarian school system.

We are indebted to the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) for information and quotations which show that the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) was in good company in bringing this question before Parliament. The member for Maisonneuve told us that the most outstanding advocate of non-sectarian schools in Canada was the late Hon. George Brown, the man who founded the party which hon. gentlemen opposite represent, the man who in the early days made a great fight for Liberal principles. Every Liberal since Hon. George Brown's time who has lead the party represented on the other side of the House has been his follower. He was an out-and-out, convinced and vigorous opponent of separate schools, and the attitude that he took in his day is practically the attitude that is taken to-day by the member for Frontenac on the floor of this House. He argued then, as we argue now, that two sets of schools tend to disunion and disintegration rather than to national unity and mutual understanding. The

member for Maisonneuve stated the case exactly when he told us that the late Hon. George Brown accepted forcibly the principle of separate schools being drafted into our Act of Confederation. It was not because he was brought to believe that it was the right thing to do; he found it to be impossible to effect the Confederation without making this concession to the advocates of the dual school system. He was disposed to sink the lesser in the greater. That is the explanation of his acceptance of the principle of a dual school system of the two provinces of Canada. But the separate schools and the separate school law that we have in Ontario to-day are very different from the statute which was assented to by the late Hon. George Brown. His biographer has told us that when he returned from Ottawa to his home city and was criticised for surrendering his views on the school question, he stated that what had been conceded was innocuous and that, in his judgment, the concession was so small that it could never be profitably worked. I do not know whether he was right or not, but I am inclined to think he was. But this is what happened: No sooner was that particular concession made than the advocates of separate schools proceeded to work on the provincial government and particularly upon the then Prime Minister, the late Sir Oliver Mowat, and during nearly the whole term of his premiership which lasted about thirty years, one concession after another was given to separate schools until, although that is a special privilege to one sect in Ontario, the schools, which they desired and which had been given to them as a special privilege, are almost on a parity with the public school system. That never was in the mind of the late hon. George Brown, because he believed, as my hon. friend said, that what was adopted in 1867, and which was practically the law of 1863, was to be a final settlement. But it is stated in Mr. Hodgins' book upon the Separate School Act of Ontario, in which he quotes all the correspondence of the late Edgerton Ryerson, that while Bishop Charbonnell and Bishop Macdonald agreed that this should be a final settlement, the ink was scarcely dry on the Act of 1863 before additional concessions were demanded. The story that is told in that book is a very interesting one. The writer, Dr. Edgerton Ryerson tells this story that he had a conference with the two bishops and he put this question to them: Is this to be a final settlement of the separate school question in Ontario? Neither of the bishops said a word, but both of them bowed their assent to his proposition, and he accepted that as a statement from them that it was to be a final settlement. As I say, it was only a few months afterwards before those same ecclesiastics were back in the city of Ottawa demanding further extensions of the separate school principle. This is laid down very clearly in Mr. Hodgins' book.

I wish to correct the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) on another point. In the course of his address to-day, he stated that Separate schools were adopted by the United Parliament of Upper and Lower Canada, with the consent of a majority given by the representatives of Ontario. That was not the case. There was an understanding in the Parliament of the United Canadas that no question affecting one province should be made into law unless there was a majority from that province favourable to it. That undertaking was observed on the part of the representatives of Ontario with the utmost faithfulness, but it was departed from on the part of the representatives of Quebec when the late Hon. R. W. Scott introduced his Separate School Act, and when it came to a vote on that question, it will be found recorded that the vote from Ontario was 26 against and 10 for, with a solid delegation lacking one from Quebec supporting the 10 who voted in favour of Separate schools for Ontario. Therefore, the Separate school system was forced upon Ontario against the will of the majority of its representatives and by a solid phalanx from Quebec.

I think every true Canadian will approach this question of national schools with the desire to see all classes of the population living in harmony and co-operating to realize the great potentialities of our country. As I understand the situation in Canada, it is only by educating our children to be Canadians and by introducing a system that will develop their initiative and cultivate their native talents that we can hope to create a citizenship equal to the great tasks that lie before us. National unity is something that we all profess to regard as essential to our progress, prosperity and happiness as a people. To bring this about, we must understand each other. This does not involve a surrender of our cherished convictions, but it requires an effort on our part to find a way of getting closer together than we are to-day and one that will lead our children to higher levels of service where they may be able to work more harmoniously while main-

taining their distinctive views on political and religious questions. There is a wide range of subjects upon which we all unite in educating the citizens of to-morrow. Those subjects that separate us are very few and, in my opinion, they are easy of adjustment, granting that there is a desire on the part of all, the leaders of both races and of both creeds, to unite for this purpose. I think I may say and be within the judgment of the House that the one particular thing that divides us is religion so far as education is concerned. We have on the one side those who believe that no educational system is satisfactory unless in the primary schools religious dogmas form an important part of the curriculum. We have on the other side those who are quite as sincerely convinced that secular studies and religious instruction should be separated. I am a strong advocate of religious instruction; in my opinion there is nothing more important in the training of children than the teaching of the principles of Christianity, but that should not be imparted at the expense of the State, nor by public officials. It is the duty of parents and of the church to provide for that kind of instruction. I believe too that it will be much more effective when it is performed by such agencies than if it is conducted as a part of the studies in the public schools. My conception of religion is such that I do not think religious principles can be properly impressed upon the minds of children when those principles are imparted under the strict and sometimes punitive discipline of the schools. As I understand religion, the centre and substance of it is love, which is, in the child's mind at least, pretty largely divorced from the idea of punishment by its teacher.

My conception is that it is better for the child, better for his morality, that he should receive his religious instruction under different auspices. I know that in holding these views I differ with many sincere people; yet holding these views it becomes my duty to try and give effect to them. I would not put any obstacles in the way of any church teaching the children of its congregation the tenets of its creed. On the contrary, I would afford the church the most ample facilities, but I would divorce religious instruction from secular study, and I believe it would be to the advantage of the children from both standpoints.

To attain the desirable end of national unity we must begin with the children. It is by intimate association that one child will be led to see the good qualities in the other. That cannot be accomplished by separation. It can only come from daily contact, in the thousand-and-one relations where one helps the other, and the inner life and spirit of the children is revealed. We all know that the friendships made in school days are the strongest and most enduring in the experience of men; that needs no elaboration because it is within the knowledge of every member of this House. That being the case, it is nothing short of a national crime to keep the children apart and organize them into two different camps on the basis of religion. We did not organize the army in that way, and if we had attempted to do so we would soon have discovered that we had made a capital mistake. Is it not the case that separation leads to misunderstanding and breeds distrust and suspicion? It is so in all the relations of life. Therefore, it is not surprising that the divisions that begin in the primary schools of this country are perpetuated to a greater or lesser degree all through the lives of the people. How any man can hope to bring about national unity under these circumstances it is hard to understand.

The sentiment in favour of a national non-sectarian school system has been growing rapidly in the last few years, and I am convinced that the more the matter is discussed the stronger the sentiment will grow. In Canada to-day all the Maritime Provinces have school laws that provide for one non-sectarian system of education. In the province of Prince Edward Island the benefits of this system obtrude themselves upon the visitor from another province. Any friction that exists in the province of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick is due to evasions of the law, by which the children are separated in their school life notwithstanding the provisions of the Act. It would probably be impossible to persuade the electors of those two provinces to change their school laws and establish conditions such as are to be found in the province of Ontario. Therefore, the proposal contained in the resolution does not affect the situation in the Maritime Provinces at all.

In my judgment, the most striking example of the benefits of national schools is to be found in the province of Manitoba. The Government in power there is a Liberal Government; the political affiliations of its ministers are supposed to be with the dominant political party in Quebec. Nevertheless, the Norris Government has revolu-

tionized the school system of the province, to the immense advantage of the people generally. In that province the principle of separation had been carried to the most extreme limit. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to-day stated the terms of that Act, by which any school with ten children of a certain nationality might have its own language used in the school for instructional purposes. Under that law, prior to 1913, the schools were conducted in at least five different languages. If the majority of a school section were German, German was the language of the school; if the majority were Poles, Polish was the language of the school. When by reason of newcomers entering the district the majority was changed from one nationality to another, the language of the school was changed also. The result was confusion and grave disorder, rapidly approaching a condition of anarchy. When the Liberal Government of Hon. T. C. Norris was confronted with the responsibility of bringing order out of this educational chaos, it was decided to adopt the principle of a non-sectarian school with one language, and in the short space of five years a veritable transformation has been effected. The schools have been made efficient, the children are keen to learn, and their parents are proud of the achievements of their little ones. I have visited schools in the province of Manitoba in which every child present was of foreign parentage, and yet by tact and patience the teachers were bringing on the pupils as rapidly as in any other school in the country. The good effects of this system are not confined to the children. Their parents, the new citizens of this country, are inspired by the success of their young folk to acquire a Canadian outlook. They cease looking backward to the land of their birth, and now face forward and strive to become good Canadian citizens. I should like to quote a paragraph from a letter written by Mr. F. B. Lacey to Dr. Thornton, Minister of Education for the province of Manitoba, after an inspection of the schools in the foreign districts of that province:

> While travelling around amongst the people in the organized portions of Manitoba one cannot help but notice the changes that have taken place among the people who came from Central Europe a few short years ago. They are amongst the most progressive people in Canada, and in ten years from now when those who are now attending the schools to-day shall have grown up and gone out into the various fields of labour open to them, we shall find among them some of our best women and men. The teaching of the English language, British ideals, sanitation, etc., is lifting these boys and girls up into a different and a better life.

That is the unbiased opinion of one who has made a thorough inspection of the schools in Manitoba. In the other Western Provinces the example of Manitoba has proved contagious, and there is a growing sentiment in favour of one national school system, which will eventually lead to the adoption in those provinces of the Manitoba law. At the last session of the Legislature of Saskatchewan important changes were made in the school laws by which all the schools have been put upon a new basis, approximating the plan in operation in Manitoba. No discerning man can doubt the ultimate adoption of a national school system throughout all Western Canada.

And now I come to the province of Ontario. I have already referred to the way in which the separate school was grafted upon the educational system of the province, and I am satisfied that the great majority of the people of Ontario would welcome such changes in the school law as would make it possible for all our children to be educated together, to play together, to grow up together, to develop a common ideal.

To show you how that works out, I refer you to two of the smaller towns in the eastern part of Ontario. The town of Port Hope is a considerable industrial centre and it is only a few miles from the town of Cobourg. In the town of Port Hope there are no separate schools, and there is a feeling of unity in that town that is admirable in every way. Those who have different faiths go their different ways on Sunday, but during the rest of the week they are friends and neighbours co-operating in all the activities of the town and joining in all those things of community interest. A few miles away is the town of Cobourg. There they have separate schools and there friction exists and there is no cause to which we can attribute it except the fact that the children, young men and young women, have been brought up in the two different schools and taught from their childhood that they should not get together for community purposes. If you speak to any young man in the town of Cobourg, he will tell you that the children of one school organize regular quarrels, snow-balling fights and sometimes instead of snow-balls they throw stones at one another. They are not old enough to know why they do that, but they have had it impressed upon them that there is the difference between this school and that school. Instead of

coming together on the football or the baseball field, they show intolerance one of another, and that is directly attributable to the instruction that goes out from these separate schools.

I have a very striking quotation here which I would like to read to the House, because it seems to me to indicate, not only as I interpret it but as an important and influential newspaper of my own province interprets it, that this condition is the result of the teaching in the separate schools of Ontario. I quote from the Christian Guardian, published in Toronto. The writer begins by saying:

> Do Roman Catholics feel the same loyalty to the state that Protestants do? Without hesitation we would answer that some of them do; but it is certain that some of them do not, and this is explained in a recent issue of the Catholic Record.

The Catholic Record, of London, is, in my judgment, the most ably edited and the best-written Roman Catholic paper published in the Dominion of Canada. The men who conduct that weekly newspaper are capable journalists, and theirs is the most creditable journalistic representative of the cause for which it speaks. The article in the Christian Guardian goes on to quote this paragraph from the Record:

> We cannot understand the abnormal enthusiasm that the sight of the flag evokes among our intelligent non-Catholic fellow citizens. They are an enigma to us, and we perhaps are just as much of an enigma to them. Their enthusiastic display of loyalty seems to us puerile and even idiotic. This is because we do not realize that there is nothing that holds a higher place in the affections of the majority of our non-Catholic Britishers than the flag. In a word, their mentality is different from ours because, if we may use the expression, our household gods are not theirs.

This paper represents the advocates of separate schools in the province of Ontario, and declares in cold type, and after deliberation, that the enthusiasm of the English-speaking Protestants of Ontario for the flag is "puerile and even idiotic." I submit that it must be clear to this House that if we have a system of schools in Ontario that turns out graduates who regard enthusiasm for the flag of the country as puerile and idiotic there is something wrong with the system, and the sooner it is corrected the better it will be for the cause of national unity. I can see no reason why the children of Canada cannot receive their secular instruction together and their religious teaching separately. That is the way the Hebrews in Toronto inculcate their religion. Special classes are held by the Rabbis, or their assistants, after the regular school hours, and the Jewish children attend for instruction in religion. There is no reason why that plan should not be followed by the Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and all other denominations. Then we would have a guarantee that the hours in school would be devoted to preparing the next generation for the secular duties of citizenship. If the churches as a whole would undertake the religious education, I am sure the results to the children would be better than those obtained by mixing secular and sacred as at the present time.

What must impress the members of this House as a significant circumstance is the fact that the question of establishing a national school system was first introduced by a representative from the province of Quebec. He introduced this question into the Senate. That his resolution represents the views of a considerable minority in that province seems to be established by several incidents that have transpired during the past year. The province of Quebec for reasons that are within the knowledge of hon. members, is perhaps the last place in Canada from which we might expect such a proposal to emanate. And yet a vigorous propaganda is being carried on there for educational reform. Not much has been accomplished as yet but experience and history teach us that once a question of this kind is presented by earnest men it gains in strength with great rapidity. Already some concessions, such as uniform text books, have been secured and a compulsory attendance law is bound to follow before long because it has proved to be a wise measure in every country where it has been tried. When it is advocated by men like Lord Shaughnessy and Senator Dandurand and scores of the most prominent lay leaders in the province, it cannot be long resisted. The opposition given to the agitation made by Mr. Bouchard, of St. Hyacinthe, has had the effect of making most of the people do some thinking on that important question. As a consequence of the study given to it we find the Trades and Labour Council of Montreal—two-thirds of the members being French Canadians—passing a resolution in favour of a national school system. These men constitute the parliament of labour in the largest industrial centre of the Dominion. They speak for the workers, whose children are the ones most vitally affected by any inefficiency of the school system.

They are men who have come up through the existing schools. They know by personal experience the shortcomings of the schools and with deliberation and earnestness they discuss this question, and by advocating a national school system condemn that which is in vogue. If there is any class of citizens whose voices should be heard with respect on an issue of this kind it is that class who must depend upon the state schools to educate their children.

But it is not only the working classes that are dissatisfied. When men like Mr. Bouchard, Senator Beaubien, and many other French Canadian leaders, feel constrained to utter their protest against the inefficiency of the system it becomes apparent that the public sentiment in favour of the motion is widespread and that it includes many different circles.

The press of the province as a whole gives no support to the demand for national schools. Perhaps it is too much to expect that at this stage of the movement. The influences against it are too powerful and apt to resent any attempt to press it forward. Still, there are some papers published in Quebec which speak for the movement and do so with the greatest frankness. Among these is L'Autorité, of Montreal, which in September, 1918, said:

> Give us less of the stories of Jonah inside or outside the whale, and more of arithmetic. We will even go farther than that and ask that the control of education be transferred from the provincial to the federal domain. Nothing, in fact, is more logical than this, for the reason that where the greatness and the unity of our country are concerned we should have national schools.

That is not the only paper which talks in that way. I have also a clipping from Le Pays, of Montreal, which in an issue of March of this year, declared:

> If the men of age to carry arms had been raised in national schools the voluntary recruitment would have given much better results and this province would have received more benefit, for the reason that it was Quebec which suffered most in her reputation.

While I do not offer the opinions of these papers as an expression of the general sentiment of the people of Quebec, they represent a minority which, in my judgment, are thinking along right lines and furthering a movement which meets with the sympathy of the majority in every one of the other provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to try and demonstrate the necessity for some Federal supervision or action, to such limited degree as may be thought wise in connection with their educational system. I submit that it is well within the province of this Parliament, and of the Dominion authorities, to see that a national sentiment of the right kind is created in Canada. In this connection I want to enlighten the House as to the kind of school books that are being used in the English-speaking public schools of Quebec, which books, I may say, I have examined personally. I find that in the third reader there are three lessons which are complimentary to Britain, and six lessons which are laudatory of Germany; and that book, Mr. Speaker, was reprinted in the year 1917, three years after the war had started. If that is the kind of stuff that is being taught in schools anywhere in this Dominion, I think it is only right and proper for the Federal power to endeavour to rectify it. In another reader used in the same class of schools I find the same thing to exist: Two of the lessons are favourable to Britain, and seven are complimentary to Germany. If this had happened ten or fifteen years ago, when we had a different idea of Germany from that which we entertain today, one might not have been surprised; but when such books as these are reprinted in the year 1917, there must be exceeding carelessness somewhere on the part of the authorities, and I submit, some effort should be made to rectify the condition. Certainly a national sentiment, whether it be French or British, cannot be developed by teaching lessons of such a nature.

Now I desire to refer for a moment to the textbooks that are used in the French schools of Quebec. A careful examination of these discloses nothing at all in their contents that would teach a child that it is going to grow up to be a British citizen; the sentiment inculcated throughout is purely French. I have no objection to the school books in the province of Quebec favouring the very romantic and interesting features of the early French discoveries and developments; I have no objection to the maintenance of French sentiment in Quebec; but I do say that at the very least there should be lessons in those books such as would teach the children of that province that they are British and are destined to take a part in the government of a British dominion when they attain to manhood. Although I have had a good deal of the contents of these books translated, I will not detain the House by reading at any great length, but I find within their covers such paragraphs as these:

> When the United States threw off the yoke England was taught at last that her interests

commanded her to moderate the severities of her iniquities,—)

and so on.

Then again:

Let us hasten to add that these moderations did not change the hostile spirit of the conquerors towards the colonists who suffered from it for nearly a century . . . . . In spite of the pernicious influences they guarded the faith, the light of their hearths and the joy of their hearts. They kept themselves from revolutionary ideas, remained submissive to legal authority in conserving scrupulously their manner of living, their language, their traditions, their love for France, their religion. By the dignity, by the admirable loyalty of their conduct, they finally brought the Protestants to honour their noble virtues.

Then at page 52 of the French textbook from which I am quoting I find this paragraph:

They excite the astonishment of all strangers who cannot understand the existence in Canada of a people distinct from those who inhabit North America, how 60,000 poor French colonists, abandoned almost a century ago on the banks of the St. Lawrence, have been able, under the stringency of conquest, to develop a numerous and strong people, with their religion, their language and their laws.

French Canadians are really a nation. When one sees a population of nearly a million souls rise like a single man to reply to his name, speaking the same language, proclaiming the same faith; when one sees it hold by the heart, to the institutions and to the laws which their ancestors have bequeathed to them, working courageously to develop the soil which they have acquired at the price of their blood which they have watered and fertilized by the sweat of their brows. . . . . A development so prodigious through so many vicissitudes and in the presence of so many difficulties is quite truly the seal of the work of God. . . . . Yes, we repeat it with happiness for the past and confidence in the future, we Canadians, we the descendants of these noble families which have given martyrs to the church and heroes to our well beloved country we are to-day a nation. The land which the blood of these martyrs has purified and sanctified, the soil which the valour of these heroes has so legitimately conquered, defended and kept with so many sacrifices is our patrie or fatherland.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this: That it is impossible where the children of one province are being taught to regard the inhabitants of that province as a separate and distinct nation from the rest of the people of Canada, that we can ever hope to establish national unity throughout the Dominion.

I suppose I shall be criticised for raising the point in this way, and yet if we are going to be frank with one another and try to reach some basis on which we can build up this country to its fullest possibilities we have to face these facts. I venture to say that so long as the children of the province

of Quebec are taught that they belong to a separate nation within Canada, we cannot hope for Canadian national unity. I find the same thing, Sir, on another page, where I read this passage:

Foreign immigration among us and the emigration of our people to the United States rendered this society necessary for strengthening the French Canadians in their patriotism and in keeping distinct the lines of their nationality.

So, Mr. Speaker, the youth of the province of Quebec are being taught that they are not a part of Canada except in so far as Canada is represented by the province of Quebec. Under such conditions I think it is hopeless for us to expect that those children can understand the children of another province.

That is not all. I have taken the trouble to go over the German text books used in the province of Saskatchewan, and I find they are teaching in the German schools there "Die Wacht am Rhein," as a prominent lesson. All the text books of that province show the same strong tendency to teach the children to admire what is German instead of instructing them in Canadian citizenship.

When we have regard to the situation in the Western provinces it is serious. I have here a diagram showing the different locations of the various nationalities in Western Canada—Austrian, French Canadian, German, Russian, and Scandinavian. There are 327,000 of the population of the province of Saskatchewan who are not English speaking, of whom 32,342 are French; the rest are Germans, Russians, and Scandinavians. I would suggest that Hansard take this variegated diagram for a cover and so make the official report so much more attractive than it is at the present time.

While we have the population of these provinces so much divided among the different nationalities, unless we take some strong measures, and unless this Government takes a hand in regulating the education of the Dominion in some supervisory way, we are never going to reach the point we ought to reach if we are to make Canada the nation it is capable of being made.

Another thing that I think should concern this Parliament and this Government is the fact—upon the authority of a responsible senator—that we have 5,000 children in the city of Montreal for whose education no provision whatever has been made. These children are neither Roman Catholics nor Protestants. Neither the Protestant committee nor the Roman Catholic committee

has the funds to educate these children, and they both refuse the responsibility. Is it not a matter of concern to this Dominion that there should be in the city of Montreal a block of 5,000 children growing up in illiteracy and no attempt made to provide for their education—no money voted, no system of schools to which those children can go? What chance have they got? And while it may be a very serious deprivation for them, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is a far more serious matter for the state. For democracy, to be successful, must have a literate population.

Now, I have not been speaking merely for the purpose of uttering criticisms; I will tell you what I think ought to be done.

10 p.m

If this Parliament would follow in the footsteps of the United States Congress it seems to me it would be taking a wise course. There education is in the hands of the states, as here it is in the hands of the provinces. But it has been found necessary there to organize a National Bureau of Education, and a Bill, known as the Smith Bill, provides for an expenditure of $100,000,000 a year of Federal money to assist and encourage the improvement of education throughout the Union. They purpose to spend $7,500,000 annually for the removal of illiteracy; $7,500,000 annually for the Americanization of foreigners; $50,000,000 annually for the equalization of educational opportunities within the various states; $20,000,000 annually to co-operate with the states in the promotion of physical health, education, and recreation, and various sums for other purposes, making a total of $100,000,000.

If it has been found necessary in the great Republic to go so far as to provide additional sums of these large amounts to supplement the state expenditure for education, do we not find in Canada the same responsibility; are we not faced with the same problems that are confronting the people of the United States; have we not here a great deal of illiteracy which should be removed, or which at least some attempt should be made to remove; and is it not necessary in this country to spend some money in trying to Canadianize the foreign portion of our population? There are 600,000 people in the Dominion of foreign birth and extraction who ought to be turned into good Canadian citizens. That is a work purely of education. It does not appear that the provinces are able to cope with it, or that they are even willing to cope with it. At all events they have not succeeded in coping with it effectively to date, and I do not see any reason to hope that they will do so in the near future. But, referring particularly to the Western Provinces, I think they would regard it as a most desirable thing if this Parliament were to enact such a Bill and make the necessary appropriations in order that the people out there might be Canadianized quickly and illiteracy removed.

I do not see why this Government should not make a very careful study of the reasons for illiteracy, and then apply the remedy which may be found effective in each case, whether in New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan or British Columbia. Illiteracy in all those provinces, I believe, would be found to be accounted for in different ways, and it might require a different remedy in each province. But I argue that it is the business of this Parliament to remedy that illiteracy and to give us an educated electorate, to acquire the proper ideals of citizenship and so to be good Canadians.

Another thing that I would suggest to this House is that under the aegis of the Federal Bureau of Education we should have uniform text books, at least in the shape of readers and history. And I would like my hon. friends opposite to understand that in advocating a uniform history I would give full and adequate prominence to those chapters of our early history that centre in their province. The early history of Canada forms one of the most romantic and heroic chapters in the history of the world, and unfortunately our children do not know it.

They get a smattering of it—perhaps one side of it; but there never has been written a history for the boys and girls of Canada, for the schools of Canada, that is adequate for the purpose. If the Federal Government did nothing else in this matter than produce a history that would give every child in Canada a real understanding of the beginnings of our history and how we have developed from the days of Champlain down to the present time, that work would be a monumental one for whoever achieved it.

Mr. BELAND: There is not one school in the whole of the province of Quebec in which the history of the pioneers of Canada is not taught.

Mr. HOCKEN: I quite believe that that particular side of our history is taught in the province of Quebec, but I wonder if the other side of our history has been taught.

Mr. VIEN: Another side of our history which is also taught in the schools of Que-

bec is the fact that in 1776 our bishops kept this country for the British Empire.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is an old tradition that does not rest on a very stable foundation. I am prepared to agree that the bishops kept Canada from joining in the revolution, but they did it as a bargain, and they got their price. If the hon. gentleman would have us understand that they did that out of pure love of the mother country, he is absolutely and entirely mistaken. They did it because they used that opportunity to get concessions for their hierarchy and for their institutions that they never could have got otherwise.

Mr. VIEN: Is that the kind of history that the hon. gentleman would advocate in the uniform books which he would circulate in our schools? If it is, we are sufficiently enlightened.

Mr. HOCKEN: I would not put that into them; a highly controversial point of that kind might well be left out of any history. But there are many other things about the development of British power in this country that the people of Quebec do not understand, because they have never learned about them. Due prominence and due space is given to that portion of history upon which the people of that province place so much stress; due prominence should be given also to the development of British power in this country. The people should be made to understand what it is to be a citizen of the British Empire and a subject of the King.

Mr. POWER: Does the hon. member know as many men on his side of the House who can speak both languages as there are on this side?

Mr. HOCKEN: I would like the hon. gentleman to understand that every member on this side of the House has studied French. But that they are as fluent in the use of French as the French members are in the use of English——

Mr. POWER: Pardon me; I am not a French Canadian. Born and bred in the province of Quebec, I am an Irishman, and proud of being a Quebecker.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Speaker, I still want to make my point. I quite understand that the people of the province of Quebec are more proficient in the use of English than the people of Ontario are in the use of French. Every child in Ontario who passes into the secondary system of schools studies French—my children studied French. All children who pass through more than four or five grades of the public schools study French, and some of them become quite proficient in that language—at least sufficiently so to pass somewhat difficult examinations, both in the high school and in the colleges and universities. But after they do learn the language they have no opportunity of keeping it up in our province. My friends of the French race on the other side have ample opportunity of keeping up their English; they speak French in their homes and English in their business.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no, they speak French in their business.

Mr. HOCKEN: In every large urban centre they certainly need to speak English to get along properly.

Mr. POWER: Je parle le francais et l'anglais, et je suis fier de parler les deux langues.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. HOCKEN: There is nothing to get excited about. I am trying to explain that there are men sitting all around me who have taken exhaustive courses in French and who cannot follow a French debate today, for the very reason that I have stated. If my hon. friends were in the same position with regard to the English language as we are with regard to the French, they would not know English any better than we know French. But I do not see why we could not have books of history that would give due place and prominence to all phases of Canadian history; I do not see why we should not have readers containing stories that would tend to develop our British citizenship. I am not entirely satisfied with the school books used in Ontario. I do not think the province has done enough in this connection. I should like to pay tribute to a brother of the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), Dr. James L. Hughes, who during the time that he was Chief Inspector of Schools for Toronto, taught patriotism in the schools of that city. One of the reasons why there was such a remarkable recruitment in Toronto was because of the work that had been done by Dr. Hughes over a period of twenty years.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Forty years.

Mr. HOCKEN: There is a collegiate institute in Toronto, round the corner from where I live. I took the trouble to ask the principal of that institute last Sunday night how many of his boys went overseas. Five hundred boys went to the front from that school. The bodies of sixty-eight lie in

France. This collegiate institute is presided over by Col. Hagarty, one of the good loyalists of our city. All these boys went through the public schools of our city and came under the hands of Chief Inspector Dr. James L. Hughes; and if the school books had done their part as well as the inspector did his, there would be nothing to complain of in Ontario.

I believe that this Government intends to give some assistance to technical education. That is a side of education that might be gone into much more thoroughly than it has yet been gone into by the Government. Toronto spent over $2,000,000 on a technical school, and it has not received a cent by way of assistance from this Government or from the Provincial Government. It should have had assistance from this Government; any city should which puts up a high-class technical institution for the perfection of the trades and industries of the country. That is a phase of the work of the proposed Bureau of Education that, I think, would be very valuable.

I have another suggestion to make. The Government, under the direction of such a Bureau of Education as I have briefly mentioned, might appropriate a million dollars a year for scholarships to be given to children, not in the high schools, but in the primary schools. Two or three thousand of these children—those who win the scholarships—could be taken every year on a two-months' trip over the country. If you took two hundred children from the province of Quebec on a trip through Ontario and the Prairie Provinces to the Pacific coast and back, they would return much better fitted to go on with their studies than they were before they started on the journey.

They would know a good deal more about Ontario and the western provinces than they ever will without some such visit, and to have them visit those provinces in that way involves an expenditure which the parents are in most cases unable to meet. I would take the Ontario children and send them to Quebec, to the Maritime Provinces, to western Canada, and so I would take the children of every province in this country and send them out through other provinces, at the rate of two or three thousand every year. Thus in the course of ten or fifteen years we would be getting to the point when it would not be easy to say that one province did not understand another. We often hear the statement made that the people of Ontario do not understand Quebec. I fancy that the people of Ontario understand Quebec a great deal better than the people of Quebec understand Ontario.

Mr. VIEN: We tried something of that kind with grown up citizens in the Bon Entente movement, and it resulted in the Unionist Publicity Committee and the Citizens' Publicity Committee in Toronto.

Mr. BUREAU: That was a political dodge.

Mr. HOCKEN: The war put an end to the Bon Entente. I do not care to elaborate that. The men who initiated the movement in Ontario before the war did not endeavour to carry it on after the war got rightly started.

Mr. VIEN: I beg pardon—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. VIEN: I will make the remark—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. gentleman that the House is not in committee and that it is only with the permission of the hon. member that he may ask a question. He may not interject a remark.

Mr. VIEN: I was proceeding to ask the hon. gentleman a question, and it is to correct him on this point that the Bon Entente movement—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. That is not a question. The hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. VIEN: I will put it in the form of a question. Does the hon. gentleman know that the Bon Entente movement was organized in 1915, one year after the war had been declared?

Mr. HOCKEN: It did not last very long, did it? The reasons the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, and I do not think it is necessary for me to state them. What I propose will, I am sure, be one of the best things for Canada if there is any desire to bring about national unity in this country. I am satisfied, as I said last session, that the French Canadian is potentially as fine a citizen as we have. Many of them are not only so potentially, but are so in fact, and those who are only potentially among our finest citizens are so rather because of the fact that they have not had the broadening education which is all that is lacking to make them good citizens. I am one of those who would rather like to assist in that very laudable object.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that in a democracy such as Canada a liberal educa-

tion should be placed within the reach of every ambitious boy and girl. The stability of our institutions depends upon the literacy of our people. They rule the country. The Government will be such as they make it. Therefore, it is of the highest importance that every one should receive an education. An illiterate population is the greatest danger to democracy. Unless the people who by their ballots determine the kind of Government we are to have are able to read and write, unless they have their reasoning powers developed by education, they become an easy prey for demagogues and designing manipulators. They must be able to read in order to form their own judgments upon public questions and the more thorough their training is the better qualified will they be to perform their duties as citizens. We have been endowed by Providence with marvellous material resources. It is ours to cultivate the mentality of the common people, to make them ambitious and enterprising by setting before them a high purpose and a goal worth striving to attain. If we fail in this we fail in everything, for it is as true to-day as when Goldsmith wrote:—

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade;
A breath can make them as a breath has made.
But a bold peasantry, a country's pride
When once destroyed can never be supplied.

SUPPLY.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. J. D. REID: We shall take up the Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1919, and if the Committee will let them pass to-night, any of the items may be discussed on the Main Estimates. We would like to get these through so that we can have the Governor General give his assent to them.

Charges of management—printing Dominion notes—further amount required	$30,000
Clerical assistance in connection with transfer and registration of war loan bonds, etc.	170,000
Total	$200,000

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister explain the second item?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is a matter which the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has charge of, and he has gone home. He will give the explanation on some other item.

[Mr. Hoeken.]

Civil Government—Department of Justice, including penitentiary grant, contingencies, $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: While I do not wish to delay the progress of the Estimates, I purpose bringing to the attention of the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) a question which was brought to the notice of the public during last summer by the press in connection with the administration of justice. On the 8th of June last, the Toronto Globe published on page 13 of its issue the following startling news with big headlines:

Young girl posed as man. Outrageous sentence upon her rouses a storm of indignation. Two years in prison! Trying to help country, she contravenes some old statute.

And then follows the despatch:

Kingston, June 7.—Because she posed as a man, had her hair cut in military style and went so far as donning a man's attire in order to do her bit in a log-driving bee for the Chaleur Bay Pulp Company, at Restigouche, "Venus" Coté, Rimouski, Quebec, aged 23, is now a prisoner in the Women's Ward at the penitentiary here having been sentenced to two years for this awful crime. The girl was brought here in male attire, and the authorities at the big prison—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I am very sorry, but I shall have to call the hon. member to order for two reasons, first, because his remarks are not relevant to the item under consideration which is merely for a sum of $5,000 for contingencies for penitentiaries, and second, that he is anticipating the discussion of a motion which is already upon the Order Paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but would just point out that the motion I have on the Order Paper has no chance of coming up this session, and I thought this was the proper time to bring the matter to the attention of the Acting Minister of Justice.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Acting Minister of Justice is not in the House at present. I would suggest that when we come to the main Estimates of the Justice Department, with the consent of the House, the hon. member might bring the matter up then.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That will be satisfactory.

Department of Immigration and Colonization—To provide for the sum of $1,000 for Deputy Minister of the Interior, to cover additional salary while acting as Deputy Minister of Immigration and Colonization during the fiscal year 1918-19, $1,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Would the minister explain what this item is for?

Mr. CALDER: When the Department of Immigration and Colonization was created in, I think, October, 1917, Mr. Cory, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, was appointed acting deputy of the new department. When the Estimates were brought down for the year 1918-19 a vote of $5,000 was taken for a deputy minister, but he has never been appointed. I am sure the Committee will realize the position we were in so far as immigration was concerned during the past year, and instead of appointing a new deputy for the department, I thought it as well to continue Mr. Cory as acting deputy, and he has consequently acted in that capacity from October, 1917, down to the end of the last fiscal year, and is still so acting.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is to put him on a footing of equality with the other deputy ministers, I suppose?

Mr. CALDER: No, because during that period other deputy ministers were receiving only $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But this year they receive $6,000.

Mr. CALDER: Yes. While the department was not active last year in so far as actual immigration was concerned, we have done a great deal of work in reorganizing the department, particularly in Canada and the United States. The entire service in Canada has been reorganized, and Mr. Cory has given a great deal of his time and attention to the work that has been done during the past year. When the Main Estimates of the department are before the Committee, I shall be able to give a fuller explanation of what has actually been done in the way of reorganization. I thought it but fair that as Mr. Cory had been appointed acting deputy and has given a great deal of his time and attention to the department during the year he should receive some remuneration for it.

Mr. FIELDING: The gentleman referred to is a most excellent officer, and if I make any reference to this item it is simply because of the principle involved, and not because I have any objection to Mr. Cory. He is a deputy minister. Other deputy ministers last year with one or two exceptions, received $5,000. Is it contemplated by this item to pay Mr. Cory $6,000 for the last year?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: The principle of paying a deputy minister for extra work is a bad principle, and I would certainly ask the minister to consider it very carefully. A deputy minister is supposed to give all his time to the service of the country, and if he gives a portion of his time from one department to another, is that a reason why he should be paid extra? I have acted as minister for a dozen departments at different times, and every one of the ministers on the front benches to-day is acting for some other department, but are they to be paid an extra salary because they are acting in the absence of somebody else? I think the principle involved is a bad and dangerous one. I have no objection to any salary that may be given to Mr. Cory as a deputy. I am very glad that the deputy ministers are to receive a salary of $6,000; that has my support. But the idea of paying any official in the public service for extra duties is to me a bad and dangerous principle. I think the example of this case will lead the minister into trouble. I repeat, I have no objection to Mr. Cory. He is an excellent officer and I should be glad to see him get the best terms given to deputies of equal rank; it is the principle I object to.

Mr. CALDER: I quite agree with what my hon. friend has said as to the principle involved. It is one that should be used with very great discretion. Under the circumstances in this particular case I submit to the Committee that there is justification for the vote. I hesitated a good deal for the very reason advanced by the hon. member, to suggest to the Government that this sum should be placed in the Estimates, but the position was briefly this: Had I taken advantage of the vote of $5,000 that was passed in the Estimates last year for a deputy minister, and appointed a deputy, I suppose there would not be the slightest objection at all. Instead of doing that, I have tried to save money for the country. I hoped to save by this method some $4,000. It is quite true that the services of any official of any department should be available when required, but under the circumstances that existed I do not think it would be fair to ask a deputy who has his own work to do, and who should have some time at his disposal to come to my department and my house night after night and spend hours and hours upon work that really was not his own. Now, because I did not take advantage of the vote passed last year, but thought it advisable under the circumstances to try and save $4,000. I am severely criticised. I quite agree that the principle is one which should be safe-

guarded in every way, but at the same time occasions may arise where the circumstances would justify the Government in doing just what it is proposed to do in this case.

Mr. FIELDING: I think that in the case of minor officials who are receiving but small salaries, allowance should be made for circumstances under which something additional may be paid to them, but even in that case I would rather have it in the shape of a direct plain vote for the salary. But those officials who are receiving a generous salary, whether it be a judge or any other official—and I should like to see all the high officials generously paid—owe their whole working time to the public service, and any service that they can render to the public they have already been paid for and they should not receive any extra allowance for it. There are many illustrations we may have to give as the Estimates come up, because I think the principle of paying a man in two or three different places is a bad one. I lay down the principle, and I think the minister will agree with me, that the man who receives $4,000 or $5,000, which is a fair salary, not too large—I am not advocating small salaries—owes his whole time to the public service, and any time he may give to the public service is time for which he has already been paid, and he is not entitled to extra pay for such extra work.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. member think for a moment that this official is obliged to go to the minister's house night after night and work for hours without receiving anything extra?

Mr. FIELDING: Certainly, unless the custom is changed. Every deputy minister does that. I am speaking from my own experience and I venture to say that every minister to-day is obliged to have his deputy go to his house many a time at night to work.

Mr. M. CLARK: The principle of working night and day in the public service works out very badly anyhow. It does not require a medical man to point out to the minister that if a deputy is working night as well as day his efficiency in the daytime will be impaired; and you will not get the work out of him you otherwise would.

But where is the minister going to get the money to do these things? I understood the Government were in difficulty about money. We have been told that all session. Yet we are asked to vote extras here and extras there. This is the time to be concerned about a few hundred millions. We are using up $30,000,000 in shipping and thousands for salaries. If we are going on in that way where are we going to land? I do not want to anticipate the Budget, but I want some assurance that there is some prospect of this money being paid. I want to emphasize the point that was so well made by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), that the whole time that a deputy can give to his work ought to be got out of him for his salary as a deputy. If it is not enough, increase it. With regard to extras in another department, that seems to be a slovenly and peculiar manner of doing public business. This increasing of our expenses is something that is going to land the country in bankruptcy.

Mr. CALDER: I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. M. Clark) did not catch the drift of my remarks. He thinks that instead of saving money we are spending additional money here. As a matter of fact, as I stated to the Committee, last year we took a vote of $5,000 for a deputy minister. I had authority to appoint a deputy minister at a salary of $5,000, and if I had done so, this matter, I suppose, would not have been mentioned. I had some concern for the growing expenditures of the country by trying to save $4,000. Now I am severely criticised because of that. I quite agree with the position taken by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens, the principle is not a good one, and if the practice is to be followed at all it should only be where there are very special circumstances. I have stated these circumstances to the Committee. I cannot say anything further about it. The Committee may agree or not. Under the circumstances that existed in connection with the creation of this department, I feel that I was justified in not appointing a deputy. The department had been created in the regular way, a minister was put in charge, and I had a full right to appoint a deputy. But, in the interest of economy I did not do so. With the statement made that the time of every officer of the Government should be at the disposal of the Government, I quite agree, but it does not appear to me as fair that you should take a man who happens to be in another department and call upon him to give a great deal of his time to work that does not belong to the department of which he is in charge.

Mr. PROULX: This department is only a branch of the Interior Department.

Mr. CALDER: No.

Mr. PROULX: The work done by the Immigration and Colonization was formerly done by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: There was very little work done, I understand. There has been no immigration during the war. I do not think that there was much more work to do than this officer had been doing before the department was created.

Mr. CALDER: During the last year Mr. Cory, the acting deputy minister, gave more of his time to the work of the department than he had done in any year during the last eight or nine years when immigration was active. Early in the year I undertook the reorganization of this department in the United States, in Canada, and to some extent in Great Britain. This required a good deal of thought and study, and Mr. Cory's services were used for that purpose. He gave more time to that department when it was not very active than he did before when it was very active.

Mr. VIEN: It is probably due to overpressure of work that the deputy minister overlooked some of the accounts for the Department of Immigration and did not check up all the details when they came in. It is probably in that way that a $32 waste basket came to be purchased. If the appointment of this acting deputy minister of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Immigration has saved $4,000 by way of salary, much of it has leaked away owing to overpressure in work which has prevented him from closely checking the accounts that came in.

Mr. CALDER: I am not so certain of that. Probably we will have an opportunity of discussing that account when we come to our Estimates. I shall have an opportunity later to have something to say regarding that.

Mr. FIELDING: If Mr. Cory gave so much of his time to the duties of the deputy minister of Immigration, what happened to the duties of the deputy minister of the Interior?

Mr. JACOBS: As I understand it, the Deputy Minister of Immigration last year was also Acting Deputy Minister of the Interior. Was there not an estimate of $5,000 passed this year for the Deputy Minister of Immigration? In the Immigration Act provision is made for the appointment of a deputy minister, and I assume that in the Estimates there will be $5,000 for his services for the coming year.

Mr. CALDER: It is $6,000.

Mr. JACOBS: This work was done last year by Mr. Cory at the same time as other work was done in the Department of the Interior, at a cost to the Government of $6,000—$5,000 plus $1,000. He assisted the minister, working night after night with the minister in the creation of this new department.

Mr. CALDER: That is right.

Mr. JACOBS: I consider Mr. Cory should have $5,000 instead of $1,000.

Mr. McCREA: I understand that the minister is proposing that his deputy should have an increase of salary. If you have a good staff of men who are reliable, trustworthy, honest and industrious, it is poor policy to underpay them. I think this Government are possibly spending a good deal of money in other directions that might well be spent in paying the employees good, fair, liberal salaries. If the minister of a department comes to this House and makes a statement to the effect, as the minister has done, that he has a good, reliable, trustworthy man on his staff, a man who has been doing not only his own work but the work of another department, and he asks for some compensation for that man, I think we should trust the minister sufficiently to accept this statement and grant the request.

Mr. CALDER: I want to be perfectly frank with the Committee. This is not a question of increasing salaries. The point raised by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens is a very important one. I had a good deal of hesitation in doing this on account of the precedent that is likely to be established and which will probably give the Government trouble in other directions. But it seems to me, taking all the circumstances into consideration, that we will not be establishing a troublesome precedent in this case. I had a good deal of hesitation in suggesting this should be done but at the same time I think it is only fair it should be done.

Mr. PROULX: Who is the deputy minister of Immigration?

Mr. CALDER: Mr. Cory is still acting. I have nobody in sight at the present time but somebody will be appointed shortly.

Department of Railways and Canals, Salaries —$2,250.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the Civil Service Commission passed on each of these appointments?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. What happened was this: We have a Purchasing Branch under Mr. Lavoie. A number of the men who belong to that staff and who were employed in the Outside Service have gone to Toronto. Those that are left belong to the Canals Branch and will be paid out of the vote for canals.

Department of Customs and Inland Revenue —To provide for a clerkship in the First Division, Subdivision B, Private Secretary—$2,100.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who is the private secretary referred to here?

Mr. J. D. REID: The private secretary to Mr. Sifton, Minister of Customs, who is overseas with his chief at the present time.

Post Office Department—Contingencies, clerical and other assistance, further amount required—$10,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We would like an explanation of this item.

Mr. ROWELL: The vote is required to pay certain temporary employees who were engaged to take the places of civil servants who had enlisted and were serving overseas.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are the temporary employees who are engaged during the rush season appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROWELL: The appointments are all passed upon by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. COPP: What amount appears in the regular Estimates with respect to this item?

Mr. ROWELL: I have not that information. That refers to last year's vote, and this is a special appropriation to cover the pay of twenty-three temporary employees who were brought in to take the places of employees who had enlisted and gone overseas.

Mr. COPP: Is this amount intended to supplement the salaries of the twenty-three temporary employees?

Mr. ROWELL: No, these persons have not been employed for the whole of the war period. As various permanent employees enlisted, or were called up under the Military Service Act, other men were engaged to take their places and the vote asked for here covers various periods during the year.

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: I received a letter some time ago from a captain attached to the Canadian forces now in Germany, who belongs to an outside branch of the Post Office Department. He has received his salary and military pay, but desires to know if the bonus granted to the civil servants in Canada will apply to those serving overseas as well?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, he will not get the bonus.

Civil Service Commission—to provide for the promotion of one clerk, and contingencies, $20,225.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When a vacancy occurs in a country post office is it necessary that the Civil Service Commission should advertise and send out circulars inviting candidates to compete for the poorly-paid position of postmaster?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would not think so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the practice in that regard? I have received circulars drawing my attention, for example, to the fact that there is a vacancy in a post office in British Columbia, or that an engineer is to be appointed in a certain province at a salary of $1,000 or $2,000. I have no interest in such appointments, and it seems to me that those circulars should be sent only to the district affected, thus avoiding a waste of money.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think my hon. friend's remarks are quite proper in so far as a certain class of positions is concerned, such as in the Post Office. There is, however, another class of positions which I think should be advertised throughout the whole country.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Technical positions.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. Some discrimination should be exercised, of course. I shall be very glad to call the attention of the Commission to the remarks of my hon. friend.

Legislation—Senate—To provide an amount for the Speaker of the Senate of $3,000 for the fiscal year 1918-19 in lieu of residence and attendants—Further amount required, $1,845.

House of Commons—To provide an amount for the Speaker of the House of Commons of $3,000 for the fiscal year 1918-19 in lieu of residence and attendants—Further amount required, $750.

Mr. PROULX: How much was voted before?

Mr. J. D. REID: The difference between $1,845 and $3,000.

Mr. PROULX: Is not $3,000 a large amount?

Mr. J. D. REID: Not when you take into account that the Speaker has to rent a house, engage servants, and so on. He had all that accommodation in the House of Commons.

Mr. PROULX: The Speakers get $4,000 besides their sessional indemnity. I do not see why they should have to rent a house; they could board at a hotel like ordinary members.

Mr. J. D. REID: Before the destruction of the Parliament Buildings it had always been the custom for the Speaker to have a residence inside the buildings, together with attendants, fuel, and other things. This is merely to replace the loss that he is under on account of living outside.

Mr. PROULX: But I do not see why it should take $3,000 to pay for the rent of a house or of rooms at the hotel. So far as attendance is concerned, I do not see why he needs any. He has a private secretary who is paid by salary. I think there is too much extravagance in that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is due to the Committee that I should say a word or two in explanation. When the Parliament Buildings were burned down the Government asked the then Sergeant-at-Arms, Col. Smith, to make a report as to what he thought should be allowed to the Speaker in lieu of residence. The report he made was to the effect that he regarded the residence, its furnishing, heating, lighting, attendants and so forth, supplied to the Speaker heretofore as worth much more than $3,000 per annum; but he felt that he could not recommend that a larger sum should be allowed owing to the circumstance that it would make the salary of the Speaker higher than that of a cabinet minister, and that was thought to be unwarranted. The Cabinet in accepting his suggestion put an item in the Estimates providing for a certain amount per diem, I think $15. The first year that amounted to a trifle over $3,000; last year it amounted to $2,250. Last autumn an arrangement was finally effected whereby it was decided to make the amount a fixed sum of $3,000 per annum to the Speaker of the House and the Speaker of the Senate in lieu of residence. The item which is now before the Committee is to make up that sum for the past year.

I think the Committee should know that at the figure as now proposed, of $3,000 a year, the country would be saving a very considerable sum over what it has cost heretofore to maintain the Speaker's residence. I am convinced that the sum does not make up to the Speaker by a very large amount, speaking purely from the standpoint of dollars and cents, what he had in accommodation in the old Parliament Buildings.

On the subject generally of the salary of the Speaker, I think it is due to the Committee that they should know that the Speaker, including this vote, receives a smaller sum than does the Speaker of any of the other British Dominions. The Speaker of the House of Commons of the South African Commonwealth receives a salary almost double; the Speakers of two or three of the Australian States, with a population in some instances of less than a million, receive more than the Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada. I am giving this information after having gone into the situation somewhat carefully.

If these facts are borne in mind, I do not think that the sum which is now asked is at all excessive. From the experience I have had I would much rather be supplied with a residence, light, fuel, and furnishings, than be paid the sum of $3,000 and furnish a house, which I am now endeavouring to do in order that I may be able to carry on in some small measure the duties of the Speaker as they apply to his office, apart from the work in the Chamber itself. I can assure hon. gentlemen that at the present cost of living the Speaker is not by any means compensated as compared with the position he occupied at the time he had his residence in the old Parliament Buildings. I venture to say that the sum of $3,000 per year which is now voted to the Speaker in lieu of residence did not cover a half, yes, I venture to say, did not cover a third of the cost to the country of the maintenance of the Speaker's quarters in the old House.

11 p.m.

Mr. PROULX: It looks to me, Mr. Chairman, as if this were an attempt in an indirect way to increase the salary of the Speaker. I would much prefer that the country pay the actual cost of renting rooms or a house. I understand that the Government is now furnishing a house for the Speaker. Last session I believe he was rooming at a hotel.

Mr. CARVELL: The Speaker is paying rent to the Government for the house he occupies.

Mr. PROULX: But this money was for last year; it does not cover this year when

he is occupying the house, I understand. If he files a Bill of what he has to pay for rooms I think it would be much more satisfactory than asking for a lump sum, when we do not know whether it is costing that amount or not.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Chairman, might I ask if there is a proposal on foot to house the Speaker in the new buildings when they are completed?

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is not the intention.

Mr. JACOBS: We are departing then from an old and traditional custom?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

General—To pay for Provincial Voters' Lists supplied after the passing of the War Times Election Act, 1917, $7,000.

Mr. VIEN: Explain.

Mr. BELAND: What is that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CARVELL: Under the law as it stood before 1917 the legal custodians of the voter's lists in the various provinces made up their accounts and sent them to the Clerk in Common Chancery. The War-Times Election Act, as you will remember, was passed in September of 1917. Most of these lists are made up in the autumn, and a number of them were forwarded to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I believe the contention was that those officials were not acquainted with the fact that it was not necessary to prepare those lists, and after a good deal of consideration a compromise was effected, by which those officials who had actually made up their lists and forwarded them were paid a portion of the amount, and in very many cases the whole.

Those, of course, who had not made them up—a notice was sent out as soon as the clerk found they were coming in—did not receive anything. This $7,000 is required to pay those who actually did send lists in.

Mr. BELAND: The money is paid to some provincial official, I assume?

Mr. CARVELL: Under the old law the legal custodian of the voters' list was to make up annually and file with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a list as found in his office. The Dominion Government paid that official so much per hundred words for furnishing that list.

Mr. VIEN: There was something more than that. The new Elections Act provided not that the electoral list should be made, as formerly, by the various secretary-treasurers of the municipalities, sent to the registrar in the county and by that official forwarded to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, but that enumerators should be appointed and Federal lists specially prepared for the purposes of the coming election. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, probably overlooking the machinery provided by the new Elections Act, sent the usual formal notices to the registrars in the various counties to provide him with the electoral lists as in the ordinary course. That was an error on the part of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery which is now costing the country $7,000. I agree that the registrars of the various counties should be paid for work that they did at the request of an official of the Crown, but the attention of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should be directed to the fact that he made an error which involves an expenditure of $7,000 on the part of the country.

Mr. CARVELL: I assure my hon. friend that the fact has been brought to his attention on more than one occasion.

For purchase of seed grain—Governor General's Warrant, October 7, 1918, $3,000,000.

Mr. VIEN: Is this for seed grain for 1919?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: This seed grain will be distributed now and paid for when it is distributed?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is sold to the farmers on certain terms—probably the cash is not paid until the crop is harvested.

Mr. VIEN: But the amounts are to be repaid? The Government is not to lose anything?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Government will not lose anything.

Mr. COPP: Where is this seed grain distributed?

Mr. J. D. REID: There was a crop failure last year in several parts of Western Canada, chiefly, I think, in Southern Albelta and Saskatchewan; and this grain was secured to provide the farmers in those districts with the necessary seed grain.

For purchase of cotton seed meal—Governor General's Warrant, November 19, 1918, $150,000.

Mr. COPP: Is it the policy of the Government to buy feed and to furnish it to anyone who is short of that commodity, extending to him the credit of the country until the price is paid?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: During the latter part of 1918 it was very difficult to secure cotton seed meal and farmers throughout the provinces were very anxious to get it. The Department of Agriculture accordingly purchased cotton seed meal and distributed it among the dealers, and the treasury was recouped.

Mr. COPP: Last fall it was impossible for the farmers of our part of the country to get hay and grain for their cattle, and they had to sell their stock at a great sacrifice. If the Government was assisting the farmers in other parts of the country, I cannot see why they should not assist the farmers in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: During the war the Government made a great many purchases on behalf of certain of the people of Canada; it was absolutely necessary that they should do so. For instance, all the wool that was imported into Canada during the last year was imported and paid for by the Government, and, through some Governmental agency, distributed to manufacturers in Canada who desired wool. Tinplate was also purchased by the Government and re-sold to dealers—to their advantage, because it was purchased by the Government at a favourable rate. Cotton seed meal was purchased for the same reason. It was practically impossible for private dealers to make the purchases, so the Department of Agriculture did it, and distributed the cotton seed meal among dealers in the various provinces. The treasury was immediately recouped.

Mr. COPP: Did any of this cotton seed meal go to the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think so.

For purchase of stock feed—Governor General's warrant July 2, 1918, $300,000.

Mr. COPP: What feed is that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Government controlled the price of by-products of elevators and flour mills during the war period, particularly during the past year. They purchased from the mills bran and shorts, and through some agency or other, they were sold to the public.

Mr. COPP: What agency?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Some department of Government or some Government agency carried out the details of the work.

Contribution towards the cost of the monument to Louis Hebert at Quebec, $1,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In connection with public monuments, may I remind my hon. friend that the Royal Society of Canada last year recommended that a monument be erected in the city of Ottawa to the memory of Edith Cavell, and I understand, that subscriptions have been solicited and a certain amount of money collected. Mr. Benjamin Sulte, our well known writer and historian, has taken the lead in the matter and has enlisted the sympathies of many citizens in and around Ottawa. I have been asked by the society, of which I am a member, to request the Government to do its share in connection with the erection of this monument. I hope I shall be able to convey to the Royal Society which meets next week in Ottawa the glad tidings that the Government of Canada will do its share towards the erection of this memorial.

Another point about art—because this item is under the heading of "Arts and Agriculture." I noticed in the Montreal Star last night that two paintings were, amongst others, to be sold at auction in Montreal. As hon. gentlemen are aware, the famous Kreigoff paintings represent Canadian scenery. I have seen a few of those Kreigoff paintings in Senator Edwards' residence in Ottawa and some too in that of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy). They are very rare and highly appreciated, and I think our museum should have those paintings on its walls. I also noticed in a paper yesterday that the collection of the late Sir George Drummond, containing some of the great masterpieces in the world, was to be sold in London, England. As hon. gentlemen know, there is a law in Italy which prevents any foreigner from taking masterpieces out of Italy to another country. We should have a similar law here. It is known that there are in the residence of at least three or four wealthy Canadians masterpieces of immense value—if they can be valued in money. The collection of the late Sir George Drummond is known not only in Canada but in Europe, and the Art Commission which was appointed some years ago ought not to let this opportunity pass and should see that this collection is retained in Canada for the National museum in Ottawa. I call the attention of the Government to this fact.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not think the matter of the Edith Cavell monument has come be-

fore the Government, but it will be taken into consideration.

Pensions—European war—Further amount required, $3,500,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Minister of Militia (Mr. Mewburn) knows that a committee is at present investigating the question of pensions generally, and I suppose he will make a statement to the House some time during the session. Many people are advocating a revision of pensions. I mentioned to the minister the other day some cases of hardship, and I have a promise from him that he will consider the question and later on make a statement to the House.

Major-General MEWBURN: The question of pensions does not come under the Department of Militia and Defence; it is entirely under another department. I am familiar with the cases which the hon. gentleman has mentioned and which I have already referred to the Committee. I have not the privilege of being a member of that Committee. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), who is chairman of the Committee, will, I understand, make a statement to the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The statement of the minister is quite correct with regard to the general question of pensions, but under the old law, widows of generals were entitled to small pensions, and I think that Act was administered by the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Major-General MEWBURN: My hon. friend is quite right. I thought he referred to this item of general pensions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No.

Major-General MEWBURN: I hope to bring in a Bill amending the Militia Pension Act. There are one or two cases of hardship. I know the case of the widow of a general who served thirty years in the Canadian service, who lost three sons and one son-in-law in this war, and who lost one son in South Africa. Under those old regulations she draws a pension of only $500 a year. I hope to bring that up on an amendment to the Pension Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Another case is that of a widow of a man who served in the Militia Department as general for many years. Since his death she has received a pittance of $500 a year. She has lost her only support in the war, and she naturally expects that the Government will do the fair thing by her.

Mr. BELAND: Just for information, as I was absent last year, I should like to know the total amount voted to meet the exigencies of the Pension Board in this regard.

Mr. ROWELL: The amount voted last year was $15,000,000. This is to meet the excess expenditure for the year. It is due, first of all, to there being a larger number of pensioners that was anticipated when the estimate was originally provided; secondly, to meet the increased allowance for children which was provided during the course of the year, particularly orphan children; thirdly, instead of paying the pensions in advance they are now paid at the end of the month, which means a double payment.

Mr. BELAND: The amount paid last year for pensions was $18,500,000?

Mr. ROWELL: Approximately.

Pensions—salaries and contingent expenses of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada—further amount required, $500,000.

Mr. FIELDING: We understand that the item of pensions must be large, but here is half a million dollars for the salaries and contingent expenses of the board. Is the item correctly worded? It looks a very large amount for salaries and contingent expenses.

Mr. ROWELL: It is quite true that the item is a large one, and the explanation is this: The Board of Pension Commissioners, when they presented their estimate to the Government of the cost of administering, estimated some $250,000 in excess of what the Government actually allowed. The Government, in the hope of keeping down the expenditure, cut down the estimate which the Board of Pension Commissioners had presented. As the end of the year approached the board reported that not only could they not keep within the appropriation, but for reasons which they explained to the Government it was necessary that they should exceed even their own estimate by the sum of $250,000. This additional sum was required principally, as I recall it now, for three reasons: First, the working out of their organization in administering the pensions throughout the country had involved a substantial increase in their staff over what they estimated a year ago; secondly, owing to the conditions which prevailed, they have had to pay larger salaries in many cases than they contemplated a year ago; and, thirdly, the expenses incidental to the office and management here in Ottawa at headquarters and at the various centres throughout the country where the board has its branches in each military district have also increased.

Mr. FIELDING: Taking this $500,000 and the former estimate, what will be the expenditure on salaries and contingent expenses?

Mr. ROWELL: A total of $1,250,000, the former appropriation being, I think, $750,000.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not complaining. I take for granted that there is an explanation. But what is the organization of the Board of Pension Commissioners which involves an expenditure of $1,250,000 on salaries and contingent expenses? I am not objecting to the amount, but simply asking for information. The amount seems very large.

Mr. ROWELL: The amount does seem large, and that was the reason the Government a year ago cut down the estimate. I have not the details here, as I did not expect the item would be up, but when the main estimate is before the Committee I will have full details as to the numbers employed and expenses.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the resignation of Commander Ross been accepted?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who succeeds him?

Mr. ROWELL: No appointment has been made yet.

Department of Militia and Defence—gratuities, $7,950.39.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister explain what these gratuities are for?

Major-General MEWBURN: I have the particulars of each one. William Taylor served for 13 years and 13 days as caretaker at headquarters in military district No. 2 at $1.50 per diem. The basis on which the gratuity is calculated is one year's pay for each twenty years of service. N. Villeneuve was caretaker at the Quebec drill hall for 22 years and 124 days. All these gratuities are calculated on the same basis.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital —Quebec and Saguenay Railway—construction —further amount required, $250,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: The work is nearly completed. This balance is required to carry on the work until the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can my hon. friend state positively when the trains will run into Murray Bay?

Mr. J. D. REID: The chief engineer assures me that the regular passenger trains will be running into Murray Bay not later than the first of July. The work trains will be going into Murray Bay before that, and you could get into Murray Bay on them about the middle of June.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Will there be a daily service?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, after the first of July, during the season.

Mr. CASGRAIN: There is in the county of Charlevoix, along the line of this railway near St. Urbain, a great deposit of a certain kind of iron or ore which was largely used during the war by the General Electric Company of the United States in the manufacturing of war material. I know this company owns a mine there. There is also another company interested in these deposits known as the American Titanic Ore Company. The name is American, but the capital stock is owned by Canadian people in Quebec and other parts of the province. This company owns a big mine, but they are unable to operate it at present. During the war they did not have working capital enough. The ore has to be hauled by wagon and horses from St. Urbain to Baie St. Paul, and the haul is too expensive. I noticed one day near Baie St. Paul as many as ten or fifteen cars of ore that had been taken from the mine, and it cost five or six dollars a load. The General Electric Company of the United States are able to exploit their mine, because they have a large amount of capital available. I was asked by the people who are interested in this Canadian enterprise to see if it would not be possible, now that the railway is operating to Baie St. Paul, to have a branch line constructed to the mine from Baie St. Paul. This would not only open up the mine, but would give employment to the people of the county, and would also facilitate the transportation of farm products. The distance would be about nine miles. There is also in the county of Charlevoix near St. Urbain, but in another direction, the National Park which belongs to the province of Quebec. Here the Provincial Government keeps magnificent herds of moose and caribou, and other wild animals.

I have no brief for the provincial government but I invite the minister to come down to that part of the country and make one of a shooting party. It would be in the interest of the country if a branch line were constructed there as soon as possible. Would the minister be able to make a statement upon that work?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I give my earnest support to the request made by my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Casgrain), as I happen to know that part of the country just as well as I know Ottawa or Montreal. The question of the Saguenay railway has been so many times before the House that I need not repeat the arguments pro and con but the Government has a chance to meet its expenditure in that district by constructing a line to St. Urbain. It is only a matter of 9 miles. There is a large capital invested for the exploitation of that mine, and I am quite sure that if my hon. friend would build a branch line nine miles only in length he would recoup himself for the losses on other sections of the line. This is an industry which ought to be developed. We are very modest in our demands. Whilst my hon. friend is giving forty-four lines to the people of the West surely he will not refuse us this little branch line from Baie St. Paul to St. Urbain. My hon. friend has promised me to pay a visit next summer to that district, and I shall make it my duty to accompany him.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) will agree that we have about all the railway building on our programme that we can undertake this year. If we complete the Quebec and Saguenay to Murray Bay I think that is about all we can do this year. But I will have the engineer look over the other and make a report.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend send an engineer there?

Mr. J. D. REID: I will tell Mr. Grant to have the suggestion looked into and a report made.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend do that this year?

Mr. J. D. REID: I will instruct him at once.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income—miscellaneous—surveys and inspections—railways—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. COPP: What survey is that?

Mr. J. D. REID: This refers to the inspection of railways and surveys. We have men inspecting railways. Different items are paid out of this account. It is an annual vote. Last year we reduced it by $10,000 and then we found that we had to put it in again. Some of the expenses were paid in connection with the investigation of the Canadian Northern railway and there was a small balance of that which is included in this item.

Labour—Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of the Labour Gazette, and allowance to correspondence, and for clerical assistance in preparing tables of statistics—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. BELAND: What did the Labour Gazette cost beside the $10,000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot tell my hon. friend at the moment what the amount was last year. It fell to the Department of Labour during the last year or two to do a great deal more than its ordinary work. There was the Cost of Living Commission which involved the collection and preparation of statistical information.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It did not reduce the cost of living.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It increased the expenditure of the department. That is true also of the vote for industrial disputes investigations; there have been more industrial disputes and consequently additional expenditures have been made.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Disputes in the Government or outside of it?

Administration — Employment Office.—Co-ordination Act. — Further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Please explain.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under an Act passed by Parliament, I think at its last session, employment offices have been established in all the provinces, and the work of the Federal and provincial Governments in connection therewith is co-ordinated. Grants have been made by the Federal Government in connection with these offices, I understand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Parliament passed an Act last session authorizing the creation of labour bureaux in the various provinces. I know there is such a bureau in Montreal, and there are others in the West. I would like to get from the minister some statistics concerning the work done by the officers at these bureaux. Have these offices been of real service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can the minister state approximately the number of men who have been given employment through these bureaux?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The employment offices have done excellent work, and have

been instrumental in securing work for many thousands of persons. I did not expect that the Supplementary Estimates for the Labour Department would be reached this evening, and therefore I am not able to give the data asked for. When the main Estimates of that department are before the House, I shall be in a position to give exact information in connection with this work.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I shall be pleased to have it, because, according to the reports of the meetings of returned soldiers which I read in the press, there is great dissatisfaction among them as regards the operation of these bureaux. The returned soldiers generally say that they have not experienced any satisfaction from them. I do not know whether the statement is true or not, and I would like definite information.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Where is the employment office located in Montreal, and who is in charge of it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I could not say, but I will be prepared to give him full information on the main Estimates. I think very probably that the selection of the employment office in Montreal rested with the Provincial Government.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I would like to know who is in charge of the office, who the staff are, and what salary is paid to each officer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is a Provincial Government office, but the Dominion contributes to the cost of administering it.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Would the minister object to letting the item stand until the information which I have asked for is forthcoming?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There will be opportunity for discussion on the vote in the Main Estimates.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount has been paid to each province under this vote?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The amount varies. For instance, in the Maritime Provinces I think the Provincial Government pay for the buildings and the furniture and the Federal Department of Labour defrays the entire cost of administration. In the case of these provinces the cost of administration is probably not a very large amount.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount does Prince Edward Island, for instance, get out of this vote?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it would be a very small sum, but I could not at present give the exact figure. Even if the office in Prince Edward Island has been opened as to which I am not sure, the administration cost to the Federal Government would be very small indeed.

Mr. CAHILL: We should have information as to the amount paid to each province. Last year an appropriation of something like $50,000 was made, and now we are confronted by a Supplementary Estimate.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not think my hon. friend was present when the Estimates now under consideration were taken up. These are Supplementary Estimates covering the twelve months up to March 31 last. We are now passing these items so as to get a Bill through and obtain the Royal consent when His Excellency the Governor General attends for that purpose in a day or two. We have not as much information concerning these Estimates to-night as we would have had had we known that they were coming up, but when the Main Estimates are under consideration the fullest information will be given.

Mr. CAHILL: When this item was discussed previously I asked the minister what amount would be apportioned to the different provinces in connection with these employment offices, and I was told that the information would be forthcoming later. Now we have the Supplementary Estimates and still the desired information is lacking. I think the minister who administers the Labour Department ought to be able to tell us how much each province receives.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was only about the time of the signing of the armistice that the Dominion Government came forward to assist these bureaus which had already been organized and were in operation under the auspices of the Provincial Governments. My impression is that $10,000 is the amount which has been expended upon them up to the close of the last fiscal year. The expenditure for the current fiscal year will, of course, be very much in excess of this vote.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: The minister states that the amount expended for this purpose since the armistice was signed is only $10,000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There was an amount voted last year, but after the signing of the armistice the expenditure on this account would increase very rapidly because the problem of unemployment be-

came quite severe about that time. Many new offices were established by the Provincial Governments, and in some instances by the Federal authorities, and last year's vote was found to be short by the amount asked for here.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I understood that the Government intended to render substantial assistance to these labour bureaux and that quite a large amount would be needed. If the Government is really in earnest in its desire to co-operate with the provinces in this matter, my opinion is that the sum of $10,000 would only be sufficient to meet the necessities of the office in Montreal.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The amount that will be needed for the current fiscal year will be very much in excess of last year's expenditure, as the Federal and the Provincial Governments have all been obliged by the necessities of the unemployment prevailing throughout the country to expend considerably more money.

Mr. CALDER: If I am not mistaken a vote of $50,000 was taken last session, and I think no portion of that money, or at least, only a very small amount, was used until the armistice was signed. Then we had a meeting here of representatives from all the provinces, and it was decided to establish these bureaus without delay, either immediately after or immediately prior to the armistice. Since then somewhere in the neighbourhood of seventy-five bureaus have been established. So that the expenditure has been largely since last November.

Mr. VIEN: In all the provinces?

Mr. CALDER: In practically all the provinces. If I am not mistaken the total expenditure will amount, with this $10,000 to something like $60,000. You will find in the Estimates I think for this year a sum of $200,000 to cover the same class of work.

Mr. CAHILL: The Minister of Immigration and Colonization last year had this Bill in charge.

Mr. CALDER: No, the Minister of Labour.

Mr. CAHILL: At least, he explained it to me. He explained at that time that it would ease the labour situation, and if I remember rightly, that it was very urgent. I think before we pass this item we should have an explanation of what has been done with the $50,000 and the $10,000.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. CASGRAIN: If we are called upon to vote $10,000 in addition to what was formerly voted, there must have been lots of additional work that was not foreseen. I think we should receive this information.

Soldiers' Land Settlement — Salaries of Board of Commissioners—Further amount required, $199.01.

Advances to soldiers settling upon the land, and cost of administering The Soldier Settlement Act, 1917, including clerical assistance, and amount payable to W. F. O'Connor, K.C., as special Counsel to the Board, at the rate of $2,000 per annum, from December 1, 1918—Further amount required, $666.66.

Mr. FIELDING: This item is a small sinner, but the principle is the same. I have no objection to any liberal salary that may be given to Mr. O'Connor, but I wish to suggest to the minister that in the Main or Supplementary Estimates next year Mr. O'Connor's salary whatever it may be, be voted straight and square and not scattered over two or three places.

Mr. COPP: Who comprises the Board of Commissioners and what are their salaries?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not the information here. If the hon. member will let it stand until the Main Estimates are brought down we will give the information then.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Let it stand.

Mr. COPP: I think we ought to have the information. I would like to know where this money is going to, and how many individuals are to receive it. I think it is only fair that the information should be furnished.

Mr. CALDER: There are three members composing the board. Dr. Black is chairman and gets a salary, I think, of $6,000—no, I think he gets the same salary as a deputy minister, $5,000; but he will get $6,000 under our Estimates for this year. He was formerly principal of the Provincial Agricultural College at Winnipeg. Major Ashton is the second member of the board, and gets a salary of either $4,000 or $5,000, I am not sure which. Then Mr. Maber, who was one of the chief officers in the Interior Department, is the third member, and gets the same salary as Major Ashton. If I am not mistaken their salaries are fixed under the legislation which created the board.

Mr. COPP: I am very grateful for the very lucid information the minister has given. I asked for the members of the board and their salaries. I am given the names, and I am told that one gets $5,000 or $6,000, the minister does not know which; the second

member gets $4,000 or $5,000, the minister does not know which; and the other member gets the same as the second one. That is the sort of information the Government is giving in answer to what I think is a fair question.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Minister of the Interior is not here this evening.

Mr. COPP: Then the Government should not ask that the item be passed.

Mr. CARVELL: This item only refers to salary payable to Mr. O'Connor. He receives $2,000 per annum as counsel to the board, and this item is to provide his salary from the date of his appointment to the end of the fiscal year; it has nothing whatever to do with the members of the board.

Mr. COPP: The item begins with "Salaries of Board of Commissioners—further amount required, $199.01."

Mr. PROULX: What is Mr. O'Connor's salary as an officer of the Justice Department?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is $5,000.

Mr. PROULX: I understand that he works for the Soldiers' Settlement Board. It is a bad principle to divide the services of an official and pay him more than one salary. There is too much camouflage in this.

Mr. PARENT: What are Mr. O'Connor's duties in the Justice Department?

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. O'Connor did work for both the Labour and Justice Departments; his salary was $2,000 with the Labour Department and $5,000 with the Justice Department.

Mr. VIEN: In what capacity does he serve in the Justice Department?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The drafting of Bills and special work.

Mr. PARENT: Did he draft Bill 91, about the defaulters?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think so. That Bill was drafted in the Justice Department, but not by Mr. O'Connor. With regard to the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding), I merely wish to remark that the criticism is not without some substance, and the matter should be corrected in some way. However, the amount which the Committee is asked to vote is for services rendered last year. Mr. O'Connor has been assigned to special work. During the Parliamentary sessions he has had a great deal to do with legislation. Previously he had a great deal to do with the Labour Department, in connection with the Cost of Living Commission. He has drafted, and is now drafting, legislation which is coming before Parliament at the present session. During the last Dominion election he was assistant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; he was engaged during several months in concluding that work. It can never be said of Mr. O'Connor that he wastes his time, because he is an exceedingly industrious man and really does give to the State full value for anything that he is paid.

Mr. PARENT: I give the minister the instance of Bill No. 91.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know what Bill No. 91 is.

Mr. PARENT: We know on this side. It is the Bill against defaulters.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That does not affect this item.

Mr. VIEN: It is a surprising thing that when we on this side speak of a question of principle ministers nearly always admit that the principle is sound, but that there is an exception here, an exception there, an exception somewhere else. Mr. O'Connor should have definite duties to perform and he should be paid a definite salary. We should not be called upon to pay him $5,000 as an official of one branch, and $2,000 as an official of another. If Mr. O'Connor's services are retained in the Justice Department they must be required there, and if they are required there we should get some one else to perform those services if he goes to another department. If Mr. O'Connor has time to spare in the Justice Department he should be called upon to fill the office of some other official of that department. If there are too many employees in the Justice Department let us reduce the number. Civil servants should have definite duties to perform and should not have the right to supplement their salaries by performing other duties in their spare time.

Mr. COPP: I have asked for certain information, which I have not yet received. I again ask that some member of the Government furnish that information.

Mr. CALDER: I am sure that the hon. gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. COPP: Absolutely.

Mr. CALDER: It is not that the Government has no desire to give the information; it is simply that the minister of the department concerned does not happen to be in

the chamber. I endeavoured to give such information as I could, and the hon. member calls me to task because I do not carry all this information in my head. If he insists that the information be given to-night the only thing to do is to send for it.

Mr. COPP: I do not take my hon. friend to task at all; he gave all the information he had. If it is not his duty to pilot this item through the Committee I have no fault to find with him.

Mr. CALDER: The minister is not here.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend attempted to give some information, but he gave none that I did not have myself. He said that there was an item of $6,000 or $5,000 for Dr. Black, $4,000 or $5,000 for somebody else, and a like amount for somebody else.

Mr. CALDER: I think the hon. member will find they are statutory salaries.

Mr. COPP: I asked the question simply to get information, and I think it is information that should be given to the Committee.

Mr. CAHILL: Can the minister in charge of the Estimates mention any Bill which Mr. O'Connor had had in charge or prepared?

Mr. ROWELL: He drafted the Soldiers' Land Settlement Bill which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) introduced the other day. He has had to do with the drafting of the Bankruptcy Bill, and he has worked on some other very important Bills.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The Franchise Bill?

Mr. ROWELL: I think he has had something to do with that. Mr. O'Connor has spent weeks of his time working on some of the largest Bills which the Government has introduced this session.

Mr. VIEN: Why should he receive a higher salary than deputy heads of various departments? As counsel to the Board he has a salary of $2,000 per annum. Why should he not be paid about the same salary as a deputy head, say in the Justice Department, and be called upon to render some legal assistance in his capacity as an employee in the Justice Department?

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member is possibly not aware of the fact that the deputy head of the Justice Department is paid a salary of $10,000 per annum.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And more; he receives fees besides.

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. ROWELL: I believe the Government have to pay that salary to Mr. O'Connor if they desire to retain his services. The reason of his being on the Soldier Settlement Board is this: The Soldier Settlement Board need a solicitor to advise them in connection with the many important agreements and forms which they have to draft in carrying out their work. Mr. O'Connor was in the Justice Department rendering a certain service. He was also rendering certain service as Cost of Living Commissioner. He was no longer required for the latter, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), the head of the Soldier Settlement Board, found that the Board could avail itself of Mr. O'Connor's services without engaging a new solicitor at a substantial salary. He, therefore, arranged to secure part of Mr. O'Connor's time for the work of the Soldier Settlement Board, and to continue paying him the salary which he had hitherto been drawing. He had been drawing $5,000 from the Justice Department and $2,000 as Cost of Living Commissioner, and the same amount is paid to him in a different form. I appreciate what the hon. member (Mr. Vien) and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) have said about paying two salaries. That is open to criticism, and the explanation in this case is that this particular official is rendering services to each of two distinct departments and the salary is divided.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is that the same Mr. O'Connor who is going to be appointed official returning officer in place of the late clerk of the Crown in Chancery?

Mr. ROWELL: I have not heard of any such appointment.

Mr. FIELDING: The requests for information on all these points are reasonable, and if they are passed, the ministers could fairly be asked to hold the items over. On the other hand, I can appreciate the desire of the ministers to get though with these items so that they may wind up the accounts of the last fiscal year, and I think hon. gentlemen may be content to accept the assurance that information on all these matters will be brought down at another stage. With that statement, I would urge that the ministers be allowed to get through with these Estimates to-night.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There has been no obstruction that I know of, and I think that what has been passed so far has been passed pretty rapidly.

Miscellaneous — Canada Gazette — further amount required,—$6,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What is this additional amount for?

Mr. J. D. REID: Increased cost of labour.

Distribution of Parliamentary documents and other Government publications—further amount required, $8,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What are the "other" Government publications?

Mr. J. D. REID: This is printing ordered by the House. The increased cost of this is for the same reason as in the other case, namely increased cost of labour and materials in connection with printing.

Mr. CASGRAIN: That seems to be the answer for the first part—distribution of parliamentary documents. But there is the other item "Other Government publications." What does that mean? Does that include the Daily Record and other papers published by the Government?

Mr. J. D. REID: A list of parliamentary documents is always printed in the Canada Gazette.

Mr. PARENT: Who gets the printing of the documents?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Printing Bureau. This is simply a cross entry.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is an amount included for the Daily Record?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, that is a separate item.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What is the cost of that publication?

Mr. ROWELL: Some question was asked early in the session and I brought down the exact figures at the time. I think the cost was approximately $50,000 a year.

Mr. CALDER: I find on turning up the Soldiers' Settlement Act that the Chief Commissioner gets $6,000 a year and each of the other commissioners $5,000.

Mr. COPP: Since the minister has gone back to that item, that is not all the information. Are there any other expenses in connection with the Soldiers' Settlement Board than the salaries of the commissioners?

Mr. CALDER: Yes, hundreds of thousands of dollars of expenses.

Mr. COPP: I should like to have the information regarding that.

Mr. J. D. REID: We shall get that for the hon. member.

To provide an amount to meet expenses in connection with the visit of Prince Fushimi of Japan, $16,374.01.

Mr. PROULX: When did this prince come here?

Mr. ROWELL: Last autumn. Prince Fushimi of Japan was returning a visit paid by Prince Arthur and was the guest of Canada while travelling through this country. The Government provided the necessary special car for the prince and his party and also necessary travelling expenses through the country.

Mr. BELAND: How long was his stay in Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: The total stay would not exceed a month. He travelled through Canada from the Pacific to the Atlantic and visited various centres in this country.

Mr. PARENT: Does the minister say that a prince cannot travel in Canada without his expenses being paid by the Canadian people?

Mr. ROWELL: I feel quite sure I am within the judgment of the Committee when I say that having regard to the fact that Japan was one of our Allies in this war it was but fitting, when the representative of Japan, the son of the ruling sovereign, was passing through Canada on his way to visit His Majesty in Great Britain, that every respect should be paid him because of the high position which he held, and the Government acted accordingly.

Mr. BELAND: But Canada can hardly afford to pay the expenses of foreign princes travelling through this country.

Mr. ROWELL: He was going as the official representative of the Government of Japan to visit the Government in Great Britain, and he was the guest of Canada while passing through this country. He became our guest as he landed, and remained our guest until he left. It was exactly the same courtesy that we paid to General Pau and his party—exactly the same respect that Japan paid to Prince Arthur, the representative of Great Britain in Japan. We treated the representative of the Government of Japan and the representative of the Government of France exactly the same in every respect.

Mr. PARENT: Is there an item in the Estimates about General Pau?

Mr. ROWELL: The money has been paid. I presume an item will be in the Estimates

for this year unless the money comes out of the War Vote. General Pau was the guest of Canada, and we were very glad indeed to have the honour of entertaining him.

Excise—travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, etc.—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What is this item?

Mr. J. D. REID: Last year the amount was $90,000, to cover the travelling expenses of the officers, rent of buildings, fuel, stationery, etc. The officers state that the estimate was $10,000 short of the amount required, due no doubt to the increased cost of transportation and of fuel.

Mr. CAHILL: Where do the officers use fuel?

Mr. J. D. REID: For heating the buildings in which they are housed. In my home town, for instance, the Excise Department has ten offices, and used from twenty to twenty-five tons of coal last winter. The cost of fuel is very much higher than it was a year ago.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to collection of revenue—Canadian Government Railways—working expenses—further amount required, $6,000,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is to make up the loss in the operation of the Government Railway System during the fiscal year ended March 31.

Mr. VIEN: Is $6,000,000 the total deficit?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. The total working expenses of the Canadian Government Railway system during the year were $42,981,603.98, and the earnings $37,493,802.11, which leaves a deficit of about $6,000,000. The deficit is made up as follows: Intercolonial Railway, eastern lines, working expenses for the twelve months, $27,361,349.39, earnings, $25,770,345.70, deficit about a million and three-quarters. Prince Edward Island Railway, working expenses $1,534,846.69, earnings $765,936.52, deficit about $750,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the estimated cost of the Prince Edward Island railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not the figures here. This item is for the operation. The working expenses of the International Railway for the year were $532,834.63 and the earnings $198,827, deficit about $300,000. Transcontinental, eastern lines, working expenses $4,088,325.30, earnings $2,904,101.29, deficit about $1,100,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What does the minister mean by the eastern lines?

Mr. J. D. REID: From Quebec to Moncton. Transcontinental, western lines—between Quebec and Winnipeg—working expenses $9,176,663.71, earnings $7,745,835, deficit about $1,600,000.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister explain how the Government system could not make ends meet while the Canadian Pacific Railway made a good profit? I can understand a deficit on the Transcontinental, but why does not the Intercolonial pay its way?

Mr. J. D. REID: One reason is that since the McAdoo award, in April of last year I think, we have been paying very much higher wages. Coal also cost us very much more, probably $3 or $4 a ton more. The increased freight rates did not come into effect until about September, and in the meantime we were put to the extra expense of increased wages, as well as paying more for coal and other materials. The loss on the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Northern, and, in fact, all the railways, was heavy during that period. The Canadian Pacific also lost very heavily during that period. Of course, that road has earnings from other sources. Its steamship lines, for instance, were making a lot of money, and some even of its railway lines were paying. The Transcontinental and the Intercolonial, of course, have not got the feeders that the Canadian Pacific has.

Mr. PARENT: Has the minister a statement showing the earnings between Quebec and Cochrane?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not think they keep a record of the revenues earned on different parts of the line in that way, although they keep a record of the revenues earned on the branch lines. They would keep a statement of the revenues between Quebec and Winnipeg, but not between Quebec and Cochrane. If we had a small line, as we have in New Brunswick, they would keep a record of the earnings in their books.

Mr. PARENT: I believe that if an answer had been given to my question it would have shown that the line between Quebec and Cochrane would have been a paying proposition, although the Government have not spent any money there. On the contrary, it has done everything possible to destroy whatever benefit the country might have derived from the construction of a line from Quebec to Cochrane or Quebec to Moncton. That particular part of the Trans-

continental was neglected for certain reasons by the Government from 1911 to 1917, I shall not speak of the Government from 1917 up to the present time. All the harm that has been done to the city of Quebec has been done by the Government since 1911. If there is a city that has been particularly neglected so far as railways are concerned it is Quebec. On the south shore of the St. Lawrence, at Levis, you find the most disgusting situation that any one could imagine. I believe there is no city in Canada with a population of 10,000 or 15,000 where a more intolerable situation exists than that at Levis to-day, where, for the last ten or twelve years, the station having been burned down, it has not been replaced. The reason for the course which has been pursued nobody can understand except it be that this city happens to be in the province of Quebec. Although the Quebec bridge has been completed, we have not seen a Transcontinental or Intercolonial train passing over it. Why? There is a city of 125,000 people with the Transcontinental and Intercolonial coming to its door, and yet the Government has not found a way to have a station of its own in that city. What it did was to make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific, which at that time was quite friendly to the Government. By that arrangement all the trains of the Transcontinental railway will go to the Canadian Pacific station, with the result that all the Canadian National railway business will pass through the terminals of the Canadian Pacific railway. Nothing is done at Quebec and the Government is doing its best to reduce to nothing the $13,000,000 spent on the Quebec bridge. I believe the minister means well, and I would urge upon him that something shall be done. If something is done as a result of the representations which I have made to the minister the few words which I have uttered will not be spoken in vain.

Mr. BELAND: Are the freight rates on the Intercolonial and the Government railways the same as on the other railways in Canada?

Mr. J. D. REID: There may have been some differences in some of the items but I think they were pretty nearly the same.

Mr. BELAND: Will they be the same in the future?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Railway Commission will have to decide whether they should be the same or not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the Transcontinental operate a daily train between Quebec and Amos?

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not say offhand. I understand from the officials that they are making more use of the Transcontinental railway system between Moncton and Quebec and they are getting it in good shape so that they will be able to handle more traffic than in the past. In addition to that they have been running a train between Quebec and Winnipeg three times a week. It is two or three months ago since I discussed the matter with the officials, and they told me that they were going to put more trains on both divisions of the Transcontinental.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very glad to hear that, because the Abitibi region where there is a splendid colonization movement going on is going to become more and more the hinterland of Quebec. I read not long ago a lecture delivered in Montreal by a young man named Mr. Authier, the Quebec Colonization agent at Amos. He was describing that district and deploring the fact that the railway facilities were not adequate to the movement of population there. I would ask my hon. friend to look into that question and meet the wishes of the people of that district. The Quebec Government intends to settle returned soldiers there. They have offered lands to them and I think we will see in that district within a very few years another province of Quebec.

Mr. J. D. REID: I agree with the hon. member. I was talking it over with Mr. Brady last year. The traffic is increasing very rapidly. In fact, the statement I have just read shows that to be the case. And they must provide for it. We have been short of equipment of all kinds on account of carrying soldiers. All the passenger cars we could get were required. It is probable that they will be putting the service on that road in the condition in which it should be.

Mr. DECHENE: The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) has spoken about the situation at Levis. We, who travel on the south shore, pass there very often, and I regret to say that people have to wait on the platform of the station. They refuse to go into the station. It is practically impossible to go in there and see anything.

Mr. J. D. REID: That very question has been brought to our attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was raised in the Senate the other day.

Mr. J. D. REID: The estimates submitted by the departmental officials for consideration some time ago, before we brought down the Main Estimates, contained an item for a new station at Levis. That item now appears in the Estimates presented to the House, and the station is to be proceeded with this year. I was discussing the matter only a few days ago with the officials, and I can say that the erection of a new station will be undertaken in the near future. I was also discussing the proposed new station at Levis with the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien), and the hon. gentleman will confirm my statement that the officials intend at once to proceed with the work. I realize that a new station should have been built before this. The former structure was destroyed by fire, but by reason of war conditions it has not been replaced at an earlier date. However, the question will not be raised at the next session, because the new station will have been built by that time.

Mr. VIEN: The work was started, but unfortunately it was badly started. The intention of the officials was to put the passenger station on the south side of the tracks, and the freight station on the north side, whereas everybody who is conversant with the conditions there, knows that ninety per cent of the travelling public using the Government railway go from Quebec to the Intercolonial, or from the Intercolonial to Quebec. Yet it was proposed to put the passenger station on the south side of the railway so that all the travelling public would have to cross four or five tracks in order to get to the ferry to cross to Quebec. Furthermore, eighty per cent of the freight that goes into Levis station is for the benefit of the population at Levis and the vicinity. Despite that fact, it was proposed to erect the freight station on the north side of the tracks so that the people of Levis or the neighbourhood would have to cross those tracks to get at their freight. I brought the matter to the attention of the minister whilst Mr. McLeod was in the city, and the minister kindly promised that he would give it his most earnest attention. I hope it will be more than official attention which such promises ordinarily mean; also that the passenger station will be erected on the site of the former structure, and that the freight station will be placed on the other side of the tracks. This question was fully threshed out ten years ago when the first station was erected, but the officials, through some misunderstanding, wished to transpose the new freight and passenger stations in the way I have described, which is contrary to common sense.

Mr. FOURNIER: What is the revenue at Levis station?

Mr. J. D. REID: I will get the information and either give it when we are considering the Estimates later, or send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. FOURNIER: I can furnish the minister with the desired information, and I am able to tell him that the Levis station pays well.

Mr. J. D. REID: I know that.

Mr. FOURNIER: I am able to tell my hon. friend that the tickets taken out there are all local tickets. The revenue of the Intercolonial at that point is about $300,000 a year, the revenue of the Quebec Central about $75,000, and that of the Grand Trunk $25,000, whilst the average number of persons using that station is about sixteen hundred a day. I venture to say these figures represent a traffic that ought to be taken into account. There is no question as to the desirability of building a modern station there, because the present Lévis station is about one of the filthiest structures owned by the Canadian Government.

Mr. J. D. REID: I know it is a bad place.

Mr. FOURNIER: Notwithstanding the poor accommodation a very handsome revenue has been collected at Lévis. That fact should be taken into account and a modern station built there without further delay.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the Government purpose taking into account the capital cost of these railways in estimating the loss to the country? There has been a loss of $6,000,000 on operating expenses, and in view of the public ownership proposition now resolved upon, I want to know if the Government at the present time, or in the future, intends taking into account the cost of the undertaking, and the interest on it, as a part of the carrying cost of the railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have never up to the present time taken into consideration the cost of construction in the case of either the Intercolonial or the Transcontinental railway. The statement annually brought down merely showed the earnings and the cost of operation. In future the statement will disclose the total earnings and the cost of operation as in the past, and in addition the amount paid out as intetrest on any

liabilities in connection with any of the railways comprised in the Canadian National Railway system. Then hon. gentlemen will know, and the public will understand, the amount invested in the Intercolonial, and if there is any surplus over and above the cost of operation, after all liabilities have been met, that would be set against the capital outlay on the Intercolonial or the Transcontinental. My own impression is that there will not be any surplus for some time; I do not think the public look forward to any surplus from either the Intercolonial or the Transcontinental. On the contrary it has always been supposed, at least in connection with the Intercolonial, that as the construction of that railway was one of the terms of the agreement at Confederation, there would not be any great profit made on the capital investment.

Mr. CAHILL: That is not quite an answer to my question. There is no indebtedness, as I understand, on either the Intercolonial or the Transcontinental Railway, but there is an investment on the part of the Government of something in the neighbourhood of $400,000,000 in the case of these two railways, and Canada is paying five and a half per cent for the money, free of taxation. Now the two railroads represent an investment on the country's part, and in order to get at the merits and demerits of the nationalization of these systems, which has been resolved upon, we must determine their value. In order to ascertain what we are actually doing by reason of their nationalization, we must know what the interest charge is as well as the operating deficit. I therefore wish to know if it is the policy of the Government in future, not only in regard to the Canadian Northern and the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, but in regard to all the Government railways, to take into account the actual value of these roads and figure the interest charges together with the operating deficits, so that we can get some idea as to where we stand.

Mr. J. D. REID: We will bring down at the end of the fiscal year a statement showing the total amount of earnings and of operating expenses and the total cost of all the different railways comprised in the Canadian National Railway system. So the House will have a statement showing what the loss or profit may be on the whole system.

Mr. VIEN: Does not the Government think it would be possible, with efficient management, to make these railways at least pay their expenses?

Mr. J. D. REID: The estimate made at the first of the year for the operation of what is now the Canadian National Railway system, if my memory serves me right, shows a deficit of about $7,000,000, that is after paying all fixed charges in connection with operation, interest on bonds, and so on; but that would not take into consideration anything for interest on the Intercolonial or the Transcontinental. The impression conveyed to me by the management is that each year that deficit will decrease. But, you see, we are met with other conditions; for instance, at the present time there are demands for increased wages from all of the employees, and the cost of fuel has gone up, while to offset that there is not any increase in freight rates.

Mr. CAHILL: I hate to delay the Committee, but the minister has repeated a statement now which he has made twice before, when I have asked him for information. He states that the loss will be $7,000,000 and that the surplus of earnings over operating expenses will amount to $3,000,000. Whereas the interest on the Canadian Northern investment alone would amount to $18,000,000, which would mean a loss in the neighbourhood of $15,000,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: When you take the total interest charge of $20,000,000 the loss last year would be $15,000,000 or $16,000,000. But as I explained the freight rates were not increased until September, whereas the increased wages of the employees and the higher cost of fuel ran from practically the first of the year. The management estimate that if they had operated during 1918 with the increased freight rates starting at the same time as the increased operating charges, the loss would have been brought down to about $7,000,000.

Mr. CAHILL: So that according to the minister's statement the loss on operation with the interest on the investment in the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental would be $22,000,000, while with the $15,000,000 on the Canadian Northern undertaking the total deficit would be about $37,000,000. That would be for 1918.

1 a.m.

Mr. J. D. REID: Let me put it my way, which I think is practically the same. The Canadian Northern system, we will say, lost $15,000,000 after paying all interest and

other charges. The Intercolonial and the Transcontinental, or the Government Railway system, lost $6,000,000. Those two sums make a total loss of $21,000,000 on operation. Over and above that, if you take into consideration the interest on the investment in the Transcontinental and Intercolonial, there is that further loss, but that has been paid long ago and has not been taken into consideration at any time in bringing the Estimates down.

Mr. CAHILL: There is just one other matter I would like to draw to the minister's attention. At Amos on the Transcontinental there is a very poor station—in fact, it is only a shack. Amos is one of the points at which most of the business on the Transcontinental is done between Cochrane and Quebec, and the people of the district have asked me repeatedly to try to get a better station for them. I have brought the matter to the attention of the Railway Department, but have had very little satisfaction. The settlers also claim that they have great difficulty in getting cars for their pulp wood, and pulp wood is their crop. If they cannot get cars they cannot sell their wood at its proper value, but have to take a ruinous price offered by scalpers. I have known instances where wood that should sell for $6 a cord has had to be sold for $3, or less than the cost of taking it out. The result is that settlers are discouraged and get out of the country as quick as they can.

The road has cost a great deal of money. It is a first class road, running through a good territory. The soil is good and all conditions are conducive to settlement if adequate railway facilities are provided. I hope the Government will take into consideration the necessity of getting people into that part of the country in order to get traffic for the road and make it pay. The passenger service is very bad, and I have been told by people in that district that there is no mail service on that railway; in sending money from one place to another they have to take a chance with the baggage. There is a bank at Amos, which takes in large sums to pay for pulpwood and other commodities. The man in charge of that bank told me that he was worried every day of his life lest something might happen to the large sums of money that were being taken into that country, and asked me to try to get a better mail service in that district.

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Brady told me last fall that they had cleaned up every bit of pulpwood along the Transcontinental. Since we got the new cars I have not heard any complaint about getting cars for the pulpwood. As to the train service, I took that up with Mr. Brady and it is the intention to put a better service on that line. I will bring to the attention of the management the question of a new station at Amos. I assure the hon. member there will be no more delays for the want of cars. We had many complaints about a year ago, but during the last few months there have been practically none.

Mr. PARENT: Last fall a flood on the line of the Canadian Northern railway caused the destruction of part of the line at Cap Rouge and since then it has not been in use. Will the repairs be made at once?

Mr. J. D. REID: I took that up with the general manager a few days ago, and he assured me they were going to make those repairs at once.

Mail service—further amount required, $475,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Does this provide for increases of salaries to rural postmasters or mail carriers?

Mr. ROWELL: It includes increases to rural mail carriers and increases for railway transportation due to a larger service. Many trains that were taken off in 1916, were restored in 1918 at the same rate and that involved an additional expenditure of $130,000. Where new contracts for land conveyance have to be made the prices have been so much higher that an additional charge of $345,000 is involved.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is it the intention of the Government to increase the salaries of rural postmasters? On account of the high cost of living these people can hardly make both ends meet. It is hard to get a man to take a rural post office; it is not a paying proposition. We have been voting increases to deputy ministers, judges and others; there is even talk of increasing the indemnity to members of Parliament. These postmasters ought to be given an increase.

Mr. ROWELL: This item does not deal with that matter. I stated when the subject was discussed on the Main Estimates that certain representations had been made to the Government, that about the midsummer of 1918 an increase had been granted, and that the view of the department was that we should see what the effect of that would be, and probably take

action next year. The matter, however, is still before the department for consideration.

To cover unprovided items, 1917-18, as per Auditor General's Report, part b, page 3, 1917-18, $83,296.75.

Mr. COPP: What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. FIELDING: This is not an appropriation; it is a book-keeping entry which the Auditor General asks for at the close of the year to meet a lot of small items amounting in the aggregate to the sum stated.

Mr. COPP: I have looked up the Auditor General's Report and I find that in every case the grant has not been all expended. In the case of Pensions, for instance, the amount of the grant not used was $2,764,135.

Mr. FIELDING: I have not looked at the items; I was only explaining the custom of the Auditor General in putting in such an item as this.

Mr. COPP: At page B—3 of the Auditor General's Report there are columns for the grant in respect of each service, the expenditure, the grant not used and the grant exceeded. In the case of pensions, the amount of the grant not used was over $2,764,000, and the amount of the grant exceeded is stated to be $62,000.

Mr. ROWELL: That relates to the Public Accounts for 1917-18 whereas the vote we are making to-night is for 1918-19.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This seems a very improper way of voting money—" to cover unprovided items, 1917-18." We are entitled to get the details as we have them for the other items.

Mr. COPP: What are the unprovided items?

Mr. J. D. REID: The items are all given in part 3, page 3. The Auditor General says that in the item " adulteration of food," for instance, there is an excess over the grant of $191.36, then charges of management, an excess over grant of $2,359.75, and so on. He gives the items in detail, amounting to $83,296.75.

Mr. COPP: What is the grant not used, Trade and Commerce, $1,023,276.22, when the same item shows, grant exceeded, $2,989.04?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is very unsatisfactory, and when this item comes up the Auditor General should not be exempt from the responsibility of giving the nature of the items on which the grants were exceeded, so that we may know what the money went for.

Mr. J. D. REID: If hon. members want this item to stand we can strike it out and pass the Bill without it.

Mr. ROWELL: I have not seen the page of the Auditor General's Report, but is not this the explanation? I presume, where an appropriation is for a particular item, even although it may not be all expended, the Auditor General has no authority to pay excess expenditure on any item out of an item on which there is an excess. I should presume the items represent the aggregate of the item in which the expenditure was in excess of the estimate.

Mr. COPP: It does not say so; it says just the reverse.

Mr. CAHILL: What harm is there in letting this item stand?

Mr. ROWELL: We cannot introduce the Bill to give effect to this estimate until all the items are through, and we want, when His Excellency the Governor General comes down within the next two or three days to assent, to have this Bill ready for assent.

Mr. VIEN: Will there be any possibility of coming back to the item at a later date if we pass it?

Mr. J. D. REID: We can get from the Auditor General the whole details of this and a letter explaining the matter, and put it in Hansard to-morrow.

Mr. CAHILL: We shall have to pass it first.

Mr. ROWELL: I have just had an opportunity of glancing at this, but the explanation appears on the face of the statement. It gives the different items in which the grant is exceeded.

Mr. BELAND: Will the minister look at the item pensions—grant exceeded, $62,475.31; grant not used, $2,764,135.97? The amount voted was $10,000,000, the amount expended $7,000,000, part of the grant not used, and then the Auditor General wants $62,475.31 more.

Mr. ROWELL: There appears to be some mistake there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think we have done very well this evening, and we shall get the report to-morrow and then pass the item.

Mr. J. D. REID: I would let this item stand and pass the others and introduce the

Bill without this one. I would like to pass the Bill, because we may not go into Supply again to-morrow as we were going on with Bills.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the minister will bring an explanation from the Auditor General to-morrow, that is necessary.

Mr. J. D. REID: I will put the whole details on Hansard to-morrow.

Mr. COPP: That may be all right, but I cannot understand what this means.

Mr. J. D. REID: I admit it requires explanation.

Resolutions reported, and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Hon. J. D. Reid 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 31st March, 1919, the sum of $18,827,098.72 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY BILL.

Hon. J. D. Reid thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 113, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public services for the financial year ending March 31, 1919.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and the second time, considered in Committee, and reported.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House adjourned.

Thursday, May 15, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock, Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 108, for the relief of Mary King.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 109, for the relief of William Herman Depper.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 110, for the relief of William Rogers Latimer.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 112, for the relief of William Pinkerton.—Mr. Mowat.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What was the aggregate amount of fixed charges (interest or securities) on the Canadian Northern Railway System for the year ending December 31, 1918?

2. With reference to the statement of the Honourable Minister of Railways (page 1678 Hansard) that the net earnings of the Canadian Northern Railway System for the calendar year of 1918 were $3,562,303.40, did the minister make provision in striking this balance for the payment of the said fixed charges?

3. If not, what would be the deficit for the said year after all fixed charges were provided for?

4. With reference to the statement of the minister that the Government has not assumed the outstanding liabilities of the Canadian Northern System, is it possible for the Government to nationalize and become the owners of this railway system without assuming its liabilities?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. The amount of fixed charges on the Canadian Northern railway system for year ended December 31, 1918, is $17,735,522.31. Included in this amount is interest payable to Government amounting to $3,900,529.15.

2. No.

3. The deficit for year 1918 after the fixed charges were provided for is $14,333,085.07.

4. The Dominion Government are shareholders of the Canadian Northern railway, and as such do not necessarily assume all its liabilities.

LAND GRANTS TO RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. How many grants of land have been made to religious denominations and institutions by the Federal Government since 1896?

2. What was the amount of each grant?

3. When, and to what religious denomination or institutions was it made, and where located?

4. Have requests been made for grants which have not been acceded to?

5. If so, by whom and where located?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. 290.

2. Answered by No. 3.

3. Schedule attached. (Placed on Clerk's table.)

4 and 5. No record kept of requests for grants which have not been acceded to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. PEDLOW:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, letters of reference, agreement, correspondence,

and other documents between Dr. F. Montizambert, Director of the Bureau of Public Health, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Immigration; regarding the appointment of Dr. W. H. Drury to position of Assistant Medical Superintendent and Bacteriologist at William Head Quarantine Station, Victoria, B.C.; and Professor Gunn, Secretary of American Journal of Public Health, the Principal of Institute Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; the Principals of Harvard and McGill Universities, Dr. R. Nelson, of William Head Quarantine Station, Victoria, B.C., Military Officers, of Victoria, B.C., and elsewhere. Report of investigation held at request of Dr. Drury, by A. B. Cook, at Victoria, B.C., on December 30 and 31, 1918. Letters from Hon. A. J. Calder in reference to this subject and investigation, covering the period from January, 1917, up to present date.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

For a return showing the quantities of fresh (frozen) and salt fish shipped from Canada to England, France and other allied countries overseas, under the direction of the Canadian Government, during the war, distinguishing between salt and fresh fish; also setting forth the quantities supplied to the Canadian troops overseas and the quantity sold to the ordinary consumer; also a statement in detail showing the names and Post Office addresses of the parties from whom the said fish was purchased and the prices paid therefor, respectively.

COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): May I be permitted to call the attention of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) to an omission in the matter of a committee? It has been customary during the last two sessions for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) to be a member of the Committee on Fisheries, but by some accident his name has not been included this session. I would think it very desirable that the minister should be a member of that Committee, and I would suggest that the Acting Prime Minister move for the addition of his name.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I am glad my hon. friend has drawn the matter to my attention. I shall make the motion to-morrow.

SUPPLY BILL.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved the third reading of Bill No. 113 granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ended the 31st March, 1919.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

FERTILIZERS ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 74, to amend the Fertilizers Act, 1909, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—phosphoric acid content or other ingredients to be stated.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understood the minister was going to have the Bill reprinted.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was reprinted and distributed. The other evening the member for Brome asked why phosphoric acid or phosphorus was stated in terms of ammonia and in reply to him I said that in the trade phosphorus or phosphoric acid was so expressed. Superficially, that might amount to a contradiction in terms. Ammonia is recovered as a by-product in the manufacture of gas from coal, but the greater proportion of ammonia is nitrogen. In 17 pounds of ammonia 14 pounds would be of the other ingredient. The technical officer of the department has never been in favour of expressing this particular ingredient in the terms of ammonia, and he has always been willing and anxious to use the term nitrogen. In many countries the term nitrogen is used instead of ammonia, and since our discussion on this Bill the other night he has expressed a preference for an amendment. I am of the same opinion and move that the word 'nitrogen' be inserted instead of 'ammonia.'

Mr. DUFF: Why is it necessary to have the word 'agent?' The agent might be a man selling goods after receiving them from the manufacturer's factory.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The main Act provides that when fertilizer is manufactured outside of the country the manufacturer must be represented here by an agent on whom processes might be served, in every way as if the manufacturer was resident here.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists of North America? I know who they are, but what is the official permanent constitution?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is merely an association of agricultural chemists, the membership of which includes Canadians as well as Americans.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Have they any corporate or official existence?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. They have a corporate existence but have no official recognition. They are, however, regarded on the continent of North America as the

association best capable of expressing accurate scientific opinions on these matters.

Sir SAM HUGHES: From what source do they obtain their constitution—the United States Government or the Canadian Government, or what?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They have a corporate existence, but it is merely an association. Originally the membership was composed entirely of Americans, but recently it was opened to Canadians. At the present time I think there is only one Canadian a member of the association, that is Dr. McGill, the chief analyst of the Dominion Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is not this very slipshod legislation? We are practically giving a constitution to a body that has no official recognition.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are many things analogous to this. For instance, the British Pharmacopoeia is recognized as a standard work by all countries, although it has no official recognition other than that given it by statute. There is an association of engineers—I forget the exact designation of it—which includes American and Canadian engineers, and they recommend standards that are accepted all over the world.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They have a constitution. The Society of Canadian Engineers and the Society of American Civil Engineers have each a constitution.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, which they make themselves.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Under control.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, not under control.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is meant by "organic products"?

Mr. MACLEAN: Animal products as distinct from mineral products, as, for instance, tankage and offal from abattoirs, and products of that kind.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Fish offal?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: And mussel mud, spoken of the other night?

Mr. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is not included?

Mr. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. SHEARD: With regard to the percentage of nitrogen, is this free nitrogen or nitrogen in compounds?

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. MACLEAN: Nitrogen in compounds. The only possible way of getting free nitrogen would be to grow clover and plough it into the soil.

Mr. SHEARD: You can get it from the air.

Mr. MACLEAN: Clover and one or two other agricultural products such as peas and beans, are the only plant life which can absorb nitrogen freely from the air and transmit it to the soil.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—registration number:

On section 9—stamps to be affixed to packages:

Mr. COPP: How will this license fee be paid?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The fee is to be paid by the manufacturer according to the ingredients contained in the fertilizer. If it contains nitrogen, phosphoric acid and potash, he will pay $24; if there is only one of these ingredients, $8, or if two, $16. The purpose of this section is to get a revenue to assist in meeting the expense of the administration of the Act. In connection with most Acts of this character, where there has to be an official inspection and oversight of the manufacture and distribution of the article, it has become the practice to make a charge. In the United States and some European countries the license fee is determined upon the principle we are adopting in this section. It seems to be satisfactory to the trade; at least, I am instructed that the officers of the department have conferred with the manufacturers and that they do not disapprove.

Mr. COPP: It seems to me that this charge will only be passed on to the consumer of the fertilizer. Fertilizer is selling at a very high price now; it will continue high, and the extra license fee of the dealer will naturally be added to the price and the farmer will have to pay for it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think it will seriously affect the price to the consumer. At any rate, the State is entitled to some contribution in connection with the administration of the Act.

Mr. COPP: The minister said that it seemed to satisfy the trade. Has he had any correspondence with the consumers and farmers who have to purchase this fertilizer or with any farmer's association?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot say that there has been any consultation with the consumer. I would like to impress upon my hon. friend that the tax is merely upon the brand. It is not $8, $16, or $24 per ton. The manufacturer may sell 100,000 tons of a certain brand but he will only be charged $24. It will not afford any substantial proportion of the cost to the department of the administration of the Act. I do not think it is a burdensome tax or that it will meet with any opposition from the consumer.

Mr. McCOIG: This seems to be a very simple matter to take up the time of the House with. As other matters come before the House, as commissions and officers are appointed, the department itself provides for defraying the expense, but when it comes to such an important question as fertilizer is to the producers of this country and also to the consumers, it does seem ridiculous that a little cent or two cent tax has to be collected to defray the expenses of the officer who administers the Act. I do not see why the department does not assume the responsibility itself and pay the expenses of the administration of the Act instead of having some officer pulling a cent or two cent tax or a hundred pounds out of the purchaser of the fertilizer and administering the Act at his expense. In the department there are men who are being paid by the Government to look after matters of this kind without penalizing the consumer by collecting a cent on every hundred pounds or twenty cents on every ton. They will have to keep a lot of bookkeepers to keep track of the administration of this Act and the distribution of the stamps. It is going to involve a lot of unnecessary expense.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I assume that my hon. friend knows that all fertilizers manufactured in Canada must be inspected by technical officers under a department of government.

Mr. McCOIG: Will the minister not admit that that has already been provided for?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is being done now and largely for the protection of the public. It is also in the interest of the manufacturer that this inspection shall take place because it is a guarantee to the public of the character of his products. The tax imposed under this section is very small indeed and it will not yield more than one-tenth of the total cost of administering the Act. It is a tax that the manufacturer alone will pay. It will be so small that I do not think it will be placed on the consumer. This is a step in the right direction. Furthermore, it has the support of precedent in all countries of the world. I think it is fair legislation.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend says that the tax is not to be imposed at the rate of so much per ton or anything of that kind. That is quite correct. It says "no manufacturer or agent shall sell or offer for sale." At the smaller points throughout the country districts there will be a number of agents appointed to handle fertilizers and each one of them must pay this fee, as I understand.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No; the word "agent" has a definition. I have not the Act before me but provision is made that every manufacturer who exports from another country into Canada must have registered with the minister the name of the Canadian agent. Before that agent can sell in Canada on behalf of his principal he must get a license. This license is not required by every dealer or retailer.

Mr. COPP: That is the point I was making because the section says "no manufacturer or agent."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The word "agent" has a special definition.

On section 10—how analysis is obtained:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This clause is the same as the one in the present Act with the exception of the last sentence reading as follows:

The certificate of the analyst shall be accepted as legal evidence in the courts.

Mr. SEXSMITH: What is the object of charging a dollar for the analysis referred to here? I think that is detrimental to the working of the Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The fee is a nominal one and intended to aid in reducing the cost of administering the Act. It is a provision which has been in force ever since the Fertilizer Act was enacted.

Mr. SEXSMITH: It does not seem wise to demand a dollar from a man who purchases fertilizer and then asks the department to make an analysis of it. I think the department should make the analysis without charging the public any fee whatever. It would then be some protection perhaps to the public and it would be the making of such analyses. I do not think the Govern-

ment requires the payment of this fee in the case of other products.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am afraid that if the department were to undertake to make analyses of fertilizers without any charge whatever, the time of the officers would be fully taken up for the whole year. The levying of the fee is rather a guarantee of the bona fides and the responsibility of the man who sends in the sample for analysis. So far as I am aware there is no objection to its payment.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Where analyses are made by departments of the Government, under other Acts, for example in the case of seed wheat, samples can be sent in and the analysis does not cost anything.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The scientific determination of the ingredients of a fertilizer is much more difficult, I think, than an analysis of grain seeds, and occupies a good deal of time.

Mr. SEXSMITH: In the case of such commodities as pepper, samples are required to be sent in to the Government from time to time, and those who forward the samples are not required to pay for the analysis.

Mr. BURNHAM: I think if the minister will consider the circumstances, he will agree that those who sell fertilizers should be responsible for the good quality of the product. If a merchant says, "I have fertilizer for sale," and induces a farmer to purchase it and spread it over his farm, and subsequently the farmer ascertains that it is of bad quality, surely the latter should not be made responsible for that? Surely the same care that is shown by the department with regard to seed wheat, and other seed grain, should be bestowed upon fertilizers?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. SEXSMITH: No. I think that under the provisions of another Act the title of which I do not at present recall, the millers and other persons who produce stock foods are required to brand and indicate the percentage of proteins and food values of the different foods which they sell upon the package but they are not charged any fee such as is imposed here. Any one producing those foods can forward a sample to the department at Ottawa and have it analyzed in order to determine what the percentage of food value is, and if it is in accordance with the brand, and percentages marked on the package. In such cases as that the Government does not collect a fee, I do not think it should be done in this instance. To my mind the imposition of a fee is unnecessary; the Government should perform that service free of charge.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think my hon. friend really has any substantial objection to this small fee. The fertilizer is inspected and analyzed at the place of production by our own inspectors. Inspectors are on the spot making purchases themselves from the dealers in order to make certain that there is no evasion of the Act by the disposal of inferior brands to the public. The number of requests for analyses of fertilizers made by private individuals throughout Canada to the department is very small, indeed, and I do not think that anybody who wants an analysis will object to paying a fee.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Perhaps the exaction of a fee is the reason why such a small number of samples for analysis has been received. I do not think you will find the number is small in the case of other products where there is no charge for making the analysis.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is a fee of one dollar.

Mr. SEXSMITH: My impression was to the contrary.

On Section 15—Penalties.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Under what circumstances is a fine imposed upon the purchaser?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would only apply to a case of a purchaser who proposed to sell the fertilizer again and become the principal in the transaction.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The clause does not make that clear. As now worded, I think it would apply to any purchaser.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 14 of the Act declares:—

> This Act shall not apply to fertilizers which are manufactured to the order of the purchaser, and are not intended for sale, unless such fertilizers be actually sold by such purchaser.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Any one acting as an agent for the manufacturer of fertilizers, or a merchant dealing in fertilizers, will feel it to be incumbent upon him to have an analysis made in order to determine that the product before the sale is made is up to standard. If not he is liable to a penalty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. McCOIG: Where will the stamps for these packages be obtained? Will special

offices be established in different municipalities for that purpose? I wrote the department some time ago about an officer stationed in a town in my constituency who was paid a salary of $600 or $700 a year, and only sold a few dollars' worth of stamps.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We have abandoned the method of taxing through stamps, and substituted for it the imposition of a license fee for the brand amounting to $8, $16, or $24, according to whether or not the fertilizer contains one, two, or three of the three specified ingredients—nitrogen, phosphoric acid, and potash.

Mr. McCOIG: Will the stamp go with the license?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The license will cover the stamps.

Mr. McCOIG: It will not be necessary to have an inland revenue officer in a particular locality to sell stamps?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not to sell stamps.

Mr. McCOIG: Is not the inland revenue officer in the town of Wallaceburg still selling stamps for the Inland Revenue Department?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. The Fertilizer Act of 1909 did not require these stamps to be affixed. The Bill introduced a few days ago did, but the policy has since been abandoned.

On schedule A:

Mr. SEXSMITH: You provide in this schedule that a representative of the department taking a sample for analysis must take it in the presence of one or more witnesses; but where an individual purchases fertilizer and sends to the department for analysis a sample of one pound accompanied by a dollar, and the sample is found to be below the proper standard, the agent or manufacturer is liable to a penalty without the benefit of any safeguard so far as the taking of the sample is concerned.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If a farmer, for instance, sends to the department for analysis a sample of fertilizer which he has purchased, having in mind probable action against the manufacturer, he must be able to prove in court that the sample he sent to the department is the same as the fertilizer purchased. The department is merely asked to make an analysis of a certain fertilizer. That is all they propose to do, and that is all they can do.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Then it seems to me there is all the greater reason why we should not charge that dollar fee. A purchaser of fertilizer in order to find out whether the article is up to the guarantee or not has to send to the department a sample of one pound accompanied by a dollar, and if on analysis the sample is below standard he has to take legal action himself. The result will be that no individual will ask the department for an analysis under those conditions, and you might just as well have that clause struck out.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section B of the Act in reference to samples submitted by a purchaser deals with that. It is:

> Samples of fertilizer submitted by a purchaser for analysis must be enclosed in glass jars or bottles and properly sealed, and samples must be taken in the presence of the vendor or his representative.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported as amended.

BANKRUPTCY ACT.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 18 respecting Bankruptcy.—Mr. Guthrie.

The CHAIRMAN: When this Bill was last before the Committee all the clauses had been considered, but a certain number were allowed to stand.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We might refer again to one or two of the early sections because there are still some clerical errors to be corrected. I refer to p. 2 of the Bill, subsection (j).

I move that we insert the word "bank" before "chartered bank" in the fifth line on p. 2.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister please explain the reason for the insertion of the word "bank?" Are not all banks chartered banks?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Because both terms are used in the Bill. Some clauses contain the word "bank," other clauses the words "chartered bank." We want a definition applying to both terms. I move also that the word "operating" in the second line of subsection (j) be struck out and the words "carrying on the business of banking" be substituted therefor; and that the words "of Canada" at the end of the subsection be struck out.

Amendments agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 14—appointment of trustees:

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move that the words "and he may in his discretion revoke any such appointment made" at the end of subsection (1) be struck out. Section 31-K of the Interpretation Act gives power to remove, pertaining to all appointments.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 20—powers exercisable by trustee with permission of inspectors:

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has been pointed out since this section was adopted that there is no provision in it with regard to what estate a trustee can convey. Of course, it is assumed that he can convey all the estate of the debtor. It has been suggested that a declaration to that effect be incorporated in the Bill. It has also been drawn to my attention that there is a difficulty in the province of Quebec in regard to trustees' deeds; they do not operate in that province quite in the same way as they do in other provinces. It
4 p.m. seems that liens, mortgages, hypothecs and the like are not removed by trustee's deed and a clear title cannot be conveyed. Several prominent members of the Bar of the province of Quebec have directed my attention to this fact and have suggested an amendment so that we might give to a trustee's deed in that province the same effect as is now given to a sheriff's deed. Personally I see no objection to inserting a clause to that effect, if it is the desire of the Committee. I move that the following be added as subsection (3):

All sales of real estate made by the trustee shall vest in the purchaser all the legal and equitable estate of the debtor therein.

That will be the general clause. Then I move that the following be added as subclause (a) of subsection (2):

(a) In the province of Quebec a sale of real estate made by the trustee shall have the same effect as to mortgages, hypothecs or privileges then existing thereon as if the same had been made by a sheriff in the said province under a writ of execution issued in the ordinary course, and the title conveyed by such sale in the said province shall have equal validity with a title created by sheriff's sale and the conveyance of the trustee shall have the same effect as a sheriff's deed in the said province.

Mr. JACOBS: The section is much improved by the amendment suggested by the Solicitor General.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

On section 24—reports to creditors by trustee:

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has been suggested that we put in some clause which will give the public an opportunity of examining the records referred to in subsection (2) and, if necessary, of obtaining copies. I move that the following be added as subsection (3) of section 24:

Any person shall be entitled to examine and make copies of all or any of the documents mentioned in subsection (2) hereof.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 14, subsection 4—general security to be given by trustee:

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) was going to move some amendment providing for interest on cash securities.

Mr. JACOBS: When this subsection was before the Committee a few days ago, I suggested that interest at the rate of 5½ per cent be paid on any cash deposited with the Government. I am not wedded to any particular rate; the rate might be 5 per cent, but any party who makes a cash deposit should receive some interest on his money while it is being used by the Government.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think any cash will be deposited as security. I think the deposit will be in the shape of guaranteed bonds, but if cash is deposited, current bank rates on deposits, namely, 3 or 3½ per cent, might be given. If my hon. friend will draft an amendment, I shall be glad to consider it.

Subsection stands.

On section 14, subsection 8—additional security to be given by trustee:

Mr. GUTHRIE: This stood at the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs), who thought that we should put in a specific clause that the registrar might enforce any bond in event of default. I have given the matter a good deal of consideration, and I think the clause is properly drawn as it is, but if my hon. friend has any suggestion to make, I will consider it.

Mr. JACOBS: If the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) as such, will assume the responsibility that the clause is all right, I will let it go, but some day he may have to run the gauntlet of the court, and if I have to argue the matter, I will argue that

the desire of the Solicitor General prevailed and not mine.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 14, subsection 11—security surrendered:

Mr. JACOBS: Under this section, there are to be given by the trustee two forms of securities, one to the Government and the other to the registrar. Therefore, it might be well to indicate that both these securities would have to be turned over.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The subsection says "the security provided for by this section," and both forms are provided under this section. I think that would include them both.

Mr. JACOBS: Why not say "securities" instead of "security?"

Mr. GUTHRIE: Subsection 4 provides for the general security; subsection 8 provides for the additional security which the creditors may require. Subsection 11 reads:

Upon payment by the trustee of the final dividend the security provided for by this section—

I think that would cover it all.

Mr. JACOBS: The two securities?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If there were a dozen, they would be covered by this subsection.

Mr. JACOBS: The Solicitor General thinks it would refer to the securities provided in subsections 4 and 8?

Mr. GUTHRIE: As a matter of fact, the $10,000 security would not be discharged, because it would be of a continuing character. If the trustee asked that it be discharged, he would be disqualified for the future.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 15, subsection 1—new trustee may be substituted:

Mr. GUTHRIE: This stood at the request of the hon. member for Royal (Mr. H. H. McLean). I think in small estates he desired that creditors representing three-fourths in value of the estate should have the right to appoint a trustee to manage the estate. I think we should pass the clause as drafted and stick to the authorized trustee.

Mr. JACOBS: As the hon. member for Royal is not here, I ask that the clause be passed forthwith.

Mr. PROULX: If those trustees are only in large centres, there will be small estates in small places where it would not be convenient for the trustee to act. Indeed, he may not care to act. Can he not delegate somebody to act for him?

Mr. GUTHRIE: So long as he assumes the responsibility, he may delegate somebody to act for him, but the authorized trustee must be the responsible party. He may, I have no doubt, operate through an agent in a small estate.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 29, subsection 1—avoidance of certain settlements:

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps I might be permitted to make a short explanation in regard to section 29 for the benefit of some members of the Committee who are not lawyers. These three subsections are somewhat intricate and drawn in legal and technical language. The object of them is to avoid certain settlements commonly known as voluntary or fraudulent settlements as against creditors, and at the same time due care has, I think, been taken to protect all genuine, bona fide settlements entered into for good consideration and for laudable purposes. Section 29, subsection 1, applies to what I might call settlements which have been made and completed prior to bankruptcy. There are three classes of settlements to which it was not applied. First, it does not apply to a settlement made before and in consideration of marriage; second, it does not apply to a settlement made in favour of a purchaser or incumbrancer in good faith and for valuable consideration; third, it does not apply to a settlement made on or for the wife or children of the settlor of property which has accrued to the settlor after marriage in right of his wife.

With these three exceptions it applies to all other voluntary settlements, and if they are made within one year of the date of the bankruptcy such settlements are to be void against the trustee. If the bankruptcy happens within five years of the date of settlement they will be void against the trustee unless the parties claiming under the settlement can prove the following: First, that the settler was, at the time he made the settlement, able to pay all his debts without resort to the property which comprised the settlement; and, secondly, that the interest of the settler in the property passed out of his hands at the time of settlement. Subsection 2 seeks to avoid as

preferences certain marriage convenants or contracts which are not uncommonly made in this country, but which are more prevalent in Great Britain, that is, covenants or promises made in consideration of marriage that at some future time the husband or the wife, as the case may be, will settle on the other party property of some kind, either in money, securities or in land. Subsection 2 provides that any covenant or contract to settle at a future time made by a person in consideration of his or her marriage, either for the future payment of money for the benefit of the settlor's wife or husband or children, or for the future settlement on or for the settlor's wife or husband or children, of property wherein the settlor had not at the date of the marriage any estate or interest whether vested or contingent, shall be void as against the trustee, except within certain very stringent limitations. Subsection 3 applies to any payment of money or any transfer of property which may hereafter be made by the settlor pursuant to any promise or covenant made before marriage. These sections apply only to settlements hereafter made. We do not seek by this clause to interfere with settlements which have been made, or covenants or promises which have been entered into prior to the coming into operation of this Act. But for the future, covenants or contracts entered into for the settlement of property in consideration of marriage will, speaking, generally, be void in the case of bankruptcy as against the trustee for the creditors. That is the object sought to be attained by section 29 and the three subsections. It is merely carrying into effect, and perhaps extending a little, a principle which has been known to English law from at least the days of Elizabeth, because it is under the statute of XIII Elizabeth that we first find any law in regard to voluntary or fraudulent preference or conveyances. Away back in the reign of Queen Elizabeth it was enacted that any conveyance which has the effect of hindering, defeating, delaying, or defrauding a creditor is void unless it be made for good cause and be bona fide. We have carried that law up to the present time in Canada and in all the provinces of Canada. This section 29 is merely declaratory of the extent of that law, and expressly states in what limitations certain settlements and covenants will be upheld in the future as against a trustee in bankruptcy. I move as an amendment to subsection 3 of section 29 that in line 47, after the word " insurance," the following words be inserted:—

[Mr. Guthrie.]

In favour of the husband, wife, child or children of the settlor.

The effect of this will be that no policy of life insurance in favour of the husband, wife, child, or children will be attacked as preference. That, I think, is in accordance with modern law on the subject, where these various parties are recognized in matters of insurance as privilege persons.

Mr. PROULX: Do you not include the mother? Under the Insurance Act the mother is in the preferred class.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have not included the mother. The insurance privilege applies only to the husband, wife, child, or children. I also move that the word " persons," in line 2 of page 25, be replaced by the word " person." It should be singular.

Amendments agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 30—avoidance of general assignment of book debts:

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move that the word "authorized" in the second line be struck out. It is improperly there.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 31, subsection 3—when transaction deemed a preference:

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move that subsection 3 be struck out. I suppose that there is no clause in any Bankruptcy Bill or any assignment and preferences act which causes as much trouble to the bar, the public and the courts as the question raised in section 31 of the present Bill. It is drawn with the purpose of avoiding anything like a preference as between creditors, and at the same time with the idea of protecting whatever is a bona fide transaction. The first part of the clause is an adaptation of section 44 of the English Bankruptcy Act. It goes a little further than the language of the English Bankruptcy Act, and so do many of the Statutes of the provinces of Canada. We have declared in section 31, as drawn, that where a transaction is entered into with a view to giving a creditor preference over other creditors it shall be null and void, or where a transaction is one which has the effect of giving such creditor a preference over the others it shall be void as against the trustee. These last words are not in the English section but have been for many years in the Ontario Act, and, I think, in the Acts of a great many of the provinces of Canada.

An attempt was made in subsection 3 of section 31 to extend the law considerably because in that the drafter of the Bill undertook to define what should be deemed to have the effect of giving a creditor a preference. That is going a step beyond any legislation on the subject of bankruptcy as far as I know. A great many protests were received in regard to subsection 3. Many of the ablest lawyers have communicated with me on the subject and various commercial bodies have also sent their representations. Upon the whole, I am inclined to think it would be wiser simply to eliminate subsection 3 altogether and in its place to substitute a clause which will be section 33 when we come to that section. I therefore move that subsection 3 of section 31 be struck out.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 32—recovering proceeds if reconveyed:

Mr. GUTHRIE: Clause 32 I think is misplaced in so far as its order goes. I am going to move that this clause be numbered 33 and that sections 32 and 33 be transposed. I therefore beg to move:

That clause 32 be numbered clause 33 and that clause 33 be replaced by clause 32.

Motion agreed to.

On section 33 (now section 32)—protection of bona fide transactions without notice.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That clause is an innovation and goes farther than any legislation I am aware of up to the present time. It is open to the same objection as was section 31 subsection 3. After considering the matter and having the benefit of the best legal ability I have concluded that the clause should be struck out and a new clause substituted therefor almost identical with the clause that now appears in the Ontario Assignments and Preferences Act. The clause which I beg to move to take the place of clause 32 is as follows:

Nothing in the next preceding section of this Act shall apply to any bona fide sale or payment made in the ordinary course of trade or calling to an innocent purchaser or person; nor to any payment of money to a creditor, nor to any bona fide conveyance, assignment, transfer or delivery over of any goods or property of any kind which is made in consideration of a present actual bona fide payment in money, or by way of security for a present actual bona fide advance of money, or which is made in consideration of a present actual bona fide sale or delivery of goods or other property where the money paid, or the goods or other property sold or delivered bear a fair and reasonable relative value to the consideration thereof.

Section 32 as amended agreed to.

On section 37, paragraph 9—no action for dividend:

Mr. GUTHRIE: That was allowed to stand because I was not quite sure of the explanation of the language used. Subsection 9 provides that no action shall lie against the trustee for a dividend but that you shall apply summarily to the court for an order. The court may make an order and under the clause providing penalties, section 96, the trustee is subject to fine and imprisonment if he fails to obey the order. It makes provision for recovery of anything in the hands of the trustee very simple and expeditious.

Mr. JACOBS: When we were discussing that subsection a few days ago there was a suggestion that the first portion of it should be left out. It reads:

No action for a dividend shall lie against the trustee.

It would then read

If the trustee refuses to pay any dividend the court may, if it thinks fit, order him to pay it, and also to pay out of his own money interest thereon for the time that it is withheld and the costs of the application.

I cannot see the utility of having the first part of the section stand as it is.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The object is to prevent the estate from being put to undue costs or money being frittered away in needless actions. We do not want to permit an action to be taken because a summary application would be a cheaper process. The English Act forbids action being brought under the same circumstances.

Mr. JACOBS: We are trying to arrive at the same idea. Why insert the words:

No action for a dividend shall lie against the trustee.

Why should they not be eliminated?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If these words were not there, the creditor could bring action and the estate might be let in for a lot of costs.

Mr. JACOBS: That would be an action between the creditor and the trustee personally.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He might sue the trustee on behalf of the creditor and this is to prevent action being taken.

On section 37—paragraph 10—unclaimed dividends to be paid to Minister of Finance:

Mr. GUTHRIE: I beg to move that a subsection be added, as subsection 10 in the following language:

37. s.s. 10. It shall be the duty of the trustee within six months after notice and distribution of final dividend has been given and made by him in accordance with this section to pay to the Minister of Finance all unclaimed dividends remaining in his hands.

(a) If such unclaimed dividends are afterwards duly claimed by the creditors entitled thereto they shall be paid over to such creditors with accrued interest thereon.

This clause has been taken out of the Winding-Up Act.

Section as amended agreed to

On section 41—Discharge of trustee:

Mr. GUTHRIE: A question has been raised under this section by various bodies. It has reference to subsection 2, paragraph (a):

Such discharge may be granted,

(a) by resolution of the inspectors expressed in writing;

Objection has been taken to that provision. Some people think that the discharge should only be granted by a meeting of creditors, not by inspectors; another suggestion is that the release should only be granted by the court. It was to permit of further consideration of that aspect of the matter, that the section was allowed to stand.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the latter proposition is the best. As the court has to deal with most of the matters involved here, it should have the power to grant a discharge.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How would it be if power were given to the creditors to do this at a meeting duly called or, in default of action by them, that the court should exercise the power? The idea, of course, is to avoid applications to the court as far as possible. The objection made is that the inspectora and the trustee may be rather friendly in the matter, and one agree to release the other, and that would be the end of it. I think it would be a protection if the creditors were the persons authorized to grant the discharge, and failing them the court.

Mr. JACOBS: The creditors will not go to a meeting.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the trouble, they will not go.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. JACOBS: I think the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition ought to be accepted.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would accept it because I think it is quite reasonable. I therefore, move to amend clause 41 by striking out paragraph (a) and the letter (b) so that subsection 2 will then read:

Such discharge may be granted by order of the court.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 48—postponement of husband's claim:

The CHAIRMAN: This clause was allowed to stand.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think it is a pretty good clause.

Mr. JACOBS: Since the request was made that this clause should be allowed to stand I believe the Solicitor General has been in conference with several members of the bar of Quebec, and they seem to be satisfied that the clause should pass in its present form.

Mr. PEDLOW: In reading over this clause it seems to me to impose a hardship on a married woman whose husband has been adjudged bankrupt and who has obtained a loan of money from her. If she has an estate separate from that of her husband why should she not receive the same consideration as in the case of any other separate estate? For instance take the case of a married woman who has inherited property from her parents, which is entirely separate from the estate of her husband, and has advanced money to him to carry on his business. I fail to see the wisdom or the fairness of the change. I think the wife is just as legally entitled as any outsider to rank as a creditor of that estate. Her money and her property are her own in that case, and she makes the loan as a purely business transaction so far as she and her husband are concerned. It seems to me, not looking at it from the legal aspect, but from the ordinary business aspect, that the woman should have the protection of the court for her estate as against her husband, and that he on his side should have similar protection against his wife.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is the experience of all lawyers in the courts of this country that there is no door quite so open to all

kinds of manipulation and of wrong-doing in regard to financial matters, and particularly as they pertain to creditors, than the relationship that exists between husband and wife. I call my hon. friend's attention in the first place to the fact that this section applies only to the future. So that husbands and wives will know after this Bill becomes law that if they loan money one to the other for business or other purposes they are taking chances under this section, and their claims may be postponed to those of other creditors. The reason for the section is that in the majority of cases of assignment a husband or a wife prefers a large claim against the estate. It may be that the claim is perfectly valid in most cases, but there are many cases in which the claim is decidedly invalid and should not be allowed to prevail as against the creditors. Such fictitious claims are so easily made and so hard to defeat that you must in some way protect ordinary creditors against them. To do so we must enact something such as we have attempted by section 48. That section has been largely used in England, and it will be used in this country, too, in future, I am sure. Case after case comes up when not only does the husband or the wife prefer a claim as a creditor for money loaned, but in addition a claim for wages. Those claims may be proper enough, but in future, if this Bill becomes law, husbands and wives must take notice that such claims will only be paid after the claims of other creditors. If with that notice staring them in the face they allow their claims for wages to accumulate they will have to take the consequences. It is in order to defeat the large number of fictitious claims which are presented in cases of bankruptcy, that it has been found necessary, I think, in every civilized country which has a bankruptcy law to include a clause of this kind. If it had a retroactive effect I would not support it as I do; but it only applies to the future.

Mr. PEDLOW: The enactment of this clause absolutely precludes the advisability of a husband advancing money to his wife in case she is in business; or, where the wife has a bona fide estate of her own, it precludes the advisability of her making a loan to her husband. Therefore it would be much better apparently that she should make a loan to some other woman's husband.

Mr. GUTHRIE: She can do it through a third person and the transaction would be quite valid.

Mr. PEDLOW: I have no quarrel with the other items enumerated in this clause, but where the transaction between husband and wife is a bona fide one why should either be penalized? It seems to me that it should not be an impossible thing on investigation to determine between bona fide and bogus loans.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has kept the courts pretty busy for the last generation.

Mr. JACOBS: I might point out to my hon. friend from Renfrew South (Mr. Pedlow) that that is one of the risks and responsibilities which people incur when they marry.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 51 was allowed to stand,—Priority of claims.

Mr. GUTHRIE: At the request of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) I think that clause might be agreed to now.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 52 was allowed to stand.—Right of landlords to distrain or realize rent to cease, but priority accorded.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does this interfere in any way with the common law right of landlords in respect to levying for rent?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is a restriction. We have not at the present time a uniform law in all the provinces in regard to this matter. In the province of Ontario in case of assignment we allow the landlord one year of past due rent as a preference, and also three months future rent. I understand that in the province of Quebec the landlord can legally claim one year's future rent, and I think varying sums are permitted in the other provinces. The Committee which had this Bill in charge last year paid a great deal of attention to this section. It was urged that if we interfered with landlords' rights landlords would insist on stiffer terms when leases were negotiated, and that the rent probably would become payable in advance. However, a body representing almost thirty thousand retail merchants of this country, who are the great tenant class among the merchants, appeared before the Committee and specifically approved the enactment. So far as they are concerned they are not afraid of the terms which may be imposed upon them by landlords in the future. This section provides that when bankruptcy proceedings take place the landlord's right

to a preference over other creditors shall be for rent for the last three months of the term, and it will be a first charge upon the estate. A landlord can always protect himself; he does not need to let his rent get three months in arrear. He has special privileges which other creditors do not possess; he can distrain the goods of his tenant and can realize at almost any moment. He is negligent if he allows his rent to become more than three months in arrear; and for the protection of the general creditors the Committee thought that three months was a fair and reasonable amount of rent to allow as a preference over the claims of other creditors. It was with that view that this section was drawn as it now appears. Of course, he is not deprived from claiming for all the rent due, but for anything beyond the three months he can only claim as an ordinary creditor. The Committee thought that was pretty fair treatment for the landlord, and it would be a good thing to make it uniform throughout Canada.

We must bear in mind that landlords have always been creatures whom our legislation and British legislation have favoured from time immemorial. Our present law of landlord and tenant is a relic of the feudal system and was made when landlords sat in Parliament, but tenants did not. Up to fifty or sixty years ago the law was so one-sided in favour of the landlord that it was practically a disgrace. Gradually the hardships have been ameliorated by legislation; but to-day in Ontario a landlord is permitted too large a claim, in my humble judgment, when he is allowed one year of arrears and three months advance rent in the case of assignment. I do not know what view the Committee will take of the clause, but in my judgment it is a very fair one.

Section agreed to.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would ask the Committee to refer to clause 55. I have given a good deal of thought to it, having regard to the discussion which took place on the question of absconding debtors. It will be remembered that at the last meeting of the Committee considerable discussion took place as to what provision we should insert. I find that the dictionary meaning of the term "abscond" is:

> To remove one's self from the jurisdiction of the court; to place one's self in hiding.

In my judgment, and it has been confirmed by the conferences I have had with some very prominent lawyers both from Ontario and Quebec, I think the section would be improved if we inserted the words "from Canada" after the word "abscond". The section would then read: "Abscond from Canada." It must be remembered that the Act has Dominion wide application. The mere fact that a debtor goes from one province to another would hardly in my judgment constitute absconding; he is still within the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court, and he is not in hiding.

Therefore I move:

> To amend section 55 by adding the words "from Canada" after the word "abscond" in the twelfth line of the said section at p. 44 of the Bill.

It will then read:

> If, after the presentation of a bankruptcy petition against him, it appears to the court that there is probable reason for believing that he has absconded, or is about to abscond from Canada, with a view of avoiding payment of the debt in respect of which the bankruptcy petition was filed, or of avoiding appearance to any such petition or of avoiding examination in respect of his affairs or of otherwise avoiding, delaying or embarrassing proceedings in bankruptcy against him.

Mr. PROULX: Canada is a very large country. A man might go from Nova Scotia to British Columbia and be a long distance from his creditors. I would prefer to keep the section as it is.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Members of the bar of Ontario and Quebec advise me that the section would be improved by the suggested amendment, because there is a jurisdiction of these courts all over Canada. If a man goes to another province in Canada he may be got at there under the courts constituted by this Act.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 63—Courts jurisdiction.

Mr. GUTHRIE: An amendment was adopted to this section which declared that these courts should be additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada under section 101 of the British North America Act. At the last sitting of the Committee I could not see how that amendment could prejudice the working of the Act, although I did not think it was a necessary amendment. However, having obtained the benefit of the advice of the leading members of the bar of Quebec and Ontario, I am inclined to think that the amendment had better be struck out. As one eminent constitutional authority told me, the amendment is an untried experiment which

5 p.m.

had better be left alone. He pointed out that our own clause was just as wide as, and perhaps wider than, the similar clause in the Winding-Up Act, under which the provincial courts obtain their jurisdiction. The clause as originally printed is of equal import, even broader in its language, because our courts are declared to have original, auxiliary and ancillary jurisdiction. I therefore move that the amendment made to this section be struck out and that the section be adopted as printed.

Motion agreed to, and section as originally printed agreed to.

On section 74—court may review, etc.:

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is the section which deals with appeals. It has been brought to my attention that there is no provision for an appeal where a debtor has been granted a discharge or where the creditors or the judge refuse to grant him a discharge. I think there is some reason for allowing an appeal under those circumstances. I therefore move that the following be added as paragraph (d) of subsection 2:

(d) if the question to be raised on the appeal involves the granting or refusal of a discharge to the bankrupt or assignor where the aggregate claims of unpaid creditors exceeds five hundred dollars.

So that if the discharge is granted and the creditors object or the discharge is refused and the debtor object, either party may appeal, provided the aggregate amount of the indebtedness unpaid is over $500.

Mr. JACOBS: I notice that we restrict by section 74 the right to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. Such appeal may not be allowed unless special leave to appeal is obtained from the judge of the Appeal Court. Why is that?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The tendency in modern law making is to discourage multiplicity of appeals.

Mr. JACOBS: Surely the debtor is vitally interested in having his case brought before the highest court in the land when the question of his discharge is concerned. Why should appeal be restricted in so important a matter as discharge from bankruptcy or anything arising out of bankruptcy? Why should the clause not read as follows:

(3) The decision of the appeal court upon any such appeal shall be final and conclusive unless appeal therefrom is taken to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Certainly it was our view that appeals should be limited. I am heartily in sympathy with that limitation.

Mr. JACOBS: As a lawyer, or as a lawmaker?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Suppose the claim is $500, and part of it is disputed and part is not. Does the $500 apply to the amount in dispute or to the amount of the claim as a whole?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It applies to the amount "involved," which is the word used. I fancy that would be the amount in dispute.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 76—application to limited partnerships.

Mr. JACOBS: When this section was previously before the Committee, it was pointed out that a limited partnership, at least in Quebec, is in many respects similar to the interest of a stockholder in a joint stock company, and it was suggested that the whole clause should be allowed to stand over for further consideration. Has the Solicitor General had views from the Bars of the various provinces regarding this matter?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We had quite a discussion on this matter in Committee and since then I have not heard of it. In Ontario, we have a law regarding limited partnerships, but in my experience I have never come across any. The clause will have a very limited application and is inserted in case anything in the way of limited partnerships should arise.

Mr. JACOBS: In Quebec, limited partnerships are quite common. A man may want to invest, say $10,000 in a business. Under a limited partnership, he may invest that money, but he must not have any dealings with the affairs of the business; his name must not appear in the firm, and he must not be engaged in any way in the business. He simply puts up his money as if he were investing it in a joint stock company. If anything goes wrong with that company, the individual, who has lent his money in the way indicated, should not be subject to the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He is dealt with just as he would be in England. We have copied this section precisely from the words of the English Act. He is protected from everything the English statute would protect him from.

Mr. JACOBS: Can the party who advances his money in this way as a limited

partner be thrown into bankruptcy if the business becomes insolvent?

Mr. GUTHRIE: In like manner, as if a limited partnership were an ordinary partnership.

Mr. JACOBS: I can understand this applying to members composing the partnership itself, but not the limited partner.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The party's liability would still be limited to the amount he invested.

Mr. JACOBS: That is to say, he would be treated like an ordinary stockholder in a joint stock company?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The partnership would be wound up as an ordinary partnership, but there would be a limitation of liability according as the partnership was formed, and the liability of any partner who was under that limitation would not be increased beyond that limitation.

Section agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Archambault the Committee reverted to the consideration of section 8.

On section 8—application of part 1.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I desire to move an amendment to this clause. I object to the application of Part I of the Bill to non-traders. This is the first time that there has been brought into the House of Commons of Canada a Bankruptcy Act which includes non-traders in its application. The Bankruptcy Act of 1875, which was repealed in 1879, and the Bill introduced in 1897 by Mr. Fortin, who is now judge of the Superior Court, did not apply to non-traders. I have gone carefully over legislation on bankruptcy of different countries, and I believe the only countries in which Bankruptcy Acts apply to non-traders are Great Britain and the United States. In France, Belgium and other countries, the Acts do not apply to non-traders. My principal objection to the extension of the law to non-traders is this: The enforcement of a bankruptcy law is a serious matter; it means a searching investigation into the affairs of a man by his creditors. It is encroaching on private rights. It allows the creditors to find out private secrets of all kinds and, in fact, it is a grave violation of property rights. The debtor ceases to have charge of his business and his creditors take his place and as Thallier says in his study on bankruptcy, only the most important reasons can justify such an action. The necessities of trade afford Parliament an opportunity of adopting such measures, although this is clearly odious to private rights. Credit requires such legislation, such violation of the liberty of the proprietor, and business cannot dispense with it. In what position would a trader be if he could not obtain credit from his banker or other creditors? That is the reason for a bankruptcy law. The law should give the banker or other creditors the assurance that if the debtor should fail, a trustee will be named who will take charge of his assets for the benefit of all creditors, present or absent. Otherwise, without this law there would be no protection for the creditors in contingencies against which no one can be safeguarded. In business relations many creditors now reside far away from their debtors, while other debtors are more easily accessible. If the insolvency law were abolished, creditors living near the debtor and being consequently more in touch with him than those who are distant, would seize his assets first, to the prejudice of those living far away; and without insolvency legislation there would be this further effect, that only cash sales would be made. There would be no more credit, and in consequence practically no trade. This consideration, however, does not, I submit, apply to non-traders. The judge, the doctor, the lawyer, or the professional man lives on his income or his salary, and has no justification in living beyond his means. His profession should preclude the necessity of speculations inherent to trade, and if he obtains credit it is not on the guarantee of any assets but merely on his personal promise to pay, and his creditors will wait until he receives his income. Unlike the case of the trader, to whom credit is a business necessity, society is not interested whether the man who receives a salary gets credit or not. Admitting that the non-trader contracts debts, it is highly improbable that his creditors will either be so numerous or most of them so far distant that some living in proximity to the debtor will reap all the benefits to the prejudice of the others. Besides that, there is a constitutional viewpoint to consider. I will grant for a moment that the law of bankruptcy in regard to the trader, even if it touches civil rights and property, as it necessarily does, is within the province of the federal power. But I contend that subsection 21 of section 91 of The British North America Act evidently conferred such power, because it pertained to the trade and commerce legislation, which is exclusively within the purview of the Federal

Government. I am sure, however, that the intention of the legislators in reference to subsection 13 of section 92 of the British North America Act, which gives the province control of legislation in regard to property and civil rights, was not to extend the bankruptcy legislation to anything outside trade and commerce, and it would undoubtedly go beyond their intention if this law were made applicable to non-traders. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Jacobs:

That subsection 1 of clause 8 be amended by striking out all the words after the first line of said section, being line 21 of page 8, and substituting the following words: "non traders."

Mr. GUTHRIE: The motion raises a point upon which there might be considerable argument. There is no doubt that in the Insolvency Bill of 1875 an attempt was made to confine the operation of that Act to traders, and one of the objections to the Act always was that it was so confined. It is contended that there is a large class of non-traders who are debtors and should be treated as ordinary citizens of the country, amenable to the ordinary laws, whether of bankruptcy or otherwise. Another difficulty is to give anything like an adequate definition of the word "trader." The definition in the Act of 1875 was certainly defective, but it covers almost two pages of typewritten matter, defining almost all classes of business enterprise we know in Canada. But still it would not suffice for a definition at the present time, because we have a great many avenues of trade and commerce to-day that were not in existence then. So that it would be extremely difficult to define just who were and who were not traders. In England the experience has been that the Act should apply generally to all classes. I think that about fifty years ago, in the sixties, the Act was limited to traders, but after an experience of some years, that Act was extended, and the British and the United States Acts to-day both apply to all classes of the people in regard not only to obligations created by the Act, but to the benefits which are conferred upon the honest debtor in the way of obtaining his discharge. I know, however, that in France, Belgium, and one or two other continental countries the bankruptcy Acts are still confined to traders. Having heard from as many public commercial bodies as I could upon the subject, and having heard a long discussion in the Special Committee by a great many interested classes, I concluded, and the Committee concluded, that this Bill, in order to have a fair chance of operation, should be made general in its application. For instance, it was urged by the very large association of retail merchants which has a membership in Canada of some 30,000, that it was unfair to them to put all the imposition on their shoulders and allow them none of the benefits. As it was pointed out that one of the great debtor classes was professional people, the question was asked, why should they not be included? and the Committee took that view. My own view is that if you are to give the Act a fair chance of success you must extend it beyond the trading classes. If it should prove to be burdensome or to be an undue imposition upon the people, within a year of its operation there would be a demand for its repeal. But I do not think it will be burdensome. On the contrary, I think it will be a great benefit to both the debtor and the creditor classes, and I certainly support the present generality of its terms.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Why not include the farming classes?

Mr. GUTHRIE: A special case was made out on behalf of the farming classes. It is said that the farmer is very much more subject to unforeseen accidents than any other class of people in the community. He may be solvent to-day, with bright prospects for the coming year, and when everything looks promising he may experience a disastrous accident. He could be put into bankruptcy by reason of his inability during a season to meet maturing liabilities, and he might be sold out and his farm taken from him. But in the ordinary course, if he were given another year or two, he would have big crops and be on his feet again and be re-established. He might be the victim of natural causes beyond his control, and for that reason the Act was not made to apply either to the farmer or to the small wage-earner.

Mr. JACOBS: I support the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres in his amendment that the provisions of part 1 of the Act shall apply only to traders. My reason for supporting the amendment is that if we force into bankruptcy the non-trading classes we may have a condition of affairs in this country which may amount to something approaching a scandal. For instance, there may be men who now occupy high positions in this country —on the Bench, and in Parliament, and others occupying public positions,—who would be forced into bankruptcy by this

Act at the whim and caprice of persons who for some reason might desire to embarrass them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have provided against malicious proceedings.

Mr. JACOBS: It might not appear to be malicious; the debtor may owe money which he cannot pay. Suppose a public man has incurred the ill-will of a political opponent. Knowing that this public man is not in a position to pay his debts at the moment he could, under this Bill, force him out of public life and into the bankruptcy court.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That would be malicious.

Mr. JACOBS: Not necessarily.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Any indirect motive is malicious.

Mr. JACOBS: The onus will be on the party against whom the petition is granted to show that he is in a position to pay his debts and if he cannot show that he must go into bankruptcy.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It will only apply to future and not to past debts.

Mr. JACOBS: The Solicitor General seems to think that in future every person in public life is going to be in a position to pay his debts. The fact that a man is in public life is a sort of presumption that he is not in a position to pay his debts. Take the case of judges on the bench. There may be men who are obliged to go on the bench because they are not able to make a living at the bar and in addition have gone behind. These men might be forced into bankruptcy and no judge could possibly continue to occupy his position under such circumstances. The remark that the Solicitor General made to the effect that these people should not be above the law has no force, for the reason that you make them amenable to the law if they wish to take advantage of it by voluntarily applying to be put in bankruptcy. There will be nothing in this section, if amended, to prevent any person from taking advantage of the Act and voluntarily going into bankruptcy. The objection I take is that men who are not traders are going to be forced into bankruptcy in the same way as the ordinary trader. In the case of the trading class it is incidental to the business that they must owe money. In a case of the non-trading class it is accidental that they should owe money. The Solicitor General would be well advised if he accepted the amendment of my hon. friend from Chambly.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It appears to me that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Chambly is altogether too broad and would cut out from the operation of the Act a large number who might not be classified by trade.

Mr. JACOBS: It does not cut them out from the operation of the Act. They may voluntarily go into bankruptcy.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It does not bring them under the operation of the Act. It says that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to non-traders.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My idea is that they may not be forced into bankruptcy but of course they can go into bankruptcy voluntarily if they wished to. It has only reference to that part of the Act which applies to forced assignments.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: A professional man who is receiving large amounts of investment funds very often gets into trouble—

Mr. JACOBS: Then he goes to jail.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: —by not investing these funds in accordance with his client's wishes. Should he not be amenable to the law? He might be a non-trader. We should be very careful in defining what a non-trader should include.

Mr. JACOBS: The case which the hon. gentleman mentions is one that may occur but the party who misappropriates or embezzles funds is imprisoned. He can take advantage of the Act, come before the court but not get a discharge. The man who applies voluntarily for bankruptcy can obtain his discharge under the wording of the amendment. We want to make some distinction between traders and non-traders. This question has been discussed not only in this House but outside of it and the general impression was that the Solicitor General would agree to this amendment. I was somewhat surprised to find that for some reason known to himself he has declined to agree to it.

Amendment (Mr. Archambault) negatived.

On section 14, subsection 4—general security to be given by trustee:

Mr. GUTHRIE: I beg to move to amend this section by adding thereto the following words:

If the security required is provided in cash the trustee shall be entitled to be paid thereon such interest as may be prescribed by the general rules.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

PROPRIETARY OR PATENT MEDICINE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Customs) Bill No. 53 to amend the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act read a second time and the House went into Committee on the Bill—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On paragraph (d), section 2—Proprietary or patent medicines:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I wish to move an amendment by inserting in line 22, after the word "minister," the words:

The national formulary of the United States of America.

Which is merely another pharmacopœia standard.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph as amended agreed to.

On section 2, subsection (2)—Appointment of agent:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I propose to amend the subsection by striking out the word "manufacturer" in the first line, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "proprietor." In the third line I propose to strike out the word "proprietor" and substitute the word "manufacturer."

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On section 3, subsection (1)—Certificate of registration:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I propose to strike out the words "and every" in the second line and substitute therefor the words "or the." The sentence will then read:

Every manufacturer of a proprietary or patent medicine, or the agent

and so on. That means the agent of the manufacturer who does not reside in Canada.

Mr. STEELE: Would the retail druggist who manufactures some special line or article be included under the term "manufacturer" in this section? If so it seems to me that it would be an injustice that the retail druggist who perhaps manufactures one or two preparations and sells them should be compelled to pay the same fee as a wholesale manufacturer of patent medicines who perhaps sells preparations to the amount of $100,000 a year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The answer to the point raised by the hon. gentleman is contained in the definition of "proprietary or patent medicine" in the second section of the Bill. The definition applies to "every artificial remedy or prescription manufactured for the internal or external use of man, the name, composition or definition of which is not to be found in the British Pharmacopœia," and so on. If the pharmaceutical preparation to which my hon. friend refers is not to be found in any of the pharmacopœia mentioned under the definition of "proprietary medicines" then the Act will not apply to it. Otherwise it would be a proprietary medicine.

Mr. STEELE: We may take it then that many of the medicines that are put up by the retail druggists and sold by them in their own shops in limited quantities would come under the designation of "proprietary medicines," and before such retail druggists could sell these articles they would have to pay a fee of $2.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. STEELE: It seems to me that if the fee were reduced to $1, and it could not well be any less, it would remove some of the injustice which will otherwise result. I also think that the wholesale manufacturer might well pay a larger fee than $2.

Mr. BELAND: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEELE: I would imagine that the wholesale manufacturer would be getting off exceedingly light if he is made subject to a less fee than $25.

Mr. KEEFER: I want to ask the minister a question about affixing the revenue stamps on these patent medicines. That has to be done, to-day, I understand by the druggist when he sells the article.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That has reference to a revenue Bill.

Mr. KEEFER: Is not the practice such as I have stated?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. KEEFER: I have had some complaints from druggists saying that this requirement was very unreasonable and unfair. Why should not the wholesaler be compelled, especially now that he is required to register, to put on all the revenue stamps needed at the time he ships his goods out? Why should the druggist be compelled to look after the manufacturers' business and be liable to a fine if he does not do so? Several very reputable druggists have made representations to me asking if they could not get some relief from this obligation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should be very glad to convey to the Minister of Finance the remarks of my hon. friend which have reference to the taxation measures of the country. I stated here a few days ago—in what connection I just forget—that when the Finance Act, I think of 1914, was introduced, and which taxed patent medicines among other things, it was provided that the tax be paid by the wholesaler. Representations were later made to the Minister of Finance by wholesalers which had the effect of inducing him to abandon that form of applying the tax. I am of the opinion that the obstacles in the way of carrying out the original intention to which the wholesalers alluded are quite substantial. The wholesaler imports a great many patent medicines in packages containing a gross, or two gross of bottles, and if he were obliged to open the package and put the required stamp on each bottle it would be highly inconvenient.

Mr. KEEFER: It is much more inconvenient to the local druggists to do that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I admit it is quite inconvenient. However, the hon. gentleman's point might be much more suitably raised when the Budget is under consideration.

Mr. KEEFER: Why should not the manufacturer put on the stamps?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have endeavoured to give my hon. friend one reason why it is difficult for him to do so.

Mr. KEEFER: That is in the case of importations, but the same difficulty would not exist in the case of patent medicines of local manufacture.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The manufacturer might sell other medicines in bulk, and the retailer might perhaps put those medicines up in smaller packages and sell them by retail. In that case the wholesaler would have no opportunity of affixing the stamps.

Mr. KEEFER: There is an excellent opportunity now to require them to register. Why not issue a regulation?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That I thought might very well come up later when the Budget is before the House. With reference to the remarks of my hon. friend from South Perth as to clause 3, I propose submitting an amendment by which the manufacturer will be entitled to have the tax refunded, if he is able to prove to the satisfaction of the minister that his sales have been less than $25 a year. The tax of $2 refers to each patent medicine and is quite a substantial burden in some cases.

Mr. JOHN A. STEWART: The question of affixing the stamp was very fully canvassed when the Act was passed. The retail drug trade, as well as the manufacturers, were heard and the present practice was the result. One argument advanced at the time in favour of that practice was that the stamp was intended as a war tax, and to be paid not by the manufacturer or by the druggist, but by the purchaser or consumer.

Mr. KEEFER: It always is paid by the consumer, no matter where it is put on.

Mr. J. A. STEWART: Yes. I am giving you the argument advanced at the time. If the stamp were affixed by the manufacturer the cost would be added to the invoice price and would be paid for by the druggist when he paid for the goods. Therefore the druggist would have a capital investment of the value of the stamps affixed to all articles on his shelves which were liable under the Act; and, this being a war tax, when it was repealed, as it logically would be at the conclusion of the war, the druggist would still have everything on his shelves stamped which under the Act had been subject to this stamp duty, while the purchaser of new goods subsequently purchased would be relieved of the amount of the tax. That was the consideration that carried weight, and I have reason to believe that many of the retail druggists are not averse to the present practice. There is no possible question, though, that the tax might very well come off altogether, because it is stated that 62½ per cent of the revenue has gone in expenses of collection and inforcement. There is undoubtedly a very strong agitation on the part of retail druggists to have the tax done away with altogether. But I have reason to believe there is some difference of opinion in regard to any change in the manner of collection if it is to continue, for the reasons I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the Committee before any other hon. gentleman rises to speak that a discussion of the question of inland revenue stamps on patent medicines is not in order in connection with this Bill.

Mr. GAUVREAU: This will come up when the Budget is before the House. We are losing our time.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I would like to support the point brought up by the member for Perth South (Mr. Steele). Two dollars is not a sufficient fee. I think it

is absolutely ridiculous to let any firm off with a yearly fee of $2 for making patent medicines, especially in these times when revenue is in such demand.

Mr. STEELE: To make it clearer, Mr. Chairman, I may say that the custom of the retail druggists of Ontario—I can only speak of them—is that each will have probably a line of goods which he puts up and sells for his own profit; he may have two or three or as many as ten or fifteen remedies of his own prescription. Very seldom does he do any wholesale business. If he has to pay $2 for the registration of the formula of each of these remedies it is a fairly heavy tax, and at the maximum would mean $30. The wholesale druggist may be manufacturing two or three lines, but selling thousands of dollars worth, and only paying a tax of $4, $6, or $8, while the retail druggist is paying two or three times that amount on his small sales. It may be an argument that the Act cannot be enforced against retail druggists. But if it is enforced over every part of the country as strictly as any other Act is enforced, I think it will work a great injustice against retail druggists who manufacture their own lines of patent medicines.

Mr. ANDERSON: If a druggist puts these prescriptions on his counter, and a person comes in complaining of bronchitis, and the druggist says, "I have a remedy," and hands him a bottle from the counter, he is practising medicine contrary to the Act. I think if this Bill is passed he will be precluded from that practice, because it says that no medicine shall be given out as a proprietary medicine for any specific disease.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If a man desires to register the formula and the name of his medicine he has only to do that once, and it would cost him, under the law as it now stands, $2. That protects his proprietary rights in that patent medicine.

Mr. COWAN: For how long?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: For ever. I do not think we can distinguish between the wholesaler and the retailer. Besides, I can assure the Committee that the retailer is not objecting to this charge of $2; we are instructed that it is quite satisfactory. Further on in the Act you will find that any manufacturer of proprietary medicine must also pay annually, for a license to sell, a fee of one dollar in respect to each medicine.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I do not think this fee of $2 is enough, because we are flooded with all kinds of patent medicines in which there is practically nothing to help the health of the public. We should impose a higher tax just to prevent the flooding of the market with such nostrums.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I hardly think you could restrict the manufacture of patent medicine by increasing the fee.

Mr. KEEFER: A fee of two dollars seems trivial for the privilege of a trade mark registration for all time to come.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The fee is small for the registration of all trade marks.

On subsection 2—contents:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Later in the Bill it is proposed to establish an Advisory Council Section 7 A (2) will provide:

> The advisory board shall have power to prescribe what shall be deemed a sufficient medication of medicines containing alcohol in excess of two and a half per cent to make them unfit for use as beverages.

There is a considerable agitation in all the provinces in connection with the sale of patent medicines and the fact that they are too high in alcoholic content. Any patent medicines containing over two and one half per cent of alcohol must be approved by the Advisory Council before they can be sold. I wish to amend this section by inserting after the word "registration" on the second line the following:

> Or any medicine containing more than two and a half per cent of alcohol or containing any of the drugs mentioned in or added to the schedule of the Act.

We are not amending the schedule, which contains a list of dangerous drugs which can be used only with the consent or permission of the Advisory Council. Two and a half per cent is fixed by reason of the fact that in no province is that alcoholic content in drugs or patent medicines prohibited.

I wish to amend the subsection further by striking out the words "essential formula and composition of such medicine" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "quantity of alcohol or of such drug or drugs contained in such medicine." This will put the Advisory Board in a position to determine whether the alcoholic content is in excess of two and a half per cent, and will also give information as to the drug or drugs contained in such medicine. The section as it now stands requires the disclosure of the essential formula and com-

position of the medicine. It was deemed possible that that would be unfair, because it would compel the proprietor to disclose all knowledge relating to his property.

Amendment agreed to; subsection as amended agreed to.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3, subsection 3—preparation of medicine to be supervised:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move:

That in section 3, subsection 3, the following words be deleted:

"The preparation of the medicine shall be continuously supervised by a pharmacist legally qualified in the province in which the medicine is being prepared."

And the following words substituted in place thereof:

"Whenever required by the minister, for good cause shown, the preparation of any medicine containing more than two and one-half per cent of alcohol, or containing any drug included in the schedule to this Act, shall be continuously supervised by a pharmacist, a chemist, or other qualified person."

The purpose is that the preparation shall be continuously supervised only when required by the minister. In many cases it was deemed by the trade too expensive to require this supervision, and the officers of the department thought that a clause along the lines of this proposed amendment would ensure sufficient protection to the public.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: Surely such companies are not manufacturing medicine for the public without having trained men in charge, and if they have trained men in charge, it does not seem to be necessary to amend the clause.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to have the sense of the Committee on the matter. There are many preparations known as proprietary or patent medicines which are very simple of preparation, which are not dangerous and which are sometimes made in a small way. While there is a great deal to be said in favour of the maintenance of the clause as it is, I thought that if the minister were empowered to direct supervision whenever he thought it was necessary, that would be sufficient protection.

Mr. SHEARD: There is considerable justification for the amendment. I presume the object is to permit the dispensing of medicines in the ordinary drug store by a pharmaceutical student who would not be a legally qualified pharmacist. If, under the section as it stands, every prescription brought into a drug store has to be dispensed by a duly licensed druggist, I can quite see the need for this amendment, because it would be impossible to conduct a drug business on any such arrangement.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Sheard) has grasped the point at all. As I understand it, we are allowing anybody without any training at all to manufacture these medicines, and to use some of the most dangerous drugs in the pharmacopoeia. I think the amendment is dangerous.

Mr. COWAN: Neither of the two hon. members seem to have grasped the idea. As I understand it, this proposes that an unqualified person may put up preparations which do not contain dangerous drugs. But that is not the danger. This unqualified person may be putting up non-dangerous drugs in a place where there are dangerous drugs, and he might easily mix dangerous drugs in what is really a simple preparation. Therefore, we should not allow unqualified persons to handle these things at all. In every drug store there is a competent druggist. Why not let him supervise every preparation that is put up?

Mr. STEELE: I think a better amendment to this clause would be to insert after the word "pharmacist" the words "or a chemist, or other person registered as such in the province." I quite agree that qualified persons only should be entrusted with this work, but there are in Canada wholesale manufacturers employing as chemists men who are absolutely qualified but who are not registered pharmacists. My suggested amendment would also cover the case of medical men, of whom there are many, operating drug stores throughout the country, who are registered as pharmacists or druggists and who are supposed to be quite well qualified to supervise the preparation of these medicines, and yet who would not wish to employ registered duly qualified pharmacists every time they wished to make up a few dozens of a simple preparation which they sell over the drug store counter.

Mr. J. A. STEWART: The hon. member for South Perth states in a fairly accurate way the condition that exists in most of the laboratories of the manufacturing phar-

macists. The fact is that many chemists in charge of work with manufacturing pharmacists in Canada to-day are chemists who have come out from England, and the suggestion made by the hon. member is a good one. The amendment proposes that where a preparation is to contain more than 2½ per cent of alcohol or to contain any drug included in the schedule, it is necessary that the preparing of it should be continuously supervised by a legally qualified pharmacist or chemist. In putting up many of the other preparations which do not contain any of the drugs included in the schedule, or alcohol in excess of the proportion stated, the manufacturers are equally interested with the public, and there has been no complaint in the past as to the sufficiency of the supervision with the manufacturers.

Mr. BELAND: I understand the hon. member for South Perth is going to submit a sub-amendment.

Subsection stands.

On section 5—license to sell; fee; term.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Earlier in the evening I referred to a proposed amendment to this section. The first part of the section reads:

> Every manufacturer of a proprietary or patent medicine shall apply annually for a license to sell such medicine, and shall pay an annual fee of one dollar for each such license.

I move that the section be amended by adding after the word "license" the following words:

> Provided that if at the end of the year, the manufacturer is able to prove to the satisfaction of the minister, that his sales of any registered article for the year amounted to less than twenty-five dollars, the license fee paid may be repaid to him.

This is to meet the case mentioned by some hon. gentleman this afternoon in dealing with another clause. A man might take out a license for $2 and pay a further license fee for selling, and his total sales for the year might be very small.

Mr. DUFF: Why should the license fee be so low in the case of the manufacturer of a patent medicine and so high in connection with fertilizers? This afternoon we passed an Act compelling the manufacturer of fertilizers to pay $8, $16 and $24 for licenses, and the manufacturers of patent medicines, which to my mind, in a great many cases, should not be allowed to be sold, pay only a small license fee of a dollar. I think the fee in regard to patent medicines should be made $24 and in regard to fertilizers $1.

Mr. MACLEAN: There is one reason why the fee in the case of fertilizers should be larger. The officers of the department must travel throughout the country administering the Fertilizers Act, and scientific determination of the ingredients of fertilizers is not an easy matter and can be carried out only by scientific men. On the other hand, the registration of a patent does not entail a great deal of work on the department, and after all it is merely for the purposes of a record. The registration number is open to the public and any one can get all the information that goes with the registration by application to Ottawa. In the one case there is considerable work on the part of the department and in the other there is not.

Mr. DUFF: I cannot agree with the minister's explanation. I think it is more important to the people that inspectors of the department should analyse patent medicines than that they should analyse fertilizers. The matter is twisted. We are really considering provisions that should be incorporated in the Fertilizers Act, so far as license fees are concerned. It is important that the public should be safeguarded, and if there is any inspection to be done it is more necessary in the case of fertilizers.

Mr. MACLEAN: Under both this and the Fertilizers Act we are protecting the public. This is not a revenue Act.

Mr. DUFF: Why should the Fertilizers Act be a revenue Act?

Mr. MACLEAN: It is not a revenue Act. The license is simply to secure some revenue to contribute to the expenses of the administration of the Act, and that is all that is intended here. If it is proposed to secure revenue from the sale of drugs, that is a matter that could be considered in discussing the Budget or revenue Bills.

Mr. DUFF: I think the fee should be at least $20.

Mr. COWAN: I do not agree with the hon. member. I think the minister is absolutely right. This is not a revenue Act. Its purpose is to regulate the business and see that people get the drugs they pay for and nothing else. If we want to make a revenue out of the sale of drugs the Minister of Finance can get after these people, and it does not matter to me how hard he goes after them. But let the proper department deal with that matter.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: Would the revenue derived from a fee of $1 make the department in charge of this work self-supporting? It seems to me that this department like every other ought to be self-supporting.

Mr. BELAND: That is a very pertinent question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGIBBON: We are making provision for an advisory board, the members of which I presume will have to be paid salaries. If a fee of $1 is sufficient to meet the expenses of the department, I see no reason to increase it; but the department should be made self-supporting.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend very accurate information. The administration of the Act will probably cost about $30,000 a year, and I think the license fee proposed should contribute very substantially to the cost of administration. If after a year's experience it is considered that a higher fee should be imposed, a further amendment can be made. For the time being I think the proposed license fee is reasonable.

Mr. BELAND: The minister has by him an officer of his department. Perhaps he can tell the Committee how many licenses are paid for and issued in the course of a year. Then we can form an idea as to what proportion of the expenditure is met by this extra tax of $1.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Heretofore the manufacturer of patent medicines was required to secure but one license covering the whole range of his production and one fee covered, say two hundred productions. Under this Bill he must register each patent or proprietary medicine and must pay the fee upon each. By reason of our legislation, as it has stood up to the present time, the department is not in a position to give the information which my hon. friend asks. If this Bill becomes law, all patent medicines must be registered and in a year we will have a very accurate idea of the number that are being made in Canada and the revenue they will afford. I imagine there are quite a number of patent medicines made in Canada to-day.

Mr. GAUVREAU: As I said before, I do not see why we impose a tax of only one dollar on patent medicine. The people are flooded with all sorts of patent medicines. When a druggist wants to sell a new patent medicine he will not be deterred from doing so by a tax of one dollar. He will try to multiply his patent medicines in order to make the people swallow them. If we impose a tax of $5 or $25 on each patent medicine he wants to put on the market he will be a little more careful about it. I propose to amend that section by substituting the word "five" for the word "one" so as to make the tax $5 instead of $1. You have Wampole's cod liver oil and Wampole's hypo-phosphate; they pay only $1 a year and they perhaps make millions of dollars out of them. I am told there is no more cod liver oil in the former preparation than there is in the finger on one of my hands.

Mr. FOURNIER: Will the minister tell us how this law will operate? I do not know if he is aware that most of the druggists buy, for example syrup of white pine tar. Some of it is made by Parke, Davis & Co., some by John Weyth & Co., of Philadelphia, some by Sharpe & Dohme, and some by Frost. If there is a license imposed upon that article the manufacturers, such as Sharpe and Dohme, manufacture for each of the druggists and put the druggist's name upon it. If this Act is going to operate in this way, how much does the minister think that he is going to get out of it? He will get millions of dollars. The druggists are paying for it whether the patent medicine is manufactured by Sharpe & Dohme, John Weyth & Company or the other manufacturers. This is looking at the question from the druggists' point of view. All those proprietary medicines that we see on the druggists' shelves are made in the same way by such manufacturers I have mentioned. These are all standard firms, their goods are of a high class, and if you impose this license every druggist will have to pay on the same article.

An hon. MEMBER: And the consumer will have to pay.

Mr. FOURNIER: The consumer will have to pay. I suppose in the city of Ottawa there are fifty druggists. Fifty druggists will have to take out a license to sell syrup of white pine tar, or some other syrup. There ought to be some provision safeguarding this point.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does my hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) say that the license should be $5?

Mr. GAUVREAU: I want to press my amendment just to know what the country thinks about it.

The CHAIRMAN: There is already one amendment to the subsection. We had per-

haps better carry that amendment before taking up the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Gauvreau).

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The proposed amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Gauvreau) is rather a negative to the motion to pass this clause. I do not know what is in my hon. friend's mind when he proposes this resolution. Does he propose it with the view of exterminating, limiting or curtailing the manufacture of patent medicines; or does he suggest it for the purpose of adding to the revenue?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Certainly, it is to increase the revenue, and to prevent people from flooding the market with patent medicines that are good for nothing.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In any event I think my hon. friend's resolution is not well founded. This is not a revenue Bill.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I will withdraw that and I will say it is to prevent manufacturers from flooding the country with patent medicines.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The manufacture of patent medicine is either a fair business or it ought not to exist at all. You cannot fairly and justly treat it as being different from any other class of business. True, in its very nature, it must be carefully carried on. There must be safeguards. That is one of the purposes of amending the Act this session. But we have no right to endeavour to reduce the manufacture of patent or proprietary medicines by restricting it in any way by taxation. That is not a good business and not good legislation, and I cannot accept the amendment whatever be the view of the Committee. If my hon. friend means that we should get more revenue from it, then I say that is the duty of the Minister of Finance. I have not a very intimate personal acquaintance with the patent medicine business. I have no doubt it is of use to some extent and serves purposes, and particularly for poor people. There are a number of people who really think that the manufacture of proprietary medicines plays a very important part in the life of the country.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Perhaps I have been too moderate and instead of proposing $5 I should have asked for $25 or $50. I am not a druggist or a doctor by profession, I am simply a notary. But physicians in my riding have written to me protesting against a fee of $1 being imposed on each kind of patent medicine.

They say the sale of patent medicines should be controlled by imposing a higher fee. If the license fee is only one dollar these people will make and sell any patent medicines they like; but the increase of the fee to five, ten, or perhaps twenty-five dollars will make them think of their purses before putting a patent medicine on the market.

Mr. STEELE: Let me point out this concerning the amendment proposed by the minister. My only object in suggesting a change of the amendment is that the interests of the retail druggists shall not be unjustly affected. If the Bill is passed in its present form the retail druggist who manufactures his own line of patent medicines and sells them in very small quantities, is going to pay a very large proportion of the revenue derived from this business. I think that revenue should be collected from the large manufacturers of patent medicines. It may be interesting to the Committee to know that patent medicines to the amount of $20,035,954 were manufactured last year in Canada, which, when resold to the consumer, would probably bring in a return of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000. This great quantity of patent medicines was produced by the large manufacturers, and I think they ought to pay a higher fee for each article they produce than $1. On the other hand, the retail druggist should not be taxed over one dollar for each article which he puts up and sells as a patent medicine. I would suggest that the retail druggist be exempted from this fee and that he simply have to pay his registration fee of two dollars. I have shown that the tax is not equitable as between the retail druggists and the large manufacturer.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill does not propose to impose a tax; my hon. friend has a mistaken notion of its purpose. It provides that every manufacturer of a proprietary or patent medicine shall register the same at Ottawa, so that the department may know what patent medicines are being sold to the public. and the technical officers of the department can investigate concerning the ingredients and qualities of their medicines. If on investigation a patent medicine is found to be one that should not be sold it would be put on the forbidden list, or to deal with it may require an amendment of the Act. The purpose of the Bill is that all men should register any patent medicine they make. Upon what principle can we say that the ordinary druggist should pay less than the

wholesaler or the manufacturer? If the manufacturer makes more money than the retailer, as he probably does, the revenue of the Government should get some of that money in the shape of income tax. If we are not getting enough now from that source then the income tax should be raised.

Mr. MORPHY: I am not a doctor or a druggist; I am merely interested in this matter as a citizen. I would like to know just what the intentions of the Government are in regard to the Budget in this connection? If this Bill goes through, the fee to be paid by a manufacturer of $100,000 worth of patent medicines will be $2 in respect of each article manufactured. You get protection from the point of view of the analyst, but the country does not derive any revenue unless that manufacturer is hit by the Budget.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is a well understood formula which supplies an answer to my hon friend's question: it is not customary to announce the Budget proposals in advance of their submission to the House.

Mr. JOHN A. STEWART: The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Steele) are very likely to create a misapprehension in the minds of the members of the Committee. When he states, as he has done, the volume of the goods manufactured the inference might be drawn that that volume of business comes under the provisions of the license which has to be taken out under the Bill. But under the provision of the Proprietary and Patent Medicines Act the manufacturer of a patent or proprietary medicine has two courses open to him. He may put upon the label of his goods the formula of the contents. If he does not do that he must register it as a proprietary or patent medicine. The only preparations which will be subject to this license, as I understand it, are those which are registered. Now a very small proportion of the business referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Steele) represents a registered business. In addition to those patent or proprietary medicines which do not contain the formula upon the label and which come under the license, there is a very large volume of preparations which are manufactured for dispensing—preparations which are manufactured for the druggist and dispensed upon the prescription of physicians. All that business does not come under the necessity for a license, as I understand the Bill. It would therefore be a very great mistake to imagine that anything more than a small proportion of the volume of business concerned will come under license at all. In fact I may say that some of the largest selling proprietary medicines on the market to-day are sold with the formula on the label and are not registered.

Mr. LEGER: I favour maintaining the clause as it now stands requiring a license of $1, for the reason that, as everybody knows, patent medicines in the rural districts are generally regarded as the farmer's "doctor." If the license fee were raised the druggist would not suffer; he would increase his price and the consumer would have to pay.

Mr. McISAAC: I certainly would not be in favour of increasing the license fee on patent medicines. A very large quantity of patent medicines are used by the poorer classes. Whether they are good or harmful in their effect, the fact remains that a great many people believe they derive benefit therefrom and therefore have recourse to these medicines to a very large extent. As has been said by the preceding speaker, if a higher license fee were imposed it would result in increasing the price of patent medicines, with the result that the masses will experience more difficulty in purchasing them and will labour under a sense of injustice.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: If I am correctly informed, a license is imposed on millers who grind grain and make flour, which I think is proper, the object being to make the department which has supervision of the industry self-sustaining. I think the department in this case ought to be made self-sustaining, and we should have some information on that point.

I think it would be a great mistake to place the department at the disposal of any organization and give them the benefit of what the Government is paying for. I think the crux of the whole matter is to see that the fee is high enough to make this department self-supporting.

Mr. COPP: A number of druggists put up their own preparations. For instance, John Jones might put up his own remedies, such as Jones's Cough Mixture, Jones's Toothache Cure, Jones's Corn Cure, Jones's Face Beautifier, and a dozen others. Would he have to pay a dollar for each one of those preparations?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, for each patent medicine.

Mr. COPP: I do not think that is right. You might have fifty preparations.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That would be all right, if he had a hundred.

Mr. COPP: He might sell only a few of those preparations.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My proposed amendment to that section takes care of that.

Mr. COPP: Suppose he sells only $26 worth and had to pay $2 on each preparation?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under my amendment if he sold less than $25 worth the fee would be returned to him.

Mr. CANNON: Will inspectors be appointed to see that the fees are properly collected? If those inspectors are given reasonable salaries, the salaries alone will eat up the fees. A dollar or a two-dollar fee is awfully small.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Those who are inspectors under the Adulteration Act will be inspectors under this Act.

Mr. GLASS: I wonder whether the minister would consider raising that amount of $25? Even a tax of $1 on a sale of $25 would be 4 per cent. Why should not that $25 be doubled?

Mr. FOURNIER: The fees, I believe, are $2 for the registration of each patent medicine, and a dollar for the license to sell?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. FOURNIER: That is a revenue Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does my hon. friend think it is excessive?

Mr. FOURNIER: It would certainly be excessive. Under this Bill you will provide at least $250,000.

Mr. BELAND: So much the better.

Mr. FOURNIER: I venture to say that the public will have to pay it, as they always do; the manufacturer does not pay anything. Many of the preparations of Parke, Davis and Company and the other manufacturing chemists are made according to the same formula, and under this Bill each of those preparations will have to be registered, although they are precisely the same and you can get them from every druggist.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Provided I can bring forward my amendment afterwards.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I move that the fee be increased from $1 to $5. I want to test the Committee on that. Call it fee, or tax, or whatever you like; I think it should be increased. It seems to me it is wrong to have too many patent medicines on the market, and I want to prevent these men deluding the public with nostrums which are good for nothing.

Mr. FIELDING: May I venture to suggest the question, whether it is in the power of this Committee to increase a tax?

Mr. GAUVREAU: The minister says it is a tax; I contend it is a fee.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order raised by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) is well taken: fees cannot be increased in Committee.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I desire to amend section 5 of the Bill by adding as subsection (3) thereto:

> No proprietary or patent medicine shall be sold in Canada unless a license as above has been granted for such sale, and the period for which the license is granted shall determine the time limit during which legal sale may be made.

That really is the substance of the clause enacting that no patent or proprietary medicine can be sold without a license.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Does this clause apply to any person who sells patent medicines? For instance, retail stores sometimes handle patent medicines that do not contain any poison.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The manufacturer will have to pay for the license. Somebody must have a license before patent or proprietary medicines may be lawfully sold.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is there any provision in the Act with regard to the disposition of stocks at present in the hands of retail druggists?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not as yet.

Mr. PEDLOW: Should there not be?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is something to be said in favour of the suggestion; I see my hon. friend's point. This Act is a very important one. Some important amendments are proposed in the new sections 6 and 7, and as they are very

closely related I would ask the Chairman to read these sections together, so that the Committee may get the sense of them. Personally, I should like to get the opinion of the Committee with regard to these two new sections.

9 p.m.

The Chairman read the proposed new clauses 6 and 7, as follows:

6. All proprietary or patent medicines containing opium, or any derivative of coal-tar, and intended for administration to children over one year of age shall be labelled with the words "Dangerous for infants under one year old."

7. (1) No proprietary or patent medicine shall be manufactured, imported, exposed or offered for sale or sold in Canada,—

(a) if it contains cocaine or any of its salts or preparations;

(b) if it contains alcohol in excess of the amount required as a solvent or preservative;

(c) if, containing alcohol, it does not state clearly on the label and wrapper of the bottle, box or other container the percentage by volume of alcohol present;

(d) if, containing alcohol above two and one-half per cent by volume, it is not sufficiently medicated to make it unfit for use as a beverage;

(e) if it contains any drug which is included in the Schedule to this Act the name of which and the amount per dose of which are not conspicuously printed on and an inseparable part of the label and wrapper of the bottle, box or other container, or if the quantity of such drug exceeds the amount permitted by the Advisory Board;

(f) if it contains any drug which is included in the Schedule to this Act and the name of such drug as used on the label be not the commonly employed name of such drug;

(g) if the article be represented as a cure for any specific disease;

(h) if any false, misleading or exaggerated claims be made on the wrapper or label, or in any advertisement of the article.

(2) No proprietary or patent medicine intended for administration to infants under one year old shall contain any opium or any derivative of opium, or any derivative of coal-tar.

Mr. BELAND: We have come to the most important clauses of this Bill. With regard to the new section 6, it will strike every member of the Committee that if a drug is "dangerous for infants under one year old" it is dangerous also for children a year and a half old. The most important question in connection with the manufacture and sale of patent medicines is that which relates to the use of soothing or calmative syrups for children. The use of these preparations in Canada has assumed such formidable proportions that we cannot ignore the subject. What they contain is well known to the medical profession, to pharmacists generally and to the better-educated class of the population. They contain opium and the derivatives of opium—that is, morphine, codeine, heroine, thebaine and other narcotics. If the good Canadian mothers were cognizant of the ravages caused among their dear ones by the use of these preparations, they would immediately and entirely abstain from administering them to their children. They are induced to use them by the alluring descriptions on the labels. It may be argued that you should not interfere with a well-established trade in Canada. But what is the importance, I ask, of the advantages reaped by manufacturers of these patent medicines as compared with the necessity of preserving the health of those beings who to-morrow will constitute the very essence of the Canadian population? It may be known to some—it is not to me—that heartless mothers, knowing what they do, administer calmative syrups for the purpose of soothing their children.

But it is well known to every one that, for instance, in the absence of the mother, an unscrupulous servant may administer those syrups in large quantities, and the mental and physical consequences cannot be measured. Therefore, I intend to move an amendment to section 6, reserving for myself the right to express my opinion further on clause 7. I am not going to adhere to the wording of this amendment; if it be found that an amendment suggested by some member of the committee or by the minister may be more effective, easier of administration or of carrying out, I am ready to accept such suggestion. I move to amend clause 1 of the present Bill by striking out the proposed section 6 and replacing it by the following:

6. The manufacture, importation or sale of all proprietary or patent medicines containing opium or its derivatives or any derivatives of coal tar intended for administration to children under fifteen years, are prohibited.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I support the amendment with pleasure. I am quite sure, after having discussed this matter with some of the medical authorities, that many of the subjects fit for our asylums or even for our jails, were the early victims of these soothing syrups, because all their troubles in life can be traced to the use of opium and narcotics generally. The other day, a very distinguished doctor from Montreal told me that he could point out on the street young men of twenty or twenty-five years of age whose demeanour showed the use of narcotics when they were infants. It is admitted to-day that it is a great misfortune that we should allow any of this poison to be served by fathers or mothers to their children. Many associations of

ladies, doctors, members of all sects and denominations, have taken a special interest in what is called baby welfare. The other day I received from the Baby Welfare Committee of Montreal a letter which has doubtless been sent to the minister. This letter informs me that the following resolution was adopted unanimously at a meeting held at Montreal a few days ago:

Whereas, there is a Bill to amend the Proprietary or Patent medicine Act now before the House of Commons, sponsored by Hon. A. K. Maclean, which, in the experience of the medical adviser and child welfare specialists connected with the various units of the Baby Welfare Committee of Montreal, does not safeguard the moral or physical entity of the young child, inasmuch as under section 6, of the proposed Act, opium-containing medication is readily procurable for any infant or child: and, inasmuch, as the Act applies solely to opium in section 6, without reference to its more dangerous habit forming derivatives, as morphine, heroin, etc., being fully considered.

Therefore, be it resolved that this committee go strongly on record as disapproving of section 6 and 7, as at present constituted, and that we urge the manufacture and sale of opium, or its derivatives, in medication be absolutely forbidden in Canada, as not being conducive to the moral or physical betterment of our younger citizenship. In default of this recommendation being adopted, that a conspicuous skull and crossbones emblem, with the word "Poison" distinctly printed across the container, be employed as a deterring influence upon the promiscuous distribution of this unnecessary class of narcotic medication, destined for popular sale and consumption among infants and children in Canada.

I would not only put this sinister emblem of a skull and cross-bones on the bottle containing this poisonous substance for the children, but bar the substance completely from the homes of Canada. It is a crime to allow those soothing syrups, made up of opium or other narcotics, to be exposed for sale in our drug stores or be sold by quack doctors travelling throughout the country. We have already too many subjects in our asylums, too many juvenile delinquents in our jails who have acquired their bad habits by the use early in life of those so-called medicaments. I hope the Committee will accept the wise amendment and that we shall not hear any more of those soothing syrups which are nothing less than poison.

Mr. STEELE: I quite agree with the amendment so far as it goes. I am sorry only that it does not go further. What is not good for a child of fourteen years of age is not good for a child of sixteen years of age. Had this amendment not been moved, or should it be rejected by the Committee, I would suggest another amendment, that a sub-clause be inserted in clause 7 to the effect that no proprietary or patent medicine should be manufactured, imported, exposed or offered for sale in Canada if it contains opium or any of its derivatives. I would exclude all patent medicines containing opium from sale or importation, whether administered to children under fifteen years of age or to adults over fifteen years of age. They should certainly be prohibited for children. The facts presented to the Committee by the hon. members for Beauce (Mr. Beland) and Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) to-night clearly indicate the views of the people who are engaged in baby welfare work, the people who, perhaps, above all others, are qualified to speak of the results of the administration of medicines containing opium to our little children. No doubt opium serves a good purpose sometimes, but too often, in fact in the great majority of cases, it is used to sooth a child suffering from some ailment which should be corrected if the child is going to enjoy good health. It covers up the real ailment affecting the child, keeps the child quiet, and if this goes on long enough, the child will no doubt be found in a moribund condition from the disease from which it is suffering, assisted possibly by the doses of opium. There is another effect which it has on the child, and which, I think, is admitted by all who have given the matter study, namely, that upon the brain. The brain of a child undergoes its greatest development in the first six months of life.

The brain of an adult weighs on an average from 1,400 to 1,500 grammes, and that of a baby six months old on an average about 1,000 grammes. Yet, during these six months of infant life, there are thousands of babies being fed daily on these remedies, call them what you choose, whose chief ingredients are opium or its derivatives, and the development of the brain of a child so fed is interfered with to the extent to which opium is administered to it. The chances of children fed that way for growing up healthy both physically and intellectually are greatly reduced. We not only think that opium should not be sold indiscriminately for administration to children, but that, in Ontario at least, it should not be sold indiscriminately for the use of even adults, who experience considerable difficulty in purchasing opium in any drug store in Ontario. The purchaser of opium has to sign the poison book and observe all the precautions with which the law surrounds its sale. Every person realizes that it is not in the interest of even adults that they should be permitted to buy opium

freely and use it as they please. That being so, why should they be allowed to purchase it indiscriminately and with the greatest freedom in the form of patent medicines? I think we should exclude it entirely in patent medicines, and when people want opium they should procure it under proper supervision, duly observing the precautions and restrictions which the law imposes. It will be observed that the first sub-clause prohibits the importation and sale of any medicine containing cocaine or any of its salts or preparation. Now, we all know that cocaine so used is not likely to be nearly so injurious as opium, and if we prohibit cocaine the arguments in favour of the prohibition of opium are very much strengthened. For these reasons I certainly would vote for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Beauce. If, however, it is not considered satisfactory to the Committee, I would move the amendment which I have suggested, that the entire importation, manufacture and sale of any patent medicines containing opium or its derivatives be prohibited. I believe that now is the time for us to take this step. The very fact that liquor is being restricted in its sale is an argument for us at this early date to protect the people against the indiscriminate use of opium and more injurious drugs which too often will be substituted for the liquor that is prohibited.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I rise to a point of order. You ruled some time ago, Mr. Chairman, that the point was well taken by the hon. member for Shelburn and Queens (Mr. Fielding) that I had no right to move an amendment for the increase of the amount of the license fee in the Bill now under consideration. I now ask your ruling on the point, as to whether the Senate could pass the Bill. Bourinot at page 492 says:

> If any Bills are sent down from the Senate with clauses involving public expenditures or public taxation, the Commons cannot accept them.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order raised by the hon. member for Temiscouata is that the present Bill which was introduced and passed in the Senate before being submitted to the House of Commons contains clauses involving public taxation in the form of license fees and therefore could not originate in the Senate and must be rejected by the House of Commons. It is true that section 53 of the British North America Act expressly provides:

> Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, or for imposing any tax or impost shall originate in the House of Commons.

But there are many precedents where Bills of this nature have been passed in the Senate and the money clauses embodied in the Bills have been later submitted to a Committee of the Whole House. Bourinot at page 493 says:

> It is frequently found convenient to introduce bills involving public expenditure in the Senate, and in such a case the money clauses are embodied in the bill as presented, in order to make it more intelligible. . . . .These clauses are always considered in a previous Committee by the Commons, and regularly referred to the Committee of the Whole on the bill.

The same practice applies to Bills imposing any tax or impost and should be followed in all cases when the House of Commons insists upon its rights and privileges. These rights and privileges are laid down in rule 78, but rule 87 provides that in order to expedite the business of Parliament, the House will not always insist on the privilege of laying aside a Bill sent from the Senate because it imposes a tax, an impost or a penalty. The House of Commons undoubtedly had the right and privilege of laying aside this Bill until it had been preceded by a resolution which would have been considered by a Committee of the Whole House, but the proper time for the exercise of this privilege was when the order was called for the second reading of this Bill. It was read a second time without objection and is now under consideration in Committee. A committee has no power to refuse the consideration of a Bill which has been submitted to it by the House, and I must therefore declare that the point of order is not now well taken.

Mr. J. A. STEWART: To resume, Mr. Chairman. A very wrong impression is apt to be created in the mind of the public by the resolution which associates derivatives of coal tar with opium. There are many of the derivatives of coal tar in very general use not only under prescriptions from practising physicians but on sale to the public. As to their effect on young children, that is a matter on which members of the medical profession in the House are more competent to judge than myself. But in associating the derivatives of coal tar with opium, I think an entirely wrong impression is likely to be created as to the injurious effects of these coal tar derivatives. This is particularly objectionable at present. There is no branch of research that is likely to produce more useful preparations than the future development of the coal tar industry. I suggest that if in

the opinion of the medical men certain of the coal tar derivatives could be used without injury, they should be permitted for children up to the age specified in the amendment, provided that the preparation was approved of by the Advisory Board as being harmless to infants over a certain age.

Mr. SHEARD: I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Beauce. I think we should put on the statute-book a distinct and positive limitation to the general sale of opiates and narcotics of that class, especially when they are sold in such a way as to be procurable by nurses and those having the care of infant children. The ordinary soothing syrups that are sold so commonly in the drug stores owe their value largely to the opiate and morphine which they contain. These are readily purchasable, and they can be readily procured by unscrupulous or careless nurses for the sole purpose of securing quietness on the part of an infant, irrespective of the harm they do. The apprehensions which have been expressed by various members of the House are well grounded, and I think strong legislation should be provided so as to prevent the general sale of these articles. Nearly the whole of the so-called soothing remedies for children owe their pernicious influence to the opiate derivative in the form of codeine and morphia which they contain. I think there is something in the exception taken by the hon. member (Mr. Steele) to linking up, particularly the preparations of coal tar with opium preparations. If you can link up coal tar derivatives, carbolic acid and other preparations, which are very largely family medicaments, or which are used for various disinfecting purposes, it is a question how far we should go in that particular inclusion. I think that might be reconsidered and we might specify more accurately what particular preparations of coal tar should be included. The family of coal tar products is a very large one. I am not sure that it would not include many of the analine dyes and preparations that are not medicinal at all. Certainly it would include many of the ordinary domestic disinfectants, which are used as disinfectants pure and simple, sometimes by the gallon. I do not suppose it is the intention of the Act to prohibit their employment in that connection, and yet they might be construed to be included in coal tar products or derivatives under this Act.

Mr. BELAND: This amendment would cover only medicines which are intended for internal use.

Mr. SHEARD: That would be satisfactory if you did that.

Mr. BELAND: That is the meaning of the amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: May I ask if the Committee may have the amendment read again? I do not think it was fully understood.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Beland moves to strike out the proposed clause 6, on page 3, and to replace the same by the following:

> The manufacture, importation and sale of all proprietary or patent medicines containing opium or its derivatives, or any derivative of coal tar intended for administration to children under fifteen years of age, are prohibited.

Mr. MANION: I should like to support the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Steele).

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Steele) is not a sub-amendment, and does not affect clause 6.

Mr. MANION: Might I say to the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) that I support his amendment entirely, but the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Steele) went further and I should like to ask the hon. member for Beauce to go as far in his amendment as the hon. member for Perth has gone in his so as to bar out patent medicines containing opium not only for children but for adults. There are in this country very many young men who are cocaine users, or as they call them in the West, snow eaters. That is the expression used in the West to describe cocaine and opium users. It is claimed by many people who are supporting anti-prohibition measures that since prohibition has been adopted the cocaine users are much more numerous than they were in the past. I do not think that a drug of the strength of opium should be used in any medicine except under a prescription of a practising physician. I would like to ask the hon. member for Beauce to strengthen his motion by introducing into it a provision to eliminate opium from all patent medicines.

Mr. BELAND: I might suggest a wording for my amendment which would cover what the hon. member for Perth has in mind. It would mean that the manufacture, im-

portation and sale of all proprietary medicines containing not only opium but the derivatives of coal tar should be prohibited. I do not know that the Committee is prepared to go so far as to prohibit patent medicines containing derivatives of coal tar for administration to adults. In order to meet the wish of the Committee I shall be willing to strike out the words "derivatives of coal tar" although I think that antipyrine or acetanilid could not safely be administered to children in any form without the supervision of a regular, qualified physician. But it would be a great step in the right direction if we adopted this amendment:

The manufacture, importation and sale of all proprietary or patent medicines containing opium or its derivatives intended for internal administration are prohibited.

That would cover people of all ages and it would leave out the derivatives of coal tar. Nobody could then come forward with preparations intended for children containing any opiates.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not intend to proceed to a conclusion with this clause to-night. In any event I purpose having it stand over. I anticipated that it would have to be amended; in fact, I have some amendments myself which I shall propose but I wanted to get the sense of the Committee on sections 6 and 7. There are many considerations which must be kept in mind when preparing this amendment and I should like a little time to consider the amendment which has been proposed and perhaps submit a different amendment of my own. I would propose that we let this clause stand.

Mr. FIELDING: Are these words "intended for administration to children" drawn from any existing Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At the present time there is no limitation upon the sale of patent medicines containing opium, or any of its derivatives, when administered to children.

Mr. FIELDING: What I desire to know is whether there is any means of determining the "intention"? The Bill speaks of medicines intended for a certain purpose; is there any difficulty in determining the "intention"?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it would be very difficult of determination.

Mr. STEELE: I would be very glad indeed to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland).

[Mr. Béland.]

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: May I ask who was, so to speak, the father of this clause? It does not appear to me that in this age one legitimate excuse can be offered for putting up in a patent medicine any form of opium to be dispensed by the laity to children. The proposal seems to be absolutely contrary to the rapidly growing practice in the medical profession which is to eliminate it as far as possible, in treating diseases not only of infants but of adults. We in the medical profession know that from time to time an emergency call comes from some home where an infant has, through ignorance or other cause, taken an overdose of opium, laudanum, paregoric, or some form of the derivatives of opium; and many of us have seen lives pass out of this world owing to the fact that medicines of that nature were easily procurable and were more or less daily used in the home as household remedies. Now the object of this Bill is to protect the public; it could have none other. It does look to me, I must say, as though the interests had not been very far away when this Bill was drawn—not only as regards the present but with respect to other succeeding clauses. This measure has all the earmarks of a Bill which had, I was going to say, been commercialized, or the earmarks of a commercial transaction. We must not get away from the fact that our object is to pass a Bill that will protect the public. I do not think any professional man or any layman can adduce a single argument to-day that will justify putting any derivative of opium into the hands of the public to be administered to children without knowing its nature, because that is what this Bill means. If you are going to give the public any form of medicine containing any of the derivatives of opium for goodness sake let it be indicated on the bottle so that the purchaser can read it and know they are administering some form of a drug which is very dangerous and very injurious. Opium, of course, has its uses, but I think I am within the mark when I say that practically the only great use it has is to alleviate pain; all other uses are detrimental to health and are absolutely dangerous to children.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the clause is allowed to stand it seems to me that after having obtained the sense of the Committee, as we have done this evening, when the Bill once more comes up for consideration the minister must eliminate this clause from it. We have a full attendance of members this

evening, and I am agreeably surprised to see so many hon. gentlemen present. If we wait until another occasion when perhaps there will be a bare quorum of members, the objectionable clause may perhaps pass contrary to the sense of the Committee as it has been expressed. I hope my hon. friend will take that into consideration, because it seems to me the general feeling of the Committee is against these poisonous syrups, and they must be done away with. I do not know why we should not follow the sound course of adopting the amendment of my hon. friend from Beauce.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I never expected that this clause would pass the Committee in its present form——

Mr. LEMIEUX: It passed the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not satisfied with the phraseology of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Beauce, and I should like a little time to consider its redrafting. I should like also to inquire how far the derivatives of coal tar should be excluded from the provisions of the clause. I think probably it would be a mistake to have the provisions so comprehensive.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a good German product.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend from Muskoka inquired who was the father of the Bill. The measure was prepared in the Department of Commerce by the departmental officials who are responsible for the administration of the Act. Up to the present moment there was nothing in our law restricting in any way the sale of drugs carrying opium or any of its derivatives, and I think the officials were under the impression that a reform of this kind could be accomplished possibly by stages rather than at one step. I have no personal knowledge of the investment in these particular drugs or patent medicines. If you prohibit the manufacture and sale of them at once you may be striking at what was at one time a perfectly lawful business, and I should like to think over what the likely effect of the prohibition would be. For instance, if the further manufacture of this particular drug is to be prohibited hereafter you have got to deal with the question of the stocks now on hand.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does my hon. friend mean the stock of medicines or the stock of infants?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I mean the stock of drugs on hand. For the reasons given I should like to have some time to consider the matter further and would therefore ask that the clause stand.

Mr. MANION: I would suggest, while consideration is being given to the question of opium and its derivatives, that the minister should also consider a drug which I do not think is referred to in the Bill and which has not been mentioned here to-night —I refer to chloral.

Mr. BELAND: I think that appears in the schedule.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it does.

Mr. BELAND: In order to meet the objections which were very properly raised by some hon. gentlemen, I have redrafted the amendment, and it will now read:—

The manufacture, importation or sale of all proprietary or patent medicines containing opinum or its derivatives for internal use are prohibited.

I will lay the amendment on the Table, Mr. Chairman, for the consideration of the minister and the department.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the hon. member have leave to withdraw the amendment which he first proposed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will have a conference with my hon. friend from Beauce in regard to the amendment which he has just submitted. I move:—

That the further consideration of clause 6 and the amendment thereto be now postponed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The balance of the Bill outside of clause 7 I do not expect will be very contentious, and should not take up a great deal of time. Therefore I do not think I shall proceed further to-night. I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Public Works—Rents, repairs, furniture, heating, etc., $3,595,000.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, the item is very large and I should think might preferably be taken up clause by clause. The information I seek, it seems to me, should properly be asked under this heading. My idea is that it would be interesting to the Committee to find out what

rental is being paid by the Government for accommodation in privately-owned buildings in Ottawa, and how that rental will compare with the current rate of interest on the capital investment for the new buildings which, I understand, are to house the different departments now scattered all over the city.

Mr. FIELDING: I would suggest to the minister that he might properly accept the first part of my hon. friend's proposal and call these items individually, otherwise we shall roam over the whole thing; and my hon. friend's question will come up a little later.

Mr. CARVELL: I think that will be the wisest course.

Ottawa public buildings—Elevator attendants, $55,000.

Mr. McMASTER: Is that elevator attendants for all the buildings?

Mr. CARVELL: All the buildings in Ottawa.

Gas and electric light, including roads and bridges, $65,000.

Mr. McMASTER: I think we should have some information about this. It is lumped together in a very general way.

Mr. CARVELL: I can only say that there is an increase of $5,000 over last year. That is because more space is now occupied, and the rates for electric light are based entirely upon the rates charged by the two electric light companies in Ottawa. I suppose one might say that the Hydro-Electric sets the rate—I do not know just which it is, sometimes one, sometimes the other company—but whatever it is the two companies charge exactly the same rate, and we pay the same rate as the ordinary user of electricity. We have a contract with the older company, the Ottawa Electric Company, made, I think, in 1916, and in that contract are set forth the amounts which we pay. The rate is $20 per horse-power for all power consumed, either direct or alternating, and we pay the same meter rate and square area rate—whatever that is—as is charged to the public.

Mr. McMASTER: Where is gas used now?

Mr. CARVELL: Gas is not used to any very great extent, but you will find it in the post office building; it is used for sealing purposes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What have roads and bridges to do with lighting?

[M. McMaster.]

Mr. CARVELL: There are a good many things that are almost unexplainable to the ordinary citizen unless he happens to live in the city of Ottawa. This has been the Capital for a long time, and a custom grew up years ago—which I would almost call an abuse—under which the Government did work on behalf of the municipality of Ottawa which they would not do in any other part of Canada. For instance, we take care of the approaches to the bridge across the Ottawa river, just below the falls. It is not a very great amount of money, but there is some expended every year in keeping that up. I cannot justify it, I cannot give any reason for it; I can only say: It is there. The Plaza in front of the Chateau Laurier comes under that category, the reason being that a great many years ago the Government maintained the bridges over the canal, known as the Dufferin and Sapper bridges, and those having been converted into the Plaza, we still take care of the maintenance. Then there is the Laurier Avenue bridge, which is also maintained by the Government. They are grouped together, and that is the meaning of the phraseology.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How much do the bridge appropriations amount to?

Mr. CARVELL: I am told $2,400.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I remember last year when I criticised those expenditures, the minister told us that he was quite new at the job, but he admitted that too much money was being expended on the grounds. I see this year that he wants some $350,000. Will he explain now why, instead of reducing that expenditure, he is more lavish than ever? Does he understand his job better this year?

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend's memory must be bad. I do not remember making the statement that too much money was expended on the grounds. Had I said so, I would have remembered it.

Mr. McMASTER: Was there not a promise of economy?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and I have tried to carry it out. There is no increase of $300,000 on grounds in Ottawa. The totals in these two columns include rents, repairs, furniture, heating, lighting, etc., for all public buildings in Canada.

Heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $250,000.

Mr. COPP: Who supplied the coal last year?

Mr. CARVELL: The coal was bought last year by the War Purchasing Commission. So far as Ottawa was concerned, it was purchased direct from the mines. Hundreds of people supplied coal, from different portions of Canada. Under the present system all purchases of coal and things of that kind for public buildings, if the amounts run over $500, come under my personal supervision. Invariably we call for tenders and before I sign for the goods I know how many tenders were submitted, whether public tenders were called for, and so on. I cannot commence to name the persons from whom coal was purchased, but that is the method pursued in purchasing it.

10 p.m.

Departments generally—care and cleaning of departmental buildings, including amount of $100 to E. Snowdon for firing noon gun—formerly voted under Civil Government Estimates, $310,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Does that mean that this item is hereafter to be under the Public Works Department?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: The Minister of Finance should be supremely grateful.

Mr. CARVELL: I think he should, judging from my experience during the last six or eight months. However, we have to take it.

Mr. COPP: How does that amount compare with the expenditure last year?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think there is any change. This charwoman service, which was formerly administered by the Finance Department, was transferred to the Department of Public Works at the beginning of the last fiscal year; therefore this is a new item in our Estimates.

Mr. COPP: I should think the amount would be higher.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think it is. I think we have effected some slight reforms in this particular service.

Mr. FIELDING: Is there not a question of increase now pending?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think there is any question pending; there may be a wish pending.

Repairs, furniture, grounds, snow and street maintenance, etc., $450,000.

Mr. McMASTER: Roughly, how is this amount divided?

Mr. CARVELL: There are 157 men on the workshop staff; they cost last year $146,066. Then there are the following items: mechanical engineer's staff, 60 men, $63,390; grounds for the Dominion buildings, 20 men for maintenance, $13,934; five men attending to flags, Dominion buildings, at 25 cents a day, $360; maintenance of roads and bridges, removal of snow in winter, etc., 16 men, $12,831; Wellington street repair staff, 14 men, $10,841; purchase of material, such as lumber, oil, seeds, bulbs, glass, etc., $202,577. That also includes purchase of carpets, furniture, etc., for all departments. I can give the name of every man employed, his salary, and how much he has been paid for the year.

Mr. McMASTER: I will not go that far along the lines of inquisition. But I would ask the minister what he considers to be the proportion maintained between the number of men engaged and the work they do?

Mr. CARVELL: I have a very strong impression on that point. If I were hiring men for this work I would put one-half or two-thirds the number of men on the job, and would get a little more work out of them. But they are doing about as much work as most men do who work for the Government.

Mr. McMASTER: You would not include ministers of the Crown in that category?

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, no; or members of Parliament.

Mr. VIEN: The minister has said that part of that amount goes to repair of Wellington street. Is that for pavements?

Mr. CARVELL: We maintain Wellington street from the Plaza to what is called the Perley Home—practically to the waterworks.

Mr. VIEN: What are the arrangements between Ottawa and the Dominion Government—I mean, our relations generally?

Mr. CARVELL: Ten years ago an arrangement was entered into between the Dominion Government and the city of Ottawa which expires on the first of June of this year. Under that agreement the Government was to take care of certain streets and bridges. But we have always adopted the policy of paying our share of local improvements, in Ottawa and elsewhere. In Ottawa, we go a little further than that, and all the construction, maintenance and repair of Wellington street is, as I understand it, done by the Government.

Mr. McMASTER: Does the Government do that through a contractor?

Mr. CARVELL: No, by this staff of men. My hon. friend, if he had followed me, would have heard the number of men employed in each one of those works, for instance, Wellington street, repair staff, fourteen men, amount, $10,841.

Mr. McMASTER: Does that mean that for the maintenance of one street, which is considerably less than one mile in length, fourteen men are kept working all the time?

Mr. CARVELL: That is what I mean to say.

Mr. McMASTER: I am sure that does not strike the minister or the hon. member for Brome as a wise or business-like proposition.

Mr. CARVELL: I quite agree with my hon. friend that I could take $10,000 and get a good deal more work done for it, but this is for repairs. There is something in that.

Mr. McMASTER: We would like to hear the minister propose some reform.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend will watch me long enough, he will, I think, get something that will satisfy him. He may get some information before I get through with these Estimates. There is no question that a system has grown up in Ottawa, the growth of half a century—we have a great body of workmen here who get their pay each day, and I hope they are working every day, but I cannot go out and watch them as I have something else to do.

Mr. McMASTER: There is only light traffic on Wellington street, and there cannot be $10,000 worth of repair work there every year.

Mr. CARVELL: The foreman says those men work there; he sends in his report and they get their pay. I think they do work there; they put in their time there anyway.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: There should be some reform in regard to this matter, and while I believe the minister is looking for some reform, I do not see the reform coming. I notice that every year we are voting $450,000 for repairs, furniture, grounds, snow and street maintenance, etc. Surely when a thing is once well done, there should be some reduction in the estimate for the following year. When the minister says that he wants $450,000 this year exactly the same sum as last year, that does not show any intention of making a reform. I can understand a piece of ground being improved one year but I cannot understand why it should be being perpetually repaired, and surely in some year less money should be voted for this work. If that were done I would see some reform about which the minister preaches so often.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend would give a little more thought to this than he has given already, I am sure he would come to the conclusion that there are two sides to the case. Since this House has assembled I have been asked a number of times to make changes in the rooms in this building. Such changes are not very great and I give them only as an illustration. It takes men and material to make those changes, and, so far as I know, they have all been granted. With the great congestion of civil servants in the last three or four years—and it has been great—a staff gets so big that it cannot occupy its premises and other premises must be provided for it and it has to be moved. There always must be changes. This is like a man moving into a new house—no man ever moved into a house in his life but his wife wanted some papering done or something else; she wanted a change of some kind. That is the way with civil servants—they want change and one has to have a staff to provide for such changes, and we have a staff of 157 men. I must say I think those men are pretty busy most of the time. Sometimes I wonder if it would not be possible to get a better system than we have in regard to the changing of staffs; but with the congestion that we have had to contend with in the last year and a half we have done the best we could, and I do not see the possibility of any improvement until the Dominion of Canada owns its own buildings. I do not believe one-half of our staff is housed in our own buildings to-day, and even when the new Hunter building is completed, as I hope it will be in July or August next, still nearly one-half of the staff will be housed in rented buildings. And every time we make a change in the occupation of those buildings or any portion of them it costs money to move the staffs, and something must always be done, such as the buying of new furniture. Civil servants are just like other human beings; they want things and they usually get them. I can give no other explanation. I have no doubt at all that in this Committee there are a dozen men who could take those 157 men, if they could deal with them as hired men, and put competent foremen

over them, and who would get more work out of them than the country is getting. But I cannot stand over them myself. In the last year and a half those men have been hired and they have been fired, if necessary, entirely by the superintendent in charge of them. No man, excepting the clerk of works, has anything to say as to who shall go on that staff; he has an absolutely free hand. I have talked the matter over with him many times; I have found fault that those men are not giving as much service as they should give; but he assures me they are, and unless I can find time to go out and supervise them personally, I do not see how I am going to change conditions. I want to treat the Committee fairly and tell them exactly the situation. I think a change should be made; I think our staff is too big, but now these men want an eight-hour day. They want nearly everything except work.

Mr. McMASTER: I would not be against an eight-hour day. I dislike working more than eight hours a day, and the man who works hard for eight hours a day has done a pretty good day's work. I do not object to a man's getting an eight-hour day so long as he is working during the eight-hour period.

Mr. CARVELL: I rather agree with that view.

Mr. McMASTER: The frankness of the minister invites criticism and makes one desire to give helpful criticism. Let us take this question of Wellington street. Has the minister any idea of making with the city of Ottawa some contract whereby the city would take over the control and maintenance of that street? It is the height of ridiculousness to maintain one plant for keeping one street in repair in a city which I presume has an adequate plant for maintaining all the other streets in repair.

Mr. CARVELL: If the hon. member has been reading the newspapers lately—and I presume he has—I think he will find that the city of Ottawa is not in a very receptive mood at the present time for taking over services hitherto performed by the Government. The city wants the Government to take over a large proportion of the services hitherto performed by the city, and we are having some very interesting discussions at present over this very question.

Mr. McMASTER: My humble observations may strengthen the minister's hand in dealing with the municipal authorities.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It would be satisfactory if the minister could give us a statement of how much we are contributing altogether to the city of Ottawa. We find the items scattered over the Estimates in various places, and I do not think any member of the Committee has a very clear idea of how much money we are paying to the city of Ottawa. I understand the city of Ottawa is dissatisfied, but we want to know whether it has a good reason to be dissatisfied or not.

Mr. CARVELL: Ten years ago an arrangement was made with the city of Ottawa by which the Dominion Government agreed to pay $100,000 a year to the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the maintenance of parks and driveways and $15,000 a year to the city of Ottawa by way of remuneration for the fire protection which we receive from the city. That contract expires on the 1st of June. There have been a number of conferences between the city of Ottawa and a committee of the Government as to the terms of the renewal of the contract. The Mayor of Ottawa published a very exhaustive statement in January last setting forth his contention as to what the Government should pay, the amount he fixes being about $800,000 a year. We had a meeting before Parliament met and a great many since, and finally, representing the Committee, I made an offer of $150,000 a year to the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the next ten years—$100,000 a year to go to the city to cover all services performed by the city for the Government, and the Government to relinquish to the city the right of taxing civil servants upon their incomes. For a great many years there has been an arrangement by which the city of Ottawa has not taxed the incomes of civil servants by reason of amounts which the Government has been paying to the city. I have taken the ground that it is none of our business. The civil servant resident in the city is an ordinary citizen and should pay his taxes the same as any other man. In my proposal we relinquish in favour of the city the right of taxing civil servants. The city think they can raise $57,000 a year from income taxes, but my opinion is they should get $75,000 or $80,000 a year under a proper administration of the law. Taking the city's figure it would mean that instead of $150,000 going to the Commission there would be a sum of $307,000. The city claim that we should pay on the basis of taxation.

Mr. COPP: An increase of $182,000?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, but not $182,000 of actual money paid out by the Government. There would be an actual increase of $135,000 a year paid by the Government. Under the British North America Act, Government property is not taxable, and the city of Ottawa claim that because of this fact we should pay them an amount representing what the taxes ordinarily ought to be. Of course, we cannot admit that, but there is one matter with which I have a great deal of sympathy. One of the most antediluvian laws regarding water or any public utility that I have ever heard of in my life exists in Ottawa. A man pays $2, I think, on the first $1,000 valuation of his property, and after that pays a greater rate on every other $1,000. And you pay that no matter whether you use water or not, or whether you have half a dozen bathrooms or none at all; and even if it is a vacant lot you pay the same water rate. They say that a fair valuation of Government property in Ottawa would be about $20,000,000, and that therefore we should pay water rates according to this valuation. I say that we should pay water rates according to the number of thousand gallons used, and I have offered to the city of Ottawa to put a meter on every service in the city and pay a fair meter rate, and that if we were not able to agree on a fair rate we could leave the matter to arbitration. We are also using their sewers to a certain extent, and pay a certain amount for that. They say we should pay one-fifth of the total maintenance charges of the sewers, but we have not agreed to that. My opinion is that all public utilities, whether used by the Government or by private individuals, should be metered; in other words, that a man should pay for what he consumes, no more and no less. But the city says: No, we should pay for all our services on the basis of their method of taxation and upon their valuation of our property. I think we shall agree in the end. I am of opinion that there is a lot of ordinary politics in it, and no doubt in the next fortnight the city will accept the offer we have made them, which I think is a generous one.

Mr. McMASTER: Has the minister considered the fact that generally the people come to a town because of the advantages the town has in itself, while Ottawa has its present population because people are attracted by the fact that this is the federal capital ?

Mr. CARVELL: If there is any argument we have not advanced along that line I should be glad to hear it. We have put up to the city every argument conceivable in that direction, and have not made much impression.

Mr. McMASTER: I trust that in the new arrangement made by the city this duplication of road maintenance equipment will be eliminated.

Mr. CARVELL: We shall certainly consider it.

Mr. LEGER: I think the Government might go further. I would suggest that in view of the fact that the sessions of Parliament are getting longer every year, and the fact that hon. members would undoubtedly like to bring with them their families, and as it is extremely difficult many a time to get necessary accommodation, the Government might provide apartments for such hon. members as desired to avail themselves of such accommodation. The members might occupy the apartments for the period of the session, or probably for the year, if they cared to, and could pay rent to the Government. Under such an arrangement they would know exactly where to go when the session convened, and the House might sit for four or five or six months without the inconvenience that members suffer at present by inability to have their families with them because of lack of accommodation.

Mr. JACOBS: The Government might take the matter up under the new housing scheme.

Mr. CARVELL: It is worth considering.

Mr. FRIPP: As I have the honour to represent the city, I cannot allow some of the remarks which have been made to pass without objection. In the first place, I would point out to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) that he is in error when he casts some doubt upon the quantity of work done by the men employed in his department. I have some personal knowledge of the work these men do, and venture to say that the working men and mechanics in the departments in Ottawa work as hard and as faithfully as those who work for private corporations.

In regard to the agreement which is now being entered into between the city of Ottawa and the Government of Canada I submit that the amount which the Government propose to offer is entirely inadequate. What is the situation? One-fifth of the whole taxable property of the city is owned or held by the Government.

When a Government leases a building the revenue which the city would otherwise derive from that building and the land upon which it stands immediately stops. The result is that the Government, unless it is placed in the position of the ordinary citizen, escapes the payment of a large share of the taxation. I fail to understand upon what principle the Government should not be treated as all the other citizens of Ottawa are treated. If the Government had to pay the city of Ottawa, the amount of payment would be in the neighbourhood of $600,000 instead of $100,000 that they propose to give to the city under this new agreement. I am not speaking for the moment of the $150,000 which the Government propose to give to the Improvement Commission, because the city of Ottawa has no control over that commission or the expenditure of that money. The Commission is one appointed by the Government, it is responsible to the Government and it spends this money upon the parks and driveway which surround the city of Ottawa, presumably for the benefit of the people of Canada and incidentally for the benefit of the people of Ottawa. But, in carrying out the scheme of the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier to make Ottawa "the Washington of the north," it was suggested that this Commission should be formed independently of the corporation so as to beautify and make attractive the city for those who have to come here to do business. The city of Ottawa is to receive only $100,000 for the services it renders. What services does it render? It supplies water to the Government and, although the supply is not under meter, the best information that the corporation officials can obtain is that the Government uses water, if it were metered, to the value of nearly $100,000. There is no restraint upon the use of it in any way; they use what they want.

Mr. McMASTER: We do not even have hot water to wash our hands with.

Mr. FRIPP: That is not the fault of the city of Ottawa. Then the city gives fire protection. That is an important item. The Government uses the sewers of the city; and there are other services supplied which if supplied to a private individual or a resident would cost that individual from $50,000 to $100,000. Why should the rest of the people pay for the services rendered to the Government of Canada? I hope the Minister of Public Works and the Committee who are still dealing with this question will further consider a more reasonable settlement in connection with the items I have mentioned.

It is true that there has to be set off against the extreme amount, say, $600,000 or $800,000 a year, the advantages that the city derives from the fact that it is the Capital. There is no doubt that there are numbers of people who come here on Government business who would not come to Ottawa if it were not the Capital, and that a certain amount is spent and business is increased by that fact. But I think if the matter were gone into carefully and fairly with the view of placing the arrangement with the city of Ottawa upon a business basis, we ought to receive at least $300,000, allowing for all those other incidental advantages which are brought to the city by reason of the fact that it is the Capital of Canada.

I still hope and trust that, notwithstanding what the minister has said, he has not yet made up his mind not to meet the city, and its position as stated by the mayor, more fairly, from the point of view of the city, at all events, and make an amicable arrangement upon the basis of the value of the services rendered.

I would ask the Committee to remember that one-third of the people of Ottawa including their families, are Government employees and that the city loses a large sum of money that it would not lose if these people were engaged in some other industry. If we could have an industry in Ottawa employing 15,000 men and women we would gain, it is quite evident, not the amount that the Government has proposed to pay, but a much larger sum in return for the services rendered in connection with water, fire protection, sewerage, and hospitals. We supply the hospitals for the city of Ottawa and these are used by the civil servants. The Government indirectly gains a benefit in that respect. We could tax their incomes, but the cost of collecting the income tax from the Civil Service would probably eat into a large portion of the revenue derived from that source. The arrangement heretofore has been that the city should not collect the income tax from the civil servants, it being, in a sense, paid by the Government under this arrangement.

I can only commend to the Minister of Public Works the spirit of the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier and express the hope that he will follow in his footsteps in his desire to make Ottawa, what it should be, as the Capital City of Canada, and to make it really the city of the whole people. If

my hon. friend will adopt the spirit of the late lamented gentleman of whom I have just spoken, I am sure that a better, a fairer arrangement can be made with the city of Ottawa than that which, apparently, the minister proposes, namely, the payment simply of $100,000 into the treasury of the corporation.

Mr. CARVELL: I appreciate the fair manner in which the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) has discussed the matter. I realize that it is a matter somewhat personal to him and one which is of interest to his constituents. I think I have approached it in the fair spirit of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and that I have even gone very much farther because I realize that the city has grown larger and that the world has advanced in ten years. Whereas Sir Wilfrid Laurier made an arrangement for the payment of $100,000 to the commission, I have offered $150,000 a year, and whereas he made an arrangement for $15,000 to go to the city, I have offered $100,000 and the right to tax the Civil Service which will represent about $50,000 or $75,000. It seems to me that, if you are going to make comparisons, I certainly have not been less generous than was the gentleman who has been referred to.

I do not want to discuss it any further than is necessary but I want to state to my hon. friend that the remarks which I made about the work done by employees were made from personal experience and knowledge, and not from hearsay. Of course, I have not had an opportunity of watching these men in a great proportion of their work, but I have had an opportunity of seeing with my own eyes certain things in the year and a half that I have been connected with the department, and I want to tell him that I would not feed some of these men for what they are doing. I would not have them on my premises at all. Why, the Speaker of the House told me only yesterday that he had a lot of these men repairing a room for him—one little room that a man would paint in one-half or three-quarters of a day. Yet six or seven men spent four or five days on the work. Wherever you go it is the same thing.

Mr. COWAN: Upon what ground are these men retained? If they were working for me I would fire them.

Mr. CARVELL: So would I.

Mr. COWAN: Why don't you?

Mr. CARVELL: I would like to get hold of a few special cases like that. The trouble is I cannot get the information. I happened to get this instance in conversation with the Speaker yesterday, when we were talking about the work of these men.

Mr. COWAN: I would fire every one of them.

Mr. FIELDING: Reference has been made to the determination to make of Ottawa "the Washington of the North," and I notice that in a recent discussion in the press mention is made of what the national government in the United States does for Washington and the question is asked, what is our Government doing? I wish to ask my hon. friend whether any proposal has been made to adopt the Washington system here? There is something to be said in favour of it, but its adoption would wipe out the municipal government in Ottawa as well as the individual citizen, so far as active participation in municipal affairs is concerned. In Washington the matter is left in the hands of a commission appointed by the Government. The Government pays a very large part of the cost of administration—I think one-half—and the citizens of Washington, unless there has been some change of late, pay the other half, and have no representation or voice in the administration. Has that proposition been put to my hon. friend?

Mr. CARVELL: No. That proposition has been discussed with the committee representing the city but it did not find very much favour at their hands.

Mr. FIELDING: Then the references made to what the national government in the United States is doing for Washington are scarcely applicable to Ottawa?

Mr. CARVELL: Hardly.

Rideau Hall (including grounds), improvements, furniture, maintenance, etc.—$65,000.

Mr. McMASTER: How are these items divided up?

Mr. CARVELL: There is, for example, a maintenance staff.

Mr. McMASTER: What is the amount required for that staff?

Mr. CARVELL: The staff includes one upholsterer, one carpenter, three painters, one carter, one plumber, three engineers, three firemen, nine labourers, and one repairer, and the amount required is $16,791.

Mr. VIEN: Do we need all these men?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not gone there to investigate. There are some things that

the Minister of Public Works rather fights shy of.

An hon. MEMBER: If the grounds are kept in good order during the present fiscal year I do not see why you require so large an amount for improvements for the next fiscal year.

Mr. CARVELL: Then there are 16 men employed on the gardens, grounds and roads, for which $12,857 is asked. About 25 labourers, engineers, carters, plumbers and such like are employed in maintenance and other kinds of work. Some of them, however, are only employed for a part of the year. In connection with greenhouse, gardens and roads I would say about 15 or 18 men are employed. I have every reason to believe that all these men are necessary.

Mr. VIEN: Upon whose recommendation are these men appointed?

Mr. CARVELL: They are employed by the Clerk of Works without any recommendation from anybody.

Mr. VIEN: Is the Clerk of Works an official of the department?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and he has the right to hire these men and to dismiss them for cause.

Mr. VIEN: I would suggest then that many of them should be fired. I understand we occupy rather a delicate position when we discuss this matter, but this is a yearly expenditure of $65,000. If the appointment of these men comes under the Clerk of Works and the officials of the department their attention should be drawn to the fact that quite a few of these employees are unnecessary; it is only common sense to say that. If a careful study of the situation were made, I think it would be found that we could economize and save a few thousand dollars on this item.

Mr. JACOBS: Do I understand that the $65,000 represents the upkeep of this mansion?

Mr. CARVELL: It does.

Mr. VIEN: No, it does not. The very next item is a vote of $17,000 additional for fuel and light.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, that is right.

Mr. JACOBS: Is that $17,000 in addition to the $65,000?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: That represents a total of $82,000 for the maintenance of this mansion. I think without curtailing the accommodation at Rideau Hall or the comfort of the high officials who reside there—comfort that should not be limited by any means—there are some unnecessary expenditures which it is our duty to diminish.

Mr. CANNON: Will the minister tell the Committee if $65,000 were spent last year?

Mr. CARVELL: No. The amount spent was $58,579, leaving a balance of $6,420 unexpended.

Mr. CANNON: If $58,000 sufficed last year, why should it not meet the necessities this year?

Mr. VIEN: With the cost of everything going up.

Mr. CARVELL: It is impossible to foresee exactly what repairs may be necessary, or what emergencies we may have to meet. With the care that we are giving this expenditure, I feel the Committee would be safe in trusting the department with $65,000. If that amount is not needed, I can assure the Committee it will not be expended.

Mr. McMASTER: Has there not been an item similar to this in the Estimates for many years past?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. Ever since Confederation we have had to maintain Rideau Hall.

Mr. McMASTER: Has the cost of maintenance always run up to figures like this?

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot speak from memory, but I know the figures have been fairly generous as long as I can remember.

Mr. CANNON: Who looks after the expenditure of that money?

Mr. CARVELL: The Clerk of Works, as far as labourers are concerned.

Mr. CANNON: Does he report to the department where the money has gone?

Mr. CARVELL: He puts in the timesheets, from which it appears to be correct that these men work the number of hours for which they are paid.

Mr. PEDLOW: It seems to me that if the Clerk of Works were given a "curtain lecture," it might have the desired effect.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know as to that. I am inclined to blame the system rather than the Clerk of Works, who is one of the officials of the department for whom I have the highest regard. I have talked

this matter over with him many times, and I believe he is doing his duty. I am afraid the only way to provide a remedy is to adopt very drastic measures, perhaps more drastic than I would feel like taking. However, I want to assure my hon. friends that from the knowledge I have at the present time, I think there will be a change in the future.

Mr. JACOBS: What is the name of the Clerk of Works?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Croll. He is Clerk of Works on government work.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What is his salary?

Mr. CARVELL: It is $1,600.

Mr. CANNON: Could the minister tell us what was done last year?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I have not the details here. It must be remembered that this item provides for the maintenance of the buildings, the grounds, the greenhouse, the gardens, and the roads. And all the expenditures are set forth in detail in the Auditor General's Report. I have not all the details here, but I will gladly give my hon. friends such information as I have. I have brought here all that one could reasonably expect to be asked to furnish the Committee.

Mr. McMASTER: I remember that at the time when our present Sovereign came to the Throne it was stated that he looked very carefully into the administration of the Royal Palaces and was able to effect very drastic reforms and economies in regard to the conduct of matters which had grown up many years before. Perhaps something of that sort is required here.

Mr. CARVELL: It may be.

Mr. CANNON: Spencerwood, the residence of the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, is far larger than Rideau Hall, but, although the Provincial Government does not spend anything like the amount provided for here, the property is always well maintained. Really I cannot understand how we can spend $62,000 on Rideau Hall—

Mr. VIEN: $82,000.

Mr. CANNON: —as there are hardly any trees and the grounds are not in very good condition. I do not think we are getting our money's worth there.

Mr. VIEN: It is not the idea of any one on this side of the House at any rate to curtail the comforts of His Excellency or of his staff, and I am sure that His Excellency might feel embarrassed about dismissing any of these employees, who are practically forced upon him as soon as they are appointed by the Government.

Mr. CARVELL: His Excellency has nothing to do with their appointment; these men are purely members of the Public Works Department staff.

Mr. VIEN: That is why we are freer to discuss it.

Mr. CARVELL: Absolutely.

Mr. VIEN: Because we would not wish to be discourteous towards His Excellency. But I think if the appointments are entirely under the hand of the department the attention of the Government should be drawn to the matter. That is what we are doing now; and even if we vote this item we are taking the word of the Minister of Public Works that special attention will be paid to it next year.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: Do I understand that Mr. Croll, the Clerk of Works, attends exclusively to the work in and about Rideau Hall?

Mr. CARVELL: That is right.

Mr. JACOBS: The minister spoke a few minutes ago about another clerk of works who was attending to the work on Wellington street.

Mr. CARVELL: That is Mr. Shearer. He is the official who has charge of all the men working on the lawns, roads and buildings generally in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose we could not make Mr. Croll a Shearer in order to cut out the expenses?

Telephone service, $62,000.

Mr. McMASTER: I see there is no allowance there for the increased rates which the Bell Telephone Co. are threatening to charge.

Mr. CARVELL: We hope to save the extra expense by a reduction in the number of phones.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Dominion Public Buildings—Dominion Immigration Buildings, repairs, furniture, etc., $13,000.

Mr. VIEN: Is that waste paper basket contained in that item?

Mr. CARVELL: I rather imagine it is.

Mr. VIEN: It should be.

Dominion Quarantine Stations—Maintenance, $4,000.

Mr. McMASTER: That seems to be a very small item to maintain a building that is going to cost $400,000.

Mr. CARVELL: I think myself that the item is too small. These Estimates were made up, of course, before the session opened. A careful investigation is being made of the immigration buildings. The Minister of Immigration has had a couple of competent men travelling all over the country trying to effect every possible economy, and last week I agreed with him to send an engineer from the Public Works Department to accompany one of his men and inspect these buildings and report what necessary improvements should be made. I am not speaking of Grosse Isle station; that is provided for in another way. When we have satisfied ourselves what should be done we will come to Parliament for a special vote. This $4,000 could not accomplish very much, and I have a suspicion that the money voted yearly has perhaps been spent in a very perfunctory manner, because I am told that the Halifax and St. John plants are in a very dilapidated condition.

Fittings and general supplies and furniture, $100,000.

Mr. McMASTER: What is this especially for?

Mr. CARVELL: For supplies and furniture for public buildings all over the Dominion.

Mr. PEDLOW: Does that include furniture and fittings only for buildings outside of Ottawa?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: Not inside?

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, no. We have passed the item for the city of Ottawa, except the rents.

Mr. CANNON: How are those fittings and furniture being purchased?

Mr. CARVELL: Through the War Purchasing Commission.

Mr. CANNON: How is it that the money is appropriated to the Department of Public Works when the purchases are being made by the War Purchasing Commission?

Mr. CARVELL: The commission simply act as agents for the Department of Public Works in purchasing these supplies, and we take delivery and pay for them. In a word, we do the paying, not the purchasing.

Mr. PEDLOW: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I forgot to refer to that item of $450,000, repairs, furniture, etc., for buildings in the city of Ottawa. I am sure it will be quite apparent to all hon. members that there is an omission in the furnishing of this building—I refer to proper accommodation for members on the cross benches. I think provision should be made for these members in the way of suitable desk accommodation. That brings me to another point: if provision is being made in the new Parliament Buildings for accommodation of third party members, or members on the cross benches? There is quite a contingent of these members in the present House, and I understand it is getting larger every day, and when we change over to the new House it is difficult to say what proportions this contingent will have grown to.

Mr. COWAN: It will be the chief Opposition then.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think accommodation should be provided for them in the new House, and for the time being in this Chamber.

Mr. CARVELL: We have not reached the point where we are considering the accommodation of the new House.

Mr. McMASTER: May I bring something to the minister's attention about which I spoke to him privately some time ago? The Hall of Fame in the new Parliament Buildings, I understand, was broadened but the roof was not raised, resulting in a tunnel-shaped hall.

Attention was drawn to the matter, and the hall was broadened out, but the roof was left at the same height. Even the best architects sometimes make mistakes. I understand from those who have visited the place and who are connoisseurs in matters of architecture that the general lay-out of the Hall of Fame will be very imperfect unless the roof is raised so that the height of the hall will correspond with its breadth.

Mr. CARVELL: A day or two after my hon. friend spoke to me I went to the building, accompanied by the architect, and looked the situation over. I am not an artist or an architect, but I became satisfied that the proportions of the hall are about as correct as they could be, and that there was nothing in the story which was told to my hon. friend.

Lighting, $175,000.

Mr. McMASTER: A new sheriff who was appointed at Montreal some few years ago,

by assigning an employee to the duty of going from room to room and turning off the electric lights when they were not required, cut down the electric light bill for the court house by one-half. Perhaps the minister is doing something of that nature; if not, it is a suggestion which is worthy of consideration.

Mr. CARVELL: The caretakers of all these buildings have instructions to do just what my hon. friend suggests; how faithfully they are carrying out these instructions, of course, I am not able to tell. If the light bills show an increase, 11 p.m. the caretakers are always asked for an explanation. But it is a pretty hard matter to control. For instance, if we had some one running round this building and turning off lights all the time, you can imagine what kind of row there would be. A housewife living on one side of the street may be able to get along with half as much electric power as that used by a housewife on the other side of the street; yet it would be hard to convince the second housewife that she could substantially reduce her electric light bills. It is just so with public officials.

Mr. VIEN: I suggest that a saving might be effected by installing a plant to develop electric power for the purpose of lighting all Dominion buildings. Big institutions have adopted this course and have found it economical. The East and West Blocks, the Langevin block, the Connaught building, could all be lighted by a plant of their own.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot agree with my hon. friend. If there is one service that the Government is obtaining which is a real, straight business proposition it is the electric light and power service that they are receiving in Ottawa. The rate is lower than it is in all places but a few in Canada. I admit that we may consume more current than we ought to, but imagine where you would land with $65,000 in attempting to pay the interest on an expenditure sufficiently large to establish and maintain a plant for the lighting of these buildings. You would not even get started; you would have to spend $165,000 a year, and then some. I am afraid my hon. friend is becoming converted to the idea of government ownership and operation of public utilities.

Mr. VIEN: Laval University, the Quebec Seminary, the Quebec Parliament buildings are all lighted in that way, and the method is found to be economical.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. CARVELL: I will give an example of the other side of the story. When the Grand Trunk station was built in Ottawa the company installed a steam plant with the idea of lighting their station, grounds and buildings, including the Chateau Laurier, and using the exhaust steam for heating purposes; but they had to go back to the outside companies for their electricity. There is no use in talking about the Government trying to run an electric plant in Ottawa; it could not be done for $200,000 a year.

Mr. PARENT: Does this item include the lighting of the Quebec post office?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. PARENT: The Quebec Railway Light and Power Company is providing power for the lighting of the different public buildings in Quebec City. There are two competing light and power companies there, the Public Service Corporation of Quebec and the Quebec Railway Light and Power Company. My information is that when a lighting contract is given it goes to one company, without prices being asked from the other. The public interest would be better served and lower rates would be obtained by getting prices from both companies.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no knowledge of that. I find from the notes placed before me that we are paying $800 a year for electric light in the Quebec post office, $750 for the custom house, and $1,000 for the examining warehouse.

Mr. PARENT: Is it correct that a five-year contract has been awarded to the Quebec Railway Light and Power Company without tenders being called?

Mr. CARVELL: I can say that it has not been done in my day. I will look into the matter and give my hon. friend the facts.

Mr. VIEN: Is the lighting of public buildings done on the basis of a meter rate, or of a flat rate?

Mr. CARVELL: On the basis of a meter rate wherever possible. We try to follow the custom, whatever it may be, in the city, town or village concerned. We always pay the same price that the ordinary consumer pays.

Mr. CROWE: What is being paid per kilowat for lighting power in Ottawa?

Mr. CARVELL: A contract was entered into with the Ottawa Electric Company, under which a flat rate for power of $20 per horse-power, both alternating and direct

was charged. Then for street lamps on bridges, streets, parks, etc., where the company supplies and maintains the poles, lines, lamps and hangers, the charge is $45 per year per arc lamp of 6½ amperes. Where the Government owns and maintains the poles, lines, etc., the charge is $22 per arc lamp of 6½ amperes.

Mr. CROWE: The consumer's rate in the city of Ottawa is two cents per kilowatt. I was wondering whether the Government got a reduction on that.

Mr. CARVELL: I am sorry I cannot give the information now, but I will get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. PEDLOW: In going through several of the public buildings in Ottawa, some of which are owned, and some merely rented, by the Government, I have noticed that the electric wiring is far from what I would call efficiently or properly installed. If the same installation were in a building owned by myself in Renfrew, the inspector of the Hydro-Electric would condemn it instantly and my insurance rates would be considerably increased. I understand that the Government carries its own insurance, or rather it does not carry insurance on its property. But the Government is responsible not only to itself and its employees but to the city in which its buildings are situated, and if a fire occurred through the negligence of the Government or its employees as regards defective wiring, if the ruling of inspectors is to be a guide in this matter, the Government would be responsible. If the Government are responsible, I should like to know who would be the one that would be considered guilty in this connection under an enactment passed here a few weeks ago, to amend the Criminal Code respecting the prevention of fires. One section of the Bill says:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who, by negligence, causes any fire which occasions loss of life or loss of property.

Mr. CARVELL: Theoretically, that would come back to the minister.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like the minister to get busy on the job at once, because the wiring is undoubtedly not in proper shape either in this building or in any other buildings in the city owned or leased by the Government.

Mr. CARVELL: This is the first I have heard of the matter. I will have an investigation and a report made. There have never in the past been any fires in Government buildings in Ottawa on account of defective wiring.

Dominion public buildings—rents, $915,000.

Mr. COWAN: Does this cover rents throughout Canada outside of Ottawa?

Mr. CARVELL: This covers the total rents in Canada.

Mr. COWAN: This is a tremendous price we are paying for occupying the humiliating position of tenant, and it would be a good thing to have public buildings in all small places. That is going pretty far, but this item proves that the Department of Public Works should adopt a policy of putting up in every capital city in the Dominion a public building capable of housing all the employees of the Government. In the city in which I live, which is the capital of Saskatchewan, it is the most difficult thing for an ordinary person entering the city to find a Dominion officer. It is most inconvenient, and the Government is being held up by landlords on every possible occasion. Whenever landlords get a chance to raise the rent, they do so. The only way to get rid of landlords is by putting up buildings of one's own.

Mr. CARVELL: I ought to take a little time to tell the Committee what we are paying in rents outside of Ottawa. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) is absolutely right when he states that rents are being put up and up all the time, and there seems to be no way to prevent it. The last three or four years have been abnormal ones, and there has been a great increase in the Civil Service in every portion of Canada, very largely due to war services, and now we have two or three other services starting up, namely, the Soldiers Land Settlement Board, the Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Department, and the Income Tax Branch.

Mr. COWAN: The latter will be permanent.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no doubt at all that the Civil Service outside of Ottawa is not going to decrease nearly as rapidly as many of us would wish. We must face the situation, and the suggestion made by the hon. member for Regina is good, sound business. I will give the Committee a few figures to show what we are paying:

	Ordinary rents.	Rents on war account.
Nova Scotia	$ 15,632	$ 13,828
New Brunswick	1,497	9,805
Prince Edward Island	542	940

Quebec	$46,748	$104,135
Ontario, outside of Ottawa	62,285	157,838
Manitoba	21,307	50,565
Saskatchewan	22,890	46,482
Alberta	61,430	72,794
British Columbia	33,507	71,782

Mr. CROWE: What was the amount of rents paid in Vancouver?

Mr. CARVELL: It would be over $60,000. I can give my hon. friend the items but it would take a long time to read them. In regard to the city of Ottawa, my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), the last time the Committee sat, asked me for a statement. I have prepared for him a statement of all the rentals in the city of Ottawa, and it shows $645,066 on ordinary rentals, and $111,482 on war account—a total of $756,549.

Mr. VIEN: Could the details of these be given to the Committee?

Mr. CARVELL: I intend to lay it on the Table or give it to the hon. member for Guysborough, and it will be available to any one who wishes to see it. It gives the names of all the several buildings.

Mr. VIEN: Not only the details in regard to Ottawa, but the other document as well.

Mr. McMASTER: It could be inserted in Hansard.

Mr. CARVELL: It would take a great many pages of Hansard. However, I would be glad to treat it as a return showing all the rents paid and the details.

Mr. PEDLOW: What about rents received for buildings owned and rented by the Government, as well as the taxes paid on them?

Mr. CARVELL: Taxes paid by the Government on Government-owned property rented in Ottawa total $8,219.25, and if we pay within a certain time we get a discount. It figures out a total of $7,769. That is in Ottawa.

Mr. PEDLOW: Have you the total rentals received on Government property on which you pay taxes?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, $25,874.

Mr. MANION: I have a suggestion to make regarding public buildings. I have often been struck by the waste space in some public buildings outside of Ottawa. If you go to some customs buildings you will see more than ample room for the requirements of the work, and yet the agent at that point will insist that he barely has enough room. I have been in customs houses in small cities where the building was large enough for a city five times its size. The Government might do well from an economical standpoint to have an independent inspector look over these buildings with a view to seeing if they could not find space for more departments of public service than those for which they are now used. The hon. minister has been doing that to some extent, because in my own city he has put a number of offices into the customs building.

Mr. CARVELL: I have had a few trials —I think that is the word I should use—in regard to the matter suggested by the hon. member, but I have not succeeded very well. I will go so far as to criticise the policy that has been in vogue for a great many years of having too big examining warehouses which were not properly arranged for office purposes, involving a great waste of space, I will not say of public money, because the buildings no doubt actually cost the money paid for them. The most notable example is the city of Calgary. In the customs warehouse there, there is enough waste space to take care of the post office of that city, for which we are going to spend $750,000 to put up a building.

Mr. McMASTER: Why not use it?

Mr. CARVELL: You cannot get light and the conveniences necessary. I went to look it over and I can assure my hon. friends that it cannot be used. The space is there. There are a few packing boxes in a room as big as this, but they will tell you that they need every inch of it. My hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) is absolutely right in his criticism, and that is why I said the other night that any buildings I had anything to do with would not be called either post office or custom house, but would be known as public buildings, to be used for the public services.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think there is any provision in the law which gives the Government the right to expropriate buildings for Government purposes.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, there is.

Mr. McMASTER: I know there is a right to expropriate land for a railway, but I did not know there was the right to expropriate what I might call the use of a building.

Mr. CARVELL: I think there was passed last year an amendment to the Exchequer Court Act which gives the right of such expropriation.

Mr. McMASTER: I am glad to hear that there is such a law, because it is only right. A farmer can have part of his farm taken from him for a public utility, and the landlord should be under the obligation to give up his property for public purposes under urgent necessity.

Mr. CARVELL: There is such a right because I have exercised it a dozen times in the last six or eight months.

Mr. VIEN: Is the lease mentioned in these lists that are to be filed as sessional papers?

Mr. CARVELL: Not the dates.

Mr. VIEN: But the duration?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. VIEN: Are they for several years?

Mr. CARVELL: Some are for five years. We have adopted the policy for the last year and a half that as these leases fall due we renew them for not later than the first of May, 1920, and in many cases not later than next December. The reason is this: The Hunter building will be completed, we hope, in July and certainly in August. That will provide about 140,000 square feet of floor space, and will house a great many civil servants now accommodated in other parts of the city. But as there are some new departments being established, such as the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, the Land Settlement Board and the Income Tax office, the idea is to have a general rearrangement of the offices of the different departments when the Hunter building is finished. We have rented the whole of what is called the Rea or Daly building of which we get possession on the 1st of July. So that in July or by the 1st of August we hope to be able to make a re-arrangement by which we shall have each department in one place. I am sorry to say that two important departments will still be distributed in sections in different places around the city, but we are making very short term leases and hope within the next year and a half, at the outside, to get rid of a great many buildings now under lease and to reduce to quite an extent the amount of rental paid in Ottawa.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: While that general plan for re-arranging the offices in Ottawa is being carried into effect, has the minister considered the unit system in the organization of Government offices to conserve space, and do away with so many partitions and doors in the buildings? It seems to me, in going through the departments as they exist at the present time, that one of the great difficulties is that the buildings were never designed as office buildings. Looking at the Hunter building from the outside it does seem to me to be the first approach to a successful modern office building that has ever been designed in connection with the Government service in any part of Canada. If it is carried out on that system it will not only conserve space but it will ultimately result in reducing the cost of the entire office staff.

Mr. CARVELL: I accept the compliment which my hon. friend offers regarding the Hunter building but I take no credit to myself; whatever credit there is belongs to the deputy minister who was the author of the building and for whom it has been named. I agree that this is the first attempt that has been made in Ottawa to have a real office building. The building is constructed on the unit basis. There are nine floors all practically alike. The only difference is that there is a well in the centre 100 x 50 feet. The building is 200 x 150 feet. That gives a row of offices all around the position of the well 50 feet wide. There is an 8-foot passageway which leads between two 20-foot offices, one on the outside and one on the inside. The great long corridors have been divided up according to the necessities of the departments intending to use them. Some of the space may be divided up into rooms 10 x 12 and in other cases there will be rooms from 30 to 50 feet long. We have consulted several departments which are going to use the different floors and have divided and partitioned the space according to the arrangements of these departments.

As to the future, I think I suggested on a former occasion that it would well repay any member of the House of Commons to take a forenoon, go to Mr. Ewart's office and see the models which he is preparing for the new building which we all hope in the not-too-far-distant future to see erected on the expropriated area on Wellington street. That idea is being carried out there exclusively. We propose to adopt the unit system in so far as the unit system can be applied to that building. The first unit will contain the Supreme Court room, and after that there will be a series of office buildings practically all built upon the

same general plan to carry out the idea that my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. JACOBS: What will the cost of the Hunter building be?

Mr. CARVELL: Including land, $1,500,000.

Mr. JACOBS: You have 140,000 square feet of floor space?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. It is by far the cheapest office building in Ottawa. If you figure light, heat, elevator attendants, and all you can possibly figure it will amount to from 68 to 69 cents per square foot per annum. We are paying all sorts of prices for rents but for a modern building we are paying around a dollar a foot. We look upon this building as a good business investment. It will also be an investment from the civil servants' standpoint because they will be housed in offices such as they never had before, and that means increased efficiency.

Mr. McMASTER: It is half past eleven, we have done a splendid evening's work, we have learned a great deal about the public service and it would seem fitting that we should adjourn.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no objection although I had hoped to get rid of the rest of these Estimates.

Mr. McMASTER: We worked until two o'clock this morning.

Mr. CARVELL: These harbour and river items are unimportant. Of course I am in the hands of the Committee.

Mr. McMASTER: They are not important on the whole but they are sometimes very important to certain constituencies and they might possibly give rise to a certain amount of discussion. The minister agreed with me about the advisability of an eight hour day.

Mr. CARVELL: That does not apply to members of Parliament.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Carvell the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Friday, May 16, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock, Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 111, for the relief of Mary Ann Scheib.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 114, for the relief of Vernon Balm Bailey.—Mr. McCurdy.

THE WINNIPEG STRIKE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): I wish to draw the attention of the Government to this startling headline which appears in the Montreal Gazette this morning: "Winnipeg sees general strike in full effect—27,000 workers quit in sympathy with metal men—minister powerless—bakers, firemen, postal employees and railway shopmen among those out." The Minister of Labour is reported as saying that the Government can do nothing in the matter. I should like to know what steps the Government are going to take in view of the extraordinary circumstances, and what action will be taken to prevent the recurrence of strikes on such a huge scale in the future. I remember that when there was a little disturbance in the city of Quebec last year the military forces were called out, and I think this is the proper time——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is perfectly in order in asking a question, but he is out of order in referring to anything that may have occurred last year.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Labour): The Minister of Labour has been closely in touch with the situation at Winnipeg during the past ten days. He is being advised of events from moment to moment, and he is ready at all times to do everything he can in the circumstances.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Has the Government any statement to make with regard to the strike of postal employees at Winnipeg?

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (for Postmaster General): Nearly all the postal employees in the Winnipeg post office have gone out on a sympathetic strike in accordance with the action taken by the labour organizations in Winnipeg. The Government considers that such action on the part of the postal employees is entirely without justification. We are advised that efforts are being made to intimidate the employees who are still faithful to the public service. The Government will stand absolutely behind all the employees who are performing their duty in the service of the Government and in the administration of the post office in Winnipeg.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I understand that a number of the employees

of the railways and telegraphs are also on strike. Has the Government any information as to their grievance?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): I have received no information from the officials at Winnipeg.

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

PAY AND PENSIONS.

On the motion of Hon. Newton W. Rowell (President of the Privy Council) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act, chapter ninety-one of the Revised Statutes, 1906, and to provide,—

1. That all members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Force on active service in the naval, military or air forces of His Majesty during the European war, which began in August, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, shall, for the purposes of pension for service in the said Force under the said Act, be entitled to have such active service counted as service in the said Police Force: Provided,

(a) that the amount of any pension, gratuity or allowance which any member of the said Force receives or is entitled to receive or apply for, in respect of any injury received by him while serving in the military, naval or air forces aforesaid, shall be deducted from any pension, gratuity or allowance to which such member would be entitled under the said Act, other than a pension for years of service, irrespective of any infirmity of mind or body or bodily injury;

and,

(b) that no widow or child of any such member who received or is entitled to receive or apply for, any pension, annuity, gratuity or allowance in consequence of the death, incapacity or injury of any such member while serving in the forces aforesaid, shall be entitled to any pension, annuity or allowance under the said Act.

2. That in case of the re-appointment or re-engagement in the Force of any person who was a member of the Force, and who, subsequent to the fourth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, resigned or purchased or otherwise obtained his discharge from the Force for the purpose of serving in the military, naval or air forces of His Majesty during the said European war, and who served therein, the period of such service in such forces shall, for the purposes of pension only under the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act, be deemed to have been served in the Force, and in any such case such member shall be repaid any money paid by him to purchase such discharge.

3. That the rates of pay as fixed by chapter forty-seven of the statutes of 1913, be increased as follows:—

"Eight staff sergeants, each per diem	$3 00
Other staff sergeants, each per diem	2 50
Other non-commissioned officers, per diem	2 25
Constable, per diem	$1 75
Scouts, per diem	2 50
Trumpeters and buglers, under eighteen years of age, per diem	1 25
Working pay to artisans and others specially employed, per diem	0 75"

. That the Governor in Council may authorize extra pay to be paid to members of the Force employed as detectives, to those serving in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, and for a period of five years from the first day of June, 1919, to any other member of the Force.

5. That an officer who is retired compulsorily for any cause other than misconduct or inefficiency after ten years' service, shall be entitled to a pension for life, not exceeding one-fiftieth of the pay and allowances of his rank or permanent appointment at the time of his retirement for each completed year of service.

6. That the Governor in Council may, as to him seems fit, grant a pension to the widow and a compassionate allowance to each of the children of any officer who, having completed twenty years' service, was at the time of his death on full pay, or who, having completed ten years' service, is at the time of his death in receipt of a pension.

7. That the pension of a widow shall be,—

(a) if her husband was at the time of his death on full pay, an amount equal to one-half of the pension to which he would have been entitled if he had been retired compulsorily immediately before his death; or,

(b) if he was on pension, an amount equal to one-half of such pension.

8. That pensions to widows heretofore granted under the provisions of the said Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act may be readjusted in accordance with the provisions of these resolutions, but no such readjustment shall authorize the increase of any payments for pension that accrued before the passing of the Act based upon these resolutions.

9. That every constable who is a member of the Force at the time of the passing of the Act based upon these resolutions, or who hereafter becomes a member of the Force, shall be entitled, upon retirement, to a pension for life, as follows:—

(a) if he has completed ten but less than twenty-one years' service, one-fiftieth of his annual pay and allowances for every year of service:

(b) if he has completed twenty-one but less than twenty-five years' service, an annual sum equal to twenty-fiftieths of his annual pay and allowances, with an addition of two-fiftieths of such pay and allowances for every completed year of service above twenty years;

(c) if he has completed twenty-five years' service, an annual sum equal to thirty-fiftieths of his annual pay and allowances, with an addition of one-fiftieth of such pay and allowances for every completed year of service above twenty-five years; Provided, that the pension shall not exceed two-thirds of his annual pay at his retirement. But for the purpose of estimating any such pension, neither working pay nor extra pay of any man shall be considered.

10. That the Governor in Council may authorize the Commissioner to appoint, by warrant under his hand, such officers and men, who have served in the Force, to be a Reserve, to be known as the "Royal Northwest Mounted Police Reserve,"

(a) such officer or man when called up for duty to hold the rank and draw the pay which he received on the date of his retirement or discharge from Force; and,

(b) any member when called up for training for a period not exceeding seven days in any one year, to receive the same rate of pay as when called up for duty.

Mr. ROWELL: The members of the Committee will see that this resolution gives effect to the policy I announced the other evening when the Estimates for the Royal Northwest Mounted Police were being considered. The first section provides that the time in which any member of the Force may have served in the overseas forces shall count for the purposes of pension. Under the Mounted Police Act as it now stands the members of the Force become entitled to a pension on retiring after twenty years' service. A large number of the members of the Force were granted leave of absence without pay to serve overseas, and others retired or purchased their discharge for this purpose. Our view is that all who withdrew from the Force in order to go overseas, if they intend to resume their place in the Force should have the time they spent overseas counted in estimating the amount of their pension. Provisos (a) and (b) are to ensure that for a disability suffered in the service overseas for which they are entitled to a pension under the general pension law applying to all who served overseas in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, they shall not be entitled to a pension under the Mounted Police Act. This, of course, does not affect the pension for length of service.

Section 3 provides the statutory authority for the increase in pay which I intimated to the House had already been granted to the Force last year under Order in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the percentage of increase granted?

Mr. ROWELL: The amount is fifty cents per day for constables and n.c.o.'s. As the Statute stood, before the Order in Council was passed, the rate of pay for the men for the first year was $1 a day, for the second year $1.10, and for the third year $1.25, the maximum being $1.25. This increases the maximum to $1.75, and the same ratio of increase will continue as before.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: How much extra pay do the officers and men serving in the Yukon territory receive?

Mr. ROWELL: Under the present Act it is as follows: Officers, $1.25; staff sergeants and sergeants, 75c; corporals and constables, 50c.

Section 5 of the resolution changes the law in reference to the period of service to earn a pension. At the present time if a mounted policeman retires after twenty years of service he becomes entitled to a pension on account of length of service. This section will permit of a pension being granted after only ten years service, under the conditions mentioned therein.

Sections 6, 7 and 8 deal with the pensions of officers' widows, making provision for some increase. Section 9 deals with the pensions of private members of the force and non-commissioned officers. At present the officer's pension is based on pay and allowance, and this is to put the pension of the private in the Royal Northwest Mounted Police on the same basis. Section 10 of the resolution provides for creating the reserve to which I referred the other evening, that is, the reserve of the men who have served in the force and have retired from it.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

BANKRUPTCY ACT.

On motion of Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General), Bill No. 18, respecting Bankruptcy, was read the third time and passed.

FERTILIZERS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce), Bill No. 74, to amend the Fertilizers Act, 1909, was read the third time and passed.

LOCATION OF RAILWAYS ACT.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways), Bill No. 93 (from the Senate), to amend the Railway Act (Location of Railways), was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—R.S., c. 37, ss. 157 and 159 amended:

Mr. J. D. REID: Perhaps I may explain the purpose of this Bill. In the Railway Bill which is before the Special Committee these clauses have been changed so as to vest in the Board of Railway Commissioners the authority to approve of route maps, this authority having in the past been exercised by the minister. When a charter was granted by the House for the incorporation of a railway, before they could proceed with the construction of the railway a route map

had to be approved of by the minister. We now purpose to change that to provide that the Board of Railway Commissioners shall have this power of approval. It is the intention to have this Bill put through in case the regular Railway Bill does not pass at this session. I should like to have this Bill go through the Committee now and put down for third reading, and if the Railway Bill now before the special committee were passed I would not proceed further with this Bill. In the event of the Railway Act not being passed at this session, we are desirous to provide that the authority for approving of route maps shall be placed in the hands of the railway commissioners. The reason for this is that practically speaking there are only two railway systems in Canada, and it is advisable that the Board of Railway Commissioners should decide on the route maps to be approved of. The Government railway or the Canadian Pacific railway might be involved and there might be a conflict of two interests.

Section agreed to.

On section 159—sanction by board:

Mr. McMASTER: Suppose the Railway Bill now before the special committee does not go through, would we not have to examine this Bill with the same care? Should we not examine it with the care that would be exercised if it were certain that the Railway Bill would not go through?

Mr. J. D. REID: Under the Railway Act as it now stands the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian National railways before they can proceed must come to the Minister of Railways and get his approval of the route map. The only difference that is now contemplated is to provide that instead of coming to the minister the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian National or the Grand Trunk or any other private companies will go to the Board of Railway Commissioners who will look into the whole situation and give their approval. I think the Railway Bill will go through this session; at least I hope it will, in which event I shall not move the third reading of this Bill. However, if the Railway Bill does not go through I have no objection to having this referred back to the Committee in order to have it more closely examined if it is deemed fit.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that these clauses are an exact repetition of the clauses contained in the new Bill which has been considered by the special committee?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not compared the clauses closely, but I instructed Mr. Gisborne, the Parliamentary Counsel, to see that they were identical. If we have to go any further with this Bill I will look into the matter closely and explain the situation. Then we can go into Committee again if necessary.

Mr. CAHILL: What difficulty does the Government anticipate in connection with the new Railway Bill? It contains only a few contentious clauses, and the closure is in good working form, so that if any difficulties arise the Government can overcome them. Why should there be any hesitation in applying the gag in the case of this Bill, which is a Government measure, when there was no hesitation in invoking the closure on an earlier occasion?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have no doubt at all about the Bill going through this year as reported from the Committee in some form. I am not able to apply the gag to the Senate, otherwise there would be no difficulty in passing the Bill as it leaves this House. The trouble is that when we send it to the Senate they may not pass it in the form in which it leaves the Commons. That was the difficulty two or three years ago; this House agreed unanimously on the form the Bill was to take, but when it reached the Senate they amended it there, and we could not get it through in the shape in which we wanted it. If I was sure that Senate would pass the Bill in the form in which it leaves us, there would be no difficulty whatever.

Section agreed to, and Bill reported.

HUDSON BAY AND STRAITS.

ASSENT OF HOUSE ASKED TO ATTENDANCE OF A MEMBER BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate requesting that the House permit Hon. F. Cochrane, one of its members, to attend and give evidence before the special committee of the Senate appointed to take evidence and report at this session upon the navigability and fishery resources of the Hudson bay and straits, and upon the character of ports of said Hudson bay with regard to their fitness as railway terminals.

DOMINION WATER-POWERS ACT.

On the motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 94, respecting Dominion Water-Powers was read a second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2, paragraph (a)—Definition of "Dominion Water-powers."

Mr. McMASTER: Did the minister set forth the purpose of this Bill on the first reading? I do not remember his having done so.

Mr. BUREAU: Even so, we are entitled to further information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At present the Interior Department embraces a Water-Powers Branch, which has for some years been engaged in the administration of water-powers under the authority of section 35 of the Dominion Lands Act. That section is for administrative purposes, brief and inadequate. Other countries administering water-powers have been driven to the enactment of comprehensive basic legislation. We are following their example by this Bill. The terms of the measure are easily discernible by its perusal, because it consists in no sense of amendments; it is complete in itself. The Bill simply declares what the property of the Dominion is, and what the authority of this Government in relation to that property shall be, as regards water-powers and everything incidental to water-powers, and determines the principle upon which those water-powers shall be administered.

Mr. MURPHY: The definition of "water-powers" in this section suggests that the control of the administration of water-powers may be under some other branch or department of the Government than the Interior Department. Is that the fact, or is it intended that all water-powers in respect of which this Government may exercise jurisdiction will be under the department presided over by the hon. Minister of the Interior?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are all under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BUREAU: Could the minister give us a concrete instance of "water-powers" which are the property of Canada, and which have been or may be placed under the control and management of the Minister of the Interior? The definition is:

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

"Dominion water-powers" means any water powers on lands of the Dominion, or any other water-powers, etc.

Is there an instance of any other water-power coming under the control of the Minister of the Interior?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reason for the insertion of that phrase is this: If possible the Federal Government may at some time, obtain jurisdiction over waters where it does not own the bed of the stream—that is the land underneath. It is further conceivable that the bed of the stream may have been parted with, reserving the rights in the stream itself. That is to say the Government may have parted with the bed, or surface rights, and not have parted with the jurisdiction of the stream itself, in which event the water-powers would still be ours.

Mr. BUREAU: That seems a queer condition of things. What purpose could be served by any one getting the bed of the river itself unless they might acquire servitude, or some such right, for the purpose of erecting a public dock or pier, or running a pipe underneath the stream? I do not see that this is a case where that is liable to happen, and I would like the minister to instance a case where a Government, or any individual, parts with the bed of a river and reserves the right to the water. As far as navigable rivers are concerned, we know exactly where we stand in this country as to the ownership of the bed of those rivers and the control of the flow of water.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Supposing, for example, a company, or a person acquired the bed of a stream for the purpose of taking out sand or gravel, or exercising quarrying rights; those rights would be quite valuable without the rights to the stream itself. I am not aware of any instance where that has been done, but the draughtsman who prepared the Bill believed it was quite possible, in which event the jurisdiction and ownership of the power rights in the stream would still be vested in the Dominion. It has been the practice for some time to exclude the bed and shore of waters or streams from ordinary land grants, but there might be land grants where the bed and shore were not excluded but the stream itself was.

Mr. BUREAU: Would the term "water-power" include streams and everything of the kind where no power could be generated? I do not know the conditions in certain provinces, but where the water-powers on any rivers are exploited I do not think

it would be to the advantage of any man to lease the bed of the river to get sand or gravel which might be under the rapids or falls.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The grant might be made over an extended area and there might be a fall in that area. The water-power must be of commercial possibility.

Mr. BUREAU: That explanation would not cover the present case, because water-power is described here in this way:—

(g) "Water-power" shall include any force or energy of whatever form or nature contained in or capable of being produced or generated from any flowing or falling water in such quantity as to make it of commercial value.

It is very improbable that any man who is going to lease or buy the bed of a river for the purpose of getting gravel or sand would do it where there were rapids. Take these words:—

or any other water-powers which are the property of Canada and which have been or may be placed under the control and management of the Minister of the Interior;

How can these water-powers be placed under the control or management of the minister? If the Government buy them, all right. We know that anything purchased by the Dominion of Canada is the property of the Dominion—except the Canadian National railway! I do not see how we become owners unless there be a specific case, and I would ask the minister to explain why these words are inserted?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not arguing that this is of vital consequence, because I do not think there are likely to be many, if, indeed, there are any. But it cannot do any harm, because the power must be ours or the definition will not cover it. In the Yukon, ownership of the bed might be given for mining purposes, but not ownership of the stream rights; that is quite possible. The instance that I gave before of grants of land for the purpose of taking out sand and gravel might be over an extended area on much of which there would be no water-power at all. I know, for example, of grants made for that purpose in Ontario, but I do not recall one for the moment in the provinces where we own the water-powers.

Mr. F. CAHILL: Has the Government now any water-powers except those acquired from private individuals or the provinces? For instance, I understand the water-powers of the eastern provinces are the property of the provinces, that is, they own the land. How do you acquire these powers, or what powers have you in mind? Take the case of Dominion ownership of land in Saskatchewan on the Saskatchewan river where power would be developed, would that give you ownership of the power at that point?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not need to have them given to us, we have them now. All water-powers of the three Prairie Provinces are the property of the Dominion; they are included in the term "natural resources," and they are administered now under the Dominion water-powers management and have been for many years. Also the water-powers in the railway belt are our property, but by virtue of two statutes the right of administration of these powers was ceded to the province of British Columbia, for the reason that the strip of land was narrow and the streams frequently ran in the delta owned by the Dominion as well as in land in the provincial jurisdiction. So an arrangement had to be arrived at.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This Act does not apply then to the eastern provinces at all? In what case would it apply to the province of Nova Scotia, for instance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act has no substantial application to the eastern provinces. I purpose adding a clause which will form the statutory authority and basis for the work we are now doing in reference to water-powers in the eastern provinces—work that we only can do by agreement with the provincial governments. That is really the only clause that has much interest for the eastern provinces.

Mr. ROBB: The Dominion has water-powers on every canal throughout Canada. These water-powers are under the Department of Railways and Canals, some of them being leased on the basis of ninety-nine years, and others on the basis of twenty-one years, with right of renewal. If I understand this Act aright, the minister will have power to take over all these water-powers from the Department of Railways and Canals, and then they will be administered under this Act. Is that correct?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; in fact that could be done to-day without this Act at all. Any administrative responsibility of a department may be taken over by another department. But it is not the intention to transfer the administration of canal water-powers to the Interior Department; that has never even been considered.

Mr. BUREAU: Water-powers generated by the construction of canals which are now

under the control or jurisdiction of the Department of Railways and Canals are Dominion water-powers under this Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think so.

Mr. BUREAU: How are they classified?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because they are not under the control and management of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. BUREAU: Unless we decide that water-powers generated as the result of constructing a canal are not water-powers under this Act, an exception ought to be made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the hon. gentleman has read the definition clearly. They are not Dominion water-powers under the definition of this Act until they are vested in the Minister of the Interior. So this definition does not include any water-power on a canal.

Mr. BUREAU: Then the water-powers will not be under the same department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; they are not now. This makes no change.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the object of the Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The object of the Act is mainly to establish the principles of statutory authority for the administration of such water-powers as are on Dominion lands, or any other water-powers the administration of which may hereafter be vested in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BUREAU: Has not the Interior Department at the present time authority to administer all those water-powers which are on Dominion lands?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has under section 35 of the Dominion Lands Act, which section has in many respects proved inadequate for the proper administration of these powers. For instance, section 35 does not enable the Department of the Interior or the Government at all to exercise any control over the appurtenances to water-power, over the transmission of the power developed, over the provision of dams, the securing of land necessary, and all such requisites. The very purpose of this Act is to provide for a more complete utilization of Dominion water-powers.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that the powers of the Department of the Interior as defined by section 35 do not go far enough to permit the acquiring of these

[Mr. Bureau.]

lands or the development of these powers by that department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They do not.

Mr. BUREAU: What about the general Expropriation Act, which vests power in the Government to acquire lands necessary for the carrying out of any public work?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Even if the Dominion does assume the business management of a water-power development, the clauses of the Expropriation Act are not adequate for the purpose. But it is not worth arguing whether they are or not, because the powers of the Expropriation Act do not apply where the Dominion does not expropriate, but leases the power subject to certain conditions, and the expropriation right is required by the lessee. These are some of the restraints under which water-power administration has laboured; we require that these restraints be removed. We simply desire the establishment of an adequate statutory basis upon which the administration may proceed.

Mr. BUREAU: This Act allows the Dominion Government to do what any private company may do, lease or develop water-power, and have all the rights inherent thereto. Is there a provision in this Act that will vest in the lessee from the Government power to expropriate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. Of course, he cannot do so under the Expropriation Act, because he is a private person and must go before the ordinary courts. But he may set expropriation proceedings in motion under the Railway Act, with the authority of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: There is provision for that here?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: What department of the Government controls the waters along the rapids of St. Lawrence and at the foot of lake Ontario, where there are vast water-powers?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not sure that I can give a very satisfactory answer to that question. The Department of the Interior, as a department, has no administrative responsibility in the St. Lawrence river. If works were to be constructed, then it would be determined whether they were under the Public Works Department or under the Department of Railways and Canals. But as regards the power features

of these works, which are inextricably linked up with the navigation features, the Dominion Power Board, of which I am chairman, is constituted for the purpose of advising the Government in relation to water-power development.

Mr. ROBB: Will the Department of the Interior have any administrative responsibility in regard to power on the St. Lawrence river after the passing of this Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. MURPHY: The doubt my hon. friend expressed seems to relate only as to which department of the Dominion Government these powers along the St. Lawrence are under. The doubt does not extend, I take it, to the question whether the jurisdiction is of the Dominion or of the provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not touch that point at all. The Dominion is concerned inasmuch as the stream is an international stream, and any arrangements that would require to be made of an international character would necessarily have to be made by the Dominion. That is one subject. As to the question whether the powers so developed should belong to the province or to the Dominion, I made no statement.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Suppose the stream was not an international stream. It is contended by some that the ebb and flow of the tide in the bay of Fundy twice a day constitutes a very important water-power. The bay of Fundy, of course, is a navigable water. Has the Dominion Government power to regulate that water-power or to give to any person the right to develop it, or would an applicant for such right have to go to the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question which the hon. member raises has no reference to the present Bill, which deals with water-powers on lands owned by the Dominion. The Dominion's interest in respect of, say, the bay of Fundy or the St. Lawrence river arises primarily from its jurisdiction, its sole responsibility, in connection with navigation. But any improvements looking to navigation in a river or a bay where water-powers are developed is necessarily mixed up with water-power development; consequently the Dominion cannot keep out. That is the primary source of interest we have in the whole thing. As to whom the power should belong to, the province or the Dominion, that is a subject that I think the Committee should not now be led into.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That is the question I want answered.

Mr. BUREAU: I want to be quite clear about this definition. Two things are required, first that the water-powers be on Dominion lands; second, that they be under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Water-powers owned by the Dominion under other conditions than these would not be considered as Dominion water-powers?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. ROBB: In section 3 I notice that an exception is made of British Columbia. Why is that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: On account of the Dominion Railway Belt Water Acts of 1912 and 1913, which divest the Dominion of its authority to administer the water-powers of the railway belt and places that administration under provincial authority.

Mr. ROBB: The Fraser river would come in there?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: Are there any developed water-powers which come under this Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes, we have very large developments in Western Canada that will be directly under this Act. All the water-powers, for example, that supply Winnipeg city with power. The Grand du Bonnet power in the Winnipeg river is now being developed. About 100,000 horse-power is now developed there, and about 400,000 horse-power is still to be developed.

Mr. CAHILL: Those water-powers are still vested in the Dominion Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—application of Act:

Mr. BUREAU: What is the particular reason for excepting British Columbia from the operation of this measure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the British Columbia Government administer the water-powers on the railway belt, as well as the other water-powers of that province. They do so under authority of this Parliament vested in them by the statutes named in the section.

Mr. BUREAU: Is there any definition of the word "lands"? Would that comprise the bed of any river which would be required and which, as explained just now by the minister, had been leased or disposed of ?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the Bill covers all previous grants of water-powers as well

as any grant since the passing of the statutes mentioned in the section.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—title to water-powers in Crown:

Mr. CAHILL: Why is this declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In order to establish Dominion jurisdiction without question. That is to say, there is no doubt at all that jurisdiction in the Dominion is complete so far as our ownership goes, but by declaring that an undertaking that now is or may be formed to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, our jurisdiction is extended to anything within the definition of the word "undertaking," and consequently our control is extended also.

Mr. CAHILL: What purpose can be served? Is it for the development and distribution in towns or for the transmission of power?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only way in which water-powers may be usefully and properly administered is by the administering body having jurisdiction ample enough to extend not only over the power itself, but over everything connected with that power development and the transmission and distribution that follow. You cannot sever jurisdiction and at the same time have adequate and successful administration of the power. I do not think it would be asked on the part of the province that the jurisdiction should be so severed. If the administration of the power itself, the mere waterfall, the mere energy that the waterfall develops, is to be under one Government and everything else under another, successful administration is impossible. The purpose of this section, and, in fact, of the whole Bill—and this is merely in harmony with the rest of the Bill—is to extend the jurisdiction of the Dominion in order to enable it adequately to administer the power itself. The word "undertaking," as defined in section 2, is made a work for the general advantage of Canada, thereby extending the jurisdiction of the Dominion to the full extent of that definition.

Mr. CAHILL: If the Government disposed of power under this, would the power carry the same character as if it were developed by the Government itself?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the Government disposes of power it does so in accordance with this measure; it does not do so by granting a fee simple; it does so by lease, subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed. The terms and conditions necessarily have to do with the distribution of the power developed, that is to say, with the undertaking. This section establishes our jurisdiction to make those terms and conditions.

4 p.m.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not know that I made my question clear. At least I do not understand the answer. Supposing the Government disposes of one of these powers or leases it for, say, ninety-nine years, or whatever the term may be, would the company acquiring the power be declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The company would not be, but the works would.

Mr. CAHILL: The company would control the works that were declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister mentioned the distribution. Would this give such a company the right to distribute power without the consent of municipalities? It certainly gives them the right to go through municipalities with transmission lines.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This would not give them any rights except the lease itself. They would have any rights of water-powers vested in them by the lease. In fact, I do not think any right of distribution would be given at all. Conditions of distribution would be imposed, and no rights that I can conceive of now would be granted.

Mr. BUREAU: In the interpretation clause, I do not see any definition of the term "water-power", except that the term "Dominion water-power" is defined. Section 4 says:

> The property in and the right to the use of all water-power is hereby declared—

And so on. Would it not be better to insert the word "Dominion" before the word "water-power?" The term "all water-power" is pretty broad.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might be just as well. After all, the intention was that water-powers would be limited by clause 3, which defines what the Bill applies to, and that clearly says that it applies to Dominion water-powers. I would agree that the word "Dominion" should be inserted.

Mr. BUREAU: I move that in section 4 the words "water-power is" at the end of the first line be struck out, and the words

"Dominion water-powers are," be substituted therefor, and that the word "power" in the fourth line be changed to "powers."

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 5—essential lands also remain Crown property.

Mr. BUREAU: That would cover the bed of a river, I suppose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes. I beg to move that the words "right of entry" be inserted in line 25 after the word "permit."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: Does the minister think that the Dominion has control over the beds of streams that are not navigable?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Only in the three Prairie Provinces. My statement did not refer to any other province.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 6—expropriation of private lands where required by the Crown.

Mr. PARENT: Does the minister think this would cover non-navigable streams?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. If it happened that part of the bed of a river of a non-navigable stream was required for a Dominion water-power development, it could be expropriated.

Mr. PARENT: It would apply also, I presume, in the case of a water-power owned by a private individual. There is a law in the province of Quebec which gives about the same rights as this section would.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Dominion could acquire such bed of a river under this section.

Mr. BUREAU: Not in Quebec.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no, because we have no Dominion water-power there. I beg to move that the word "or" at the beginning of line 44 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 7—taking of private lands by applicants or licensees:

Mr. BUREAU: This is the section I was asking the minister about just now. It provides that any person who is authorized by the minister shall have the power to expropriate. Now I think that is a pretty broad provision. Generally speaking, powers of expropriation are granted by the legislative body. The power to expropriate is limited very strictly. When the minister authorizes a man to take another man's property against his will for the benefit of a private individual he is delegating a power which I think should rest alone with the legislative body. The power of expropriation is used only in case of public utilities, on the principle that the public good prevails over the individual good but under this section it is a case of the individual against the individual. Some person may acquire from the minister a water-power for the purpose of his farm, and he may want to back up the water. Under this section, upon the authority of the minister alone, he may go to his neighbour and say: "I cannot agree with you as to price, so I am going to expropriate your land which is required for the development of my water-power, which is useful to me alone." I think that is against the law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The whole theory of this Act is that water-powers are essentially and increasingly a public utility. All water-power developments of business organizations developing and transmitting water-power are more and more public utilities. Consequently, the power of expropriation, under the very principle which my hon. friend has enunciated, is necessarily vested with the Government. We do nothing more here than is done under the Government. We do nothing more here than is done under the Irrigation Act. Under that Act the very same authority to expropriate under similar circumstances is vested, and the same with the Railway Act. It would never do to require every company that is developing a water-power to come back to Parliament when it wanted to expropriate a few acres that might be needed in connection with the development of its water-power. Water-power development is necessarily, in a sense, local—not like a railway which runs over a considerable length of line—and in connection with its development only a very small acreage may have to be expropriated.

They may expropriate if the minister is convinced that it is a proper case for expropriation; that is to say, if upon the advice of his water-power authorities it is shown to him that the land is required in connection with that public utility, then the clauses that Parliament has passed will be invoked, but only then. Surely that is a sufficient safeguard. I would be quite willing to have "Governor in Council" substituted for minister, and it would be along the same line as the preceding

clause which authorizes the Governor in Council to expropriate lands in a proper case where the development is a public undertaking. In this case it is a private undertaking under lease from the Crown, and we say that it being a public utility, if it is shown that certain land must be acquired to make that utility useful and effective, then the power to expropriate is granted.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think it would improve matters to make it "Governor in Council." If you intend to assume the control of water-powers, to lease them and have them developed, it is a very easy matter for this Parliament to pass a law defining in what cases power of expropriation shall exist. We have a law in Quebec whereby any private individual, provided he can develop so many horse-power, can expropriate, but there is a limit, and it cannot be confined to a private individual for his own purposes. It would be fair and more within the rights of expropriation of eminent domain if there were a general law applicable to every man, and if the powers were graded. There are certain powers that cannot be public utilities owing to the very small amount of horse-power that can be developed, and they can be used only for limited purposes. Let us have a general law grading these powers and it would prevent the cession by Parliament of what I think is its most sacred prerogative and duty, the protection of private rights, not leaving either in the minister or in the Governor in Council the power to give any individual the right to go over the land of his neighbour and take it from him.

Mr. BUTTS: I agree with the hon. member for Three Rivers that the granting of powers of expropriation is not always sufficiently considered by Parliament. I happen to have sat in the legislature of Nova Scotia for a number of years, and one of the things I continually railed against was the power of expropriation given by the Nova Scotia Government to the Dominion Coal Company. I always contended that where the public welfare was being served, the Government might well and legitimately grant powers of expropriation. But they went so far at one time down there as to grant the Dominion Coal Company the power of expropriating for the building of their own houses to accommodate their workmen. This, to the average man, would appear to be a very extreme measure, and I therefore suggest to the minister that he should be somewhat more cautious in the matter of expropriation. It is a dangerous undertaking that may work injustice in many cases. I am of the opinion that this section is a little bit extreme in that it gives almost absolute power of expropriation and very nearly takes away the right of private ownership of property. We cannot always ignore the rights of a private individual to his ownership of his own land. I have not considered the section with sufficient care to offer an amendment, but I think it is rather loosely drafted and perhaps the minister might reconsider it and make it more in keeping with the views that have been expressed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In 1897, not so very long ago, Parliament enacted the following legislation with regard to irrigation companies:

> Lands required for the works of any applicant, as shown by the maps and plans filed, in whomsoever they are vested, whether in the Crown or in any other applicant or licensee, or in any railway company, or in any other person whomsoever or in any interest in or right or privilege with regard to such land which is so required, may be taken and acquired by such first mentioned licensee; and to this end all the provisions of the Railway Act which and so far as they are applicable to such taking and acquisition, shall apply as if they were included in this Act.

The rest of it is the same as the wording here. That was re-enacted again in 1906 and is the law to-day. Now, this is a public utility; it must be essentially so. It may be only in a small way and it may be in a large way; but if in a small way, surely we are not going to require the expense of coming to Parliament for a special Bill. That much ought surely to be trusted to administration. That is the whole principle upon which the administration of legislation operates. The power is not granted absolutely, as the hon. member for Cape Breton seems to fear. There is no absolute provision here. The minister must be convinced—I am ready to have it made the Governor in Council—on representations of his water-power authorities that the land is required for the development of that water-power. If so, then they have to acquire it and pay for it under the provisions that are laid down. It seems to me that there can be nothing expensively cumbersome about that method.

Mr. BUREAU: I absolutely agree with the minister that it would not be fair to ask every little company to come before Parliament for expropriation powers. That is not what I contended. What can be

done without expense to the man who is going to buy water-power is to pass general legislation applying to all Dominion water-powers which could be classified without being named specifically. We could classify them by the amount of horse-power that could be developed, and limit the extent of the powers of the individual intending to develop them. The minister is the person to decide whether or not the land is required. Plans have to be filed with him, all the records will remain with him, and the owner of the land will just receive a notice under the Railway Act and then the arbitration takes place if they cannot agree upon the compensation. That is all the consideration shown the owner.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 35 of the Dominion Lands Act, passed in 1908, in this regard is just the same as the section we are enacting now, but the interposition of the minister is the check which exists. A company when it has authority may expropriate, under the law as it is to-day, and we are not asking for any more power in this case.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not a good reason that because section 35 of the Dominion Lands Act contains these powers that they should be embodied in the present Bill. To my mind it is wrong to give a man the right to take the property of his neighbour under certain conditions, and we should prevent as much as possible the delegation of any such power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have such water-power legislation now.

Mr. BUREAU: That may be, but when we find it necessary to pass a new law why not improve on the existing legislation? If the existing power is sufficient and greater than that for which the minister is now asking, I do not see the necessity for this Bill. If the minister is asking for certain powers, and we find that they ought not to be granted to him but left with Parliament, why not take that point into consideration? I do not say that every man who wants to develop water-power should come before this Parliament and ask for the right to expropriate, but it is easy for Parliament to legislate generally with respect to cases where men wish to develop water-powers and ask for the right of expropriation, and to declare in that Act that the development is intended for public and not private purposes. The expropriatory power should not be left subject to the whim of a man's neighbour because he has more money to pay for water-power development than the owner of the property who has this water on his farm or domain. That is the reason I say a general law should be passed regulating this matter, and the power which this Bill seeks to confer upon the minister or the Governor in Council should not be granted. I do not say this in disparagement of the minister; but it is a matter of principle that this power ought to remain with Parliament and not be delegated to any one, except under general legislation defining the powers that can be developed and the circumstances under which the expropriation can take place.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have not heard the whole of the discussion on this Bill, but I very largely agree with the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) and the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Butts) that it is rather too great a power to grant any private individual the right to expropriate his neighbour's property. This Bill particularly deals with Government-owned water-powers, and we cannot criticise the Government in laying down rules as to property of which it is the owner. But right alongside of that Government property there may be privately-owned property which the owner himself may need for the development of the water-power which it contains. But suppose a man who is better off than the owner, and is prepared to go on with the development at once, buys the adjacent water-power from the Government. Under this Bill he could obtain authority from the Government to take his neighbour's land and possibly for all time to deprive that neighbour of the opportunity to develop the water-power on his own land or to utilize the property for a thousand and one other reasons for which he may require it. It is quite possible for the wealthier individual to step in and under the provisions contained in the Railway Act take his neighbour's land. I think that he should be left to deal with his neighbour just as would be the case if a person wanted to build a store on his own property and required some adjoining land for the purpose of keeping a cattle yard, or for some other reason in connection with the running of his store. In such a case as that the man contemplating the purchase must deal with his neighbour and buy the land in the ordinary way. Nobody would think of giving a man who wished to build a warehouse the right to go and expropriate his neighbour's land. He would be told at once "Make your bargain in the ordinary way, and if you cannot get the property you will

have to go without. The fact of your wanting to establish a stock-yard in connection with your business does not affect the public, and therefore we cannot pass over to you the power of expropriation." I cannot see very much difference between that case and the case of a man who buys a piece of property on which there is a waterfall or a creek that is strong enough to furnish hydraulic energy. I don't see why such a man should have the right to compel his neighbour to yield his property to him if he does not want to do so. I have not heard the minister advance very much argument on the point, and I would like to be convinced that there is any real necessity for any such right to be vested in a private individual. If it was a corporation that had to develop a certain amount of horse-power before their proposition would be considered by the Government at all—a corporation, for example, that were prepared to go on and develop power for the general benefit of the country, or for the benefit of a town or local industries, or something of that nature—I could understand it. As I read the section, however, it gives the right to any individual who wishes to build a saw-mill, a grist-mill, or anything of the like, for which he requires water-power entirely for the benefit of himself, to take his neighbour's land and use it for such private purpose. I cannot agree with any such proposition.

My hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Butts) has referred to the powers given to the Dominion Coal Company. Those people operate a very large coal mine under the provisions of the Coal Mines Act of Nova Scotia which permits any lands required for mining purposes to be expropriated. Well, to operate a coal mine you must have miners and you must have houses for the miners, and you can very easily persuade the Minister of Mines of the province that if you need to build houses for the accommodation of your miners you should get the necessary land. It was for such purposes as that, expropriatory powers were given to the Dominion Coal Company. Now, the running of coal mines, or like operations, is in the public interest, and everything should be done to encourage the enterprise and help it along. But that is entirely different from undertakings of a purely private character, and for the reasons I have given I think the minister should not be too ready to grant rights of the kind to a private individual.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not able to comprehend the argument, still less the distinction, raised by the leader of the Opposition. He seems to think that it is right and proper to grant to a large corporation engaged in developing coal mines the expropriatory powers necessary to that development, but entirely wrong to grant them to an individual, say, or a small corporation, desiring to utilize a water power. In my judgment, one is exactly on the same ground as the other. I am finding no fault with the Nova Scotia legislation, although I hope that legislation does not vest the power absolutely in the coal mine owners, but maintains governmental control. If it does, then it seems to me it is justified, and this legislation rests on the very same, if not, indeed, on a higher ground. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) says that in the case of a public utility the expropriatory power is all right; but that with respect to a private property the expropriatory power, even although governmentally controlled, is all wrong.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member does not want to misrepresent me? I say that the delegation of the expropriatory powers is all wrong, whether for use by a corporation or by an individual. I think we ought to have uniform legislation granting to people who come within this legislation the right to expropriate under certain conditions to be enumerated in the statute.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very true. I think the class who would come within it would be public utility users. If not, I do not know what distinction my hon. friend would draw when he is making his classes.

Mr. BUREAU: I object to the power being delegated from this Parliament to the minister to give to any individual or corporation the right to expropriate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Our legislation for the last forty or fifty years gives that power.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not make it any the better.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Parliament could not carry out its duties if it had to pass an Act for every expropriation that might be required.

Mr. BUREAU: That is misrepresenting my point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what point my hon. friend is raising then.

Mr. BUREAU: I will get for the minister our Quebec statute so that he may read it.

That gives to all individuals who come within its provisions the right to develop water-power with the right to expropriate. They do not ask for a separate commission; they classify the water-powers wherein this right of expropriation can be taken advantage of. I am contending that we should pass a general law enacting that when a corporation or an individual comes within certain conditions therein specified, such corporation or individual shall have the right to exercise expropriation powers. I do not know if I have made myself clear. It would be a general law covering expropriation powers, and defining in what cases the expropriatory right can be used, whether by an individual or by a corporation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It only shows that I have understood my hon. friend all along. The Quebec Act defines in what cases expropriation can be used. What is the class of cases? The first class of cases is where development is for public utility purposes, If not, what is the general characteristic of the class? There is no other I ever heard of or that the hon. member suggests. We say here that wherever it is shown to be to the public advantage that the expropriatory power should be exercised it can be exercised; that is all. That is really the Quebec legislation. My hon. friend from Cape Breton says it is all right if a corporation, it is all wrong if an individual. Take the Grand Rapids river in Manitoba, where there is tremendous water-power. A company has a lease of that power and purposes a large development. There is an area of land below the falls which will be flooded if further development of that power takes place, and consequently that area must be expropriated. It is private property. It is quite true that the company are not there for the good of their health or the good of the community; they are there to make money. But is the community to be advantaged by enabling the owner of a little swamp land below the falls to deny the development of the whole water-power in the Grand Rapids river?

Mr. McKENZIE: Buy his land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very good. He says: "I want a million dollars an acre." What are you going to do?

Mr. McKENZIE: Arbitrate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Suppose he says: "I will not arbitrate."

Mr. BUREAU: Let him come under the law instead of under the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Suppose he will not arbitrate?

Mr. McKENZIE: If I was satisfied he had been offered a fair amount of money for his property and would not accept arbitration, then I would be willing that some extreme measures should be taken. That power should be held in reserve for cases of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly the Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no reservation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, this is exactly the Act. I have made a convert of the hon. member. The Act forbids expropriation to be exercised by any company or individual until the facts are laid before the minister and he approves of the expropriation. That can be changed to the Governor in Council if the hon. member desires. But no one would suggest that you should come to Parliament because somebody up on the flats of the Grand Rapids river refuses to accept the value of his land or to arbitrate.

Mr. BUREAU: No one suggests that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what it amounts to if my hon. friend sticks by his argument.

Mr. BUREAU: My argument is that the right of expropriation should not be determined by the minister or the Governor in Council, but should be defined by law. That is the whole thing in a nut shell. My hon. friend need not cloud the issue. You ought to have a separate Act specifying in what cases the right of expropriation can be exercised and under what powers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what cases should it be exercised, and in what cases should it not be exercised?

Mr. BUREAU: I can tell the hon. gentleman after he makes his surveys, and so on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On what principle?

Mr. BUREAU: That every man should have the same rights under the law, instead of having to go to the minister to get his rights.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What characteristic class can expropriate and what class cannot?

Mr. BUREAU: The volume of power they can develop and the use to which it may be put. If for waterworks or something of public advantage for a municipality, or for the development of an enterprise of any kind, well and good; but if you are going to let a man develop sixteen, eighteen or twenty horse-power for his own purpose, I

say that should not be allowed. I would make a classification of that kind to show what the minister may do under his regime. That man, I should judge, should not be entitled to go to work and for his own personal use be able to expropriate his neighbour's property. It depends on the conditions where the water-powers are located. That can be classified easily; we do it in Quebec. We go to the courts, and I think that is preferable to the Minister of the Interior or the Governor in Council, for the courts after hearing the evidence are in a much better condition to give a satisfactory decision.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The classification the hon. member gives is by the amount of development of water-power or by the use to be made of it. If for distribution for public utility purposes, then he would allow expropriation. There might be only a hundred horse-power developed, but certainly it is in the public interest to develop it. Is 100 horse-power to lie forever unused merely because of the obstinacy of a single individual, and are we to sit by helpless? You cannot classify these matters in the way the hon. member suggests. However small the horse-power may be, it may be distinctly in the public interest to have it developed, rather than allow it to lie dormant merely owing to the obstinacy of an individual landowner. The power may be exercised harshly, but that must be left to the Governor in Council, because you cannot isolate every individual case and determine whether expropriation should be exercised there or not until you have the facts before you. So I submit to the hon. member that the Bill is most convenient and most useful and safest in its present form.

Mr. BUREAU: It is no use arguing the point any longer, but that is just what I deny; it is unfair.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—cancellation of entries, leases, etc., in certain cases.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are these provisions in section 8 subject to the Railway Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where the expropriation is by the Crown, it is under the Expropriation Act; otherwise it is under the Railway Act.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—joint development of two or more water-powers:

Mr. ROBB: What is the explanation of this clause?

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The basic idea of clause 9 is to secure the best use that can be made of falls that are close together. We should be able to make our regulations so that adjoining falls may be developed together, because that is the most economical method and requires a smaller capital investment. For example, the reservoir for the one may serve the other. On the Ottawa river we have no jurisdiction with regard to powers, and there is one province on one side of the river and another on the other, each with different regulations. By reason of these two conditions there is a very uneconomical power development. A large amount of capital has been invested by separate companies developing powers closely adjoining, whereas the proper and sound development would be a unified one, with one large plant producing power at much less capital cost and, consequently, at less cost to the consumer.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—surveys, measurements, etc.:

Mr. McKENZIE: Are there any records or reports showing the water-powers in Canada that are owned by the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, we are rather proud of the progress that has been made in our water-power inventory. At a recent conference in Great Britain held under the auspices of the British Government, a survey was made of the potential and developed water-powers in all portions of the Empire—and, indeed, in other countries—of the progress made in inventoring water-powers and securing data of the requirements for their development and use, of the various mineral and other resources in the neighbourhood, etc., and it was freely acknowledged that we had made more progress than any other part of the British Empire, and that our information was in much better and more available form.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the department any policy in regard to the selling of water-powers?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not sell water-powers, nor shall we have authority to sell them under this Bill. They are leased, and as yet they are not leased with the primary object of obtaining revenue. The aim of the Government is to secure the cheapest possible distribution of power. Fifty cents a horse-power of developed power is what is charged now. For a time at all events it is probable that the principle of charging nominal rental will prevail. We maintain control of the enterprise from the beginning.

Mr. McKENZIE: What provision is there against a man getting a water-power and holding it idle and undeveloped?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The regulations now deal with cases of that kind, so far as our regulatory power extends—and that regulatory power will be more ample under this Bill. But at the present time any one leasing water-powers has to develop according to the conditions of his lease. He must in the first year expend so much and in the second year so much. He must have so much power up to a certain time and he must sell that power in accordance with the regulations.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have in Sydney what is known as a Utilities Board, a body which regulates the price of water-power or of anything that is a public utility, and to which application may be made for adjustment of complaints or disputes as to charges, and so on. If the water-power owned by the Dominion were developed in a province, would the industry or institution agreeing to sell that power be subject to the regulations of the Utilities Board of that province?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That question is a very important one and will be before the Committee shortly when section 10, sub-clause (m) is under consideration. I am disposed to the opinion that as it is the development of a Dominion property, the Dominion has full jurisdiction in relation to everything incidental to that development and that any regulations we made as to rates, and so on, would be valid. We assume their validity by this clause (m) of section 10 and propose to act upon it. But that section also contains power to devolve that authority upon any provincial utilities commission or other body provincially appointed. They can exercise the authority which originally is ours if it is convenient that they should—and in my judgment it would very probably be convenient.

Mr. ROBB: How much power has been leased at the price of fifty cents per horsepower of developed power?

Mr. MEIGHEN: About 100,000 horsepower. I desire to move that sub-clause (b) of section 10 be amended by striking out the word "developed" in line 35, and by adding the following as sub-section 4:

The Minister may enter into co-operative agreements with the authorities of any of the provinces for the making of steam measurements, the carrying on of investigations and the collection and publication of data respecting water and power resources and the best method of utilizing the same.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 11—director of water-power:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to amend clause 11 by striking out the words "a duly qualified engineer," in lines 31 and 32, and replacing the said words by the words "an officer."

Mr. ROBB: I do not think the minister is improving the Bill very much. He is now asking for permission that will enable him to appoint a barber, for example, to do the work of an engineer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like what might be called professional legislation. I do not like legislating into any body of men the right to say: We alone can be
5 p.m appointed to a certain office. It is obvious that an engineer should be appointed to this office. It is an engineer, and a very capable one, that holds this post now, but I do not like the principle of engineers being allowed to say to the Government: You have not power to appoint anybody but us and now do the best you can.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think we should leave everything in except the word "engineer." If the minister says "a duly qualified officer," I should not have so much objection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I agree to that.

Mr. McMASTER: I suppose all Government appointees are presumed to be duly qualified for the positions to which they are appointed.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope I have made no mistake. This work is the work of an engineer, and I think the term "a duly qualified officer" means that he must be qualified for doing work of that character.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move to replace the word "engineer," in line 32, by the word "officer," so that the clause will now read:

All investigations and surveys and all undertakings shall, subject to the control of the minister, and for the purposes of this Act, be under the direction of a duly qualified officer to be designated the "Director of Water-Power."

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 12—powers of Governor in Council:

Mr. ROBB: I was wondering whether there was anything the minister had forgotten in this clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope not.

Mr. McMASTER: As this is a very wide reaching clause, it might be well to go over it paragraph by paragraph.

On section 12—paragraph (b):

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister mean to go over private lands?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is one of the purposes of this Bill. We have to go over private lands or our water-powers can not be used.

Mr. McKENZIE: I thought that the expropriatory power with which we were dealing in clause 7 was the safeguard against any impediment of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That clause provides the condition upon which we go on private land and use it, but this is the power to go on it and take it. The regulations will say what may be done with private lands, but if anything is done, it must be done by expropriation. That is, there must be compensation.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would not the Expropriation Act provide the procedure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It provides the procedure for expropriation, but this says that the regulations we make shall cover this subject. That is, when we are making our regulations as to the development, transmission, distribution, sale, exchange, disposal or use of water-power, those regulations may contemplate development, transmission, distribution, sale, exchange, disposal and use over private lands, but if, for the sake of carrying out the regulations, we have to have private lands then, of course, the expropriatory clause applies.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister says that this does not give him any greater power over private lands than what is contemplated by clause 7.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. McMASTER: Let me suggest a verbal change which I think will make the clause clearer. I move that the words "of water-power" be struck out at the end of the paragraph and inserted after the word "use" in the second line of the paragraph. The paragraph would then read:

For the development, transmission, distribution, sale, exchange, disposal or use of water-power through or over lands of the Dominion or any other lands.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is better. I accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

On paragraph (h):

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move to amend paragraph (h) by adding after the word "dividing" in line 26 the words "and collecting."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McMASTER: I notice something that strikes me as awkward drafting in so much of the legislation that is brought down and that is putting in part of the predicate at the commencement, then some adverbs or adverbial phrases, such as "from time to time," and then finishing the predicate. For instance, paragraph (h) reads "for the purchase or taking over of works already constructed, and for the dividing from time to time of the cost of constructing, etc." It would be better to say "for the purchase or taking over of works already constructed, and for the dividing of the cost of constructing from time to time, etc." I have noticed that several times, and I think the draftsman's attention should be called to it. I do not wish to delay the Committee by moving an amendment now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it might be better if it came after the word "operating." I beg to move that the words "from time to time" be struck out of lines 26 and 27 and inserted after the word "operating" in line 28.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph as amended agreed to.

Mr. NESBITT: Reverting to paragraph (b) is there any danger of our interfering with municipal rights?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The Dominion has power to legislate with regard to its own property, including all the use that can be made of it, and embodied within that power is the power to legislate upon everything incidental to the use of its own property. Of that there can be no dispute, even though it may involve the passing over of private lands.

Mr. NESBITT: Why the "development, transmission and distribution?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the property that is being developed is our own in fee simple in right of the Dominion. If it were not for that, we would not have the jurisdiction.

Mr. BUREAU: I notice that this is not restricted to Dominion lands. It says "over lands of the Dominion or any other lands."

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the development of our water-power we may require other lands, and inasmuch as the water-power is ours we have the right to legislate in regard to anything incidental to its development.

Mr. McKENZIE: Coming back to the point of law my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) has raised, I wish to be sure that I clearly understand the minister. That incidental power is conferred upon the Dominion Government in connection with the use or development of any public utilities—public works, for instance. But if the Government should go privately into the development of water-power exclusively for its own use, I question very much if it would have the right of passing over private lands just as if it was a case of building a railway. In the provinces, if a railway runs along a mile or ten miles of the public road, we have the power to build another post road alongside to take its place, because that is incidental to the building of the railway, but I am not so clear that the Dominion Government could exercise this power if it chose to go into the development of water-power exclusively for its own use.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I quite apprehend the difference. Perhaps it is this: If the Dominion owns a water-power and is developing it as a public undertaking, then the power to do anything incidental to its development is clearly vested in us.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But if instead of developing it as a public undertaking, we lease it to a pulp-mill, for instance, my hon. friend contends that we cannot grant that pulp-mill the necessary incidental powers which will enable it to use the waterfall. If that is my hon. friend's doubt, I cannot agree with him. I think the Dominion has power to make whatever use it desires of its own resources, either by itself directly or through the agency of the lessee.

Mr. McKENZIE: Certainly, the Government can exercise its incidental powers when it is a case of the greatest good for the greatest number, but I am not at all so clear as to the Government's right when it is a case of developing a saw-mill for private purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) has raised a question with regard to paragraph (b). Section 12, condensed, will read as follows:

> The Governor in Council may make such orders . . . . . for the development, transmission, distribution . . . . . over lands of the Dominion or any other lands, of water-power.

What would those orders be limited to? Apparently they are not to be limited to Dominion lands, because it clearly says "any other lands."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I can make the section any clearer than it stands.

Mr. BUREAU: It is too clear. It covers everything and everywhere.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Only in so far as is requisite to the transmission of the developed power; that is incidental to the use of the power itself. If the power is not to be used entirely at the point of development it must be transmitted, and we have the power to provide for its transmission and distribution, even if in its transmission it has to pass over private lands. All of that is incidental to the use of the power, and we have jurisdiction to deal with it under the constitution. We enable the Governor in Council to pass regulations as to the transmission of the power involving the passing over private lands.

Mr. BUREAU: As it stands now, the Governor in Council could make orders for the taking over of the streets of municipalities and for putting posts upon them for transmission purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume that the Governor in Council could exercise that power tyranically, but it would never be in our interest to do so. We must assert the right that is ours. This is our property, and we must not put ourselves at the mercy of provincial legislatures. We are simply asserting our right; we have asserted it in statutes innumerable ever since Confederation. We asserted it in the Railway Act, in the Irrigation Act, in the Dominion Lands Act, ever since 1887, and this is simply another assertion of the same kind; but in the exercise of it we would endeavour to conform to the utmost extent with any provincial necessities.

Mr. BUREAU: Far from asserting our rights, I think we are abandoning them. It provides that these matters shall not be regulated by statute but by the Governor in Council. We are abandoning our rights; it is the same old story relating to the Bill which my hon. friend is laying aside to get stale or have us forget about it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If this is abandoning rights, the hon. gentleman abandoned them in 1897 and again in 1906.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister is advancing the same defence, that two wrongs make a right. When he cannot stand upright on the northwest corner of a hair he falls back on precedent, and endeavours to make us believe that he can convert two black balls into a white one. We are now in a period of reconstruction, and the Government must not forget that important fact, and if we are going to reconstruct at all, we had better proceed on sound democratic principles. Let us not abandon any of our rights. We should not encroach on private or provincial rights by reserving to individuals any arbitrary power. Let us do things as a Parliament and not delegate to the Governor in Council the rights and powers that belong to the House of Commons.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not rise to object to the clause, but I would like to know what the clause means.

Mr. ROBB: If the minister finds it necessary to regulate the passage of logs and timber, will he also require a regulation to put in fish ways in these dams? I cannot find provision for that in the Act, and it is most important.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is left to the operation of the general clause at the end.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is not this matter of fish ways provided for by the Fisheries Act? There are such regulations in the Fisheries Department, and we shall have to be careful not to enact anything that will conflict with the other statute.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it were deemed wise we might exercise the power provided in subclause (p).

for any purpose deemed necessary for giving full effect to the provisions of this Act.

I think that representations would be made to the Marine and Fisheries Department with regard to any fishery obstruction, and they might take steps in the matter.

Mr. ROBB: I have in mind a firm of mill owners who constructed a dam of cement without providing a fish way and after it was constructed the Marine Department drew their attention to this omission. It is a question whether they had the right to put in the fish way, and that right might as well be provided for at once in this clause which regulates the flow of timber.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that the Fisheries Act requires a fish way to be provided where a dam is built. Our regulations would provide that a fish way should be provided. We have the power to make such regulations under the clause I have read.

Mr. McMASTER: What would be the position in regard to the regulations made under section (k) in a possible conflict with the rules and regulations which are laid down in the province of Quebec in connection with boom companies? We have considerable legislation determining the relative rights of lumber men on slides, and there is also provision for the forming of boom companies. I would take it that on a tidal river under control of the Dominion these regulations would override the provincial law. Am I right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think not, because this Act would not apply to such a case, as evidenced by section 3. It applies only to Dominion water-powers and lands and properties used in connection therewith.

On paragraph (m):

Mr. BUREAU: I should like some explanation in regard to the controlling of bond issues, and the appointments of a special commission to regulate and control the stock and bond issues. There exists in every province, I believe, a public utilities commission which has the control of those things, and this seems to contemplate a double service or at least a duplicated authority in the regulation of these matters, which is not in the public interest. It would not promote the advancement of any public utility as much as if there were one control.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is why the word "designating" is used—"for the appointing or the designating of the board or commission." For instance, Mr. Macdonald in Manitoba is Public Utilities Commissioner and we could either appoint him, or designate the Public Utilities Commission of Manitoba as the proper authority. I do not think it would be well, whether this Act contemplates it or not, to put ourselves wholly in a position where we must appoint only the public utilities commission of the province; because it is conceivable that the commission might act arbitrarily with regard to our property. Possibly there might be a provincial development competing with it, although it is not very probable. But the intention is to appoint the Public Utilities Commission, which is in

the nature of a court of the province, as the controlling factor.

Mr. BUREAU: The case may be reversed: If this Dominion Board is competing with a private utility, it may be arbitrary in its proceedings. The objection that my hon. friend laid at the door of the provincial commission might exist in the case of a similar federal body.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we appoint a federal board it would have no jurisdiction at all over property provincially developed—property developed by, or entirely within, the province—

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —so the case could not be reversed. I think it is conceivable that a provincial commission which exercises authority over some provincial developments—for example, over street railways and other enterprises of that character—might act arbitrarily with regard to our property.

Mr. BUREAU: Hardly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is very unlikely.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the Dominion Government anticipate developing water-powers in the different provinces as a federal enterprise, or is it simply putting itself in a position under this Bill to control those rights and be able to sell them? I can see at once that if the Government, as a public ownership enterprise, is going to develop power and sell it to cities, towns, and individuals in the different provinces, a very serious situation is going to arise at once. Because if we can absolutely control this development by the Government in a province we can say that it shall be exempt from taxation. The Government can say, for example, "Any works that we construct in the province of Nova Scotia shall be free from taxation; we shall not be subject to school rates or any other rates in the province". That certainly cannot be contemplated, because when a property is built in a province it becomes ipso facto, I think, subject to the regulations of that province, so far as taxation is concerned for provincial purposes, etc. I point out to the minister that if the minister is going to develop these powers and intends to keep everything incidental to them within his own control he is bound to encounter a great deal of difficulty. If the minister is going to develop power on a large scale say, in some part of the province of Nova Scotia where the Government might own land, he might have a considerable village there consisting of men employed by the Government, having houses and requiring everything that any other village in the province would require. Now, if that village is entirely subject to the control of the Dominion Government the Provincial Parliament could not legislate in regard to it at all, and the provincial regulations in regard to assessment and all that pertains to the running of a city, town, or municipal district, would not apply. I think it should be clearly understood the moment any condition of that kind develops that community would be subject to the laws of the province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has forgotten for the moment section 3, the application section, which defines the area within which the Act shall apply. Nova Scotia water-powers would not come within it, consequently as to his province, or, indeed, any except the three Western Provinces, the point he makes could not arise.

Mr. McKENZIE: But it can arise in the West.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It can arise in the three Western Provinces. As a general matter of policy, we had not intended, and do not now intend, governmental development of these water-powers as Government undertakings. We intend to exercise control through a leasehold licensing system, but there may be specific instances where Dominion development is right and may be undertaken. For example, in Banff Park, which we own, it is indeed probable that there should be, and will be, a Dominion development to take the place of the present steam boiler that is utilized in the park. Then it is quite possible, as well, that in connection with the Winnipeg river power sites there may be a Dominion storage plant laid down—that is to say, the reservoir utilizable in connection with all the powers there may be Dominion owned; that is under consideration and may be a development of the future. So that while there may be exceptions, and very important exceptions, the general rule is to administer under private leaseholders licenses.

Mr. McMASTER: I want some further information about paragraph (m), because it seems to go very far. In saying that I do not wish to be regarded as opposing the principle of the paragraph, because I am rather favourable to it. The provision reads:

For regulating and controlling the stock and bond issues of persons establishing or conducting undertakings.

I think, first of all, the sort of undertakings should be mentioned; it must be undertakings in connection with power development.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "Undertaking" is defined in the Bill.

Mr. McMASTER: Then perhaps it is not necessary to incorporate a definition in this paragraph. However, I would ask if the Government contemplates controlling a case such as this: Suppose a company acquires a certain Dominion water-power, by license or otherwise let us say, and manufactures boots and shoes, not conducting a public utility. In that case is it contemplated that the Government should supervise the company's issues of stock and bonds?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not necessarily; I should not think so in a case such as the hon. gentleman mentioned. But suppose the company is one that desires a power on the Grand Rapids say, a tremendous power, and it is the only one in the whole district. It may be the part of wisdom on the part of the Governor in Council to take control even to the extent of supervising the stock and bond issue in order to prevent concessions, so-called, given by the Crown, being exploited on the market for merely jobbing or private purposes. That is the idea. The stigma that frequently comes back on the administration is not that the concession itself originally was improper, but that it was used for improper purposes in order to exploit the public. We desire to shield ourselves against such an occurrence as that in advance.

Mr. McMASTER: You do, however, practically take such power under this paragraph?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: If any company wishes to develop power obtained from the Dominion Government for the purpose of furnishing motive power for its industry, it may have to lay all its internal financing before the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a thing that may work both ways. My hon. friend says he wants to protect the general public from being fleeced by the issue of stocks?

Mr. MEIGHEN: And protect the department too.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. BUREAU: The department would not be affected very much; it owns the power and if the parties did not live up to the terms of their lease the department could cancel the lease and grant the privilege to somebody else. But there is another thing: We must not forget that it is within the power of the Governor in Council in such cases as these to ruin a man also. The Governor in Council might say to that man when he wants to make certain improvements that are necessary: No, this is the end of your bond issue, and we cut your credit therefore to the wall. The power to do that ought not to exist. I think the public are well able to take care of themselves. When they are fleeced they do not cry it from the housetops, but generally conceal the fact.

I think they know well enough that water-powers have been generally well developed, and they know what the possibilities are, and I think it would be hampering the proper administration of the undertaking to have such a clause as this. I understand that the Government may think they are impeccable, but, on the other hand, the public does not seem to think so. This restriction would prevent the sale of bonds at as a high a price as otherwise might be secured because there is this power of the Governor in Council to step in and regulate or handle the stock over the heads of the directors, or of the stockholders. I do not think it is wise to insert such a clause.

Mr. McMASTER: I am not opposed to the idea that the Government should retain control of valuable privileges which it disposes of to anybody; but I do see the danger which has been pointed out by the member for Three Rivers. Let us suppose that the Governor in Council were not fair in regard to the limitations placed upon the proposed issue of stock and bonds; the company would be without redress. The Government, representing the people, would be judge and jury and one of the parties to the case.

Mr. BUREAU: Safety first.

Mr. McMASTER: I would ask the minister to consider the wisdom, in such a case as I have outlined, of giving to the company which is asking for the privilege the right to appeal to the Supreme Court from the decision of the Governor in Council. I think the minister will understand what my fear is, that a company might possibly consider that the regulation was too onerous and was not giving it a fair chance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This power would be exercised mainly in the case of the establishing of undertakings. That is to say, as a part of the negotiations for the acquirement of the lease certain stipulations will be laid down. Now, the company knows it must abide by those stipulations, and if it does not want to do so it does not need to take the lease; consequently it could not complain of any hardship. It might be, though, that a company having acquired its lease, desired afterwards to change its stock issue, so as to readjust itself on a proper financial foundation, and I do not think it would be taking any chances in submitting that stock issue to the control of the Governor in Council. Without this clause that company might take its concession and get far enough away, and by exploiting the public, cause a hue and cry to be raised that the public resources were being squandered to enable friends of the Government to make a profit. We want to insure ourselves against that in advance. The mere terms upon which a stock or bond issue may be made do not involve the possibility of confiscation, or what was once called "conscription of wealth." It is merely a matter of regulation—something with regard to which, if the company's intentions are honest, it is not going to be deprived of, its legitimate rights. Otherwise, of course, there should be an appeal to the Exchequer Court. But this is not a case of that nature. It does not contemplate that the Governor in Council shall have power to wipe out the company's property at all; it merely gives power to stipulate what stock and bond issues shall be made, and the like of that. So it seems to me there is scarcely any necessity for appeal to the Exchequer Court. I would have no objection to it but for the fact that it would very probably render cumbersome and, consequently, not of much value, the power we seek here.

Mr. PARENT: The regulation does not seem to control the salaries paid to those managing the company. There might be restrictions as to the amount of securities, bonds and stocks, and at the same time enormous salaries might be paid to the officers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think we ought to regulate that. That is merely a matter of internal management. All we want to guard against is that they do not take our concession as a mere promoting enterprise.

Mr. McMASTER: I can understand that sometimes it may be a little troublesome to have an appeal, but let me draw to the attention of the Committee this fact. Some time ago a price for newsprint was set by the Governor in Council, and, whether it was well founded or not, a very strong protest was made by the pulp-mills of this country, with the result that the Government thought it wise to appoint a commissioner to sit as judge and decide whether the price limitation was just. On the one hand we want to avoid—and the minister is trying to do that, and I absolutely approve of his action—the dissipation of the public domain in private hands by exploiters who make for themselves money which should belong to the people; but at the same time I think that any safeguard should be effected in such a way that the parties will feel they have had a square deal, and if they are dissatisfied with the decision of the Minister of the Governor in Council, an appeal to the Supreme Court will convince them that they are being fairly treated.

Mr. BUREAU: We all know that railways are about the most useful public utility we now have, and in the charters of the railway companies we stipulate that they shall not bond their railways more than so much per mile. Why not insert in the leases or licenses granted by the Government that the maximum amount of bonds to be issued shall be determined per horsepower? That would regulate the thing completely. We do not meddle with the stock of railway companies, we let them issue it as they want to. As to their bonds, we limit their borrowing capacity to so much per mile. There we have a unit, as we have a unit here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think a moment's reflection will convince the hon. member that that will be impossible. For example, a company formed to develop power on the river at the Lake of the Woods would first of all perhaps develop, say, 10,000 horsepower, but the company must be organized with a view to an ultimate development of 100,000 horsepower. Now, if you are going to regulate their stock issue on the basis of power development you would have to be regulating their issues all the time, because they are developing their power from year to year.

Mr. BUREAU: Not on the developed horse-power, but on the estimated horsepower. The railways do not borrow their

money on the constructed mileage, but on the mileage specified in the charter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the company would have to make its stock issue simply on the basis of whatever potentiality there was in the river on which they were operating.

Mr. BUREAU: Not necessarily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So many circumstances might intervene that you could not possibly adopt any rule. It may depend on the purpose they are going to use it for. For example, if they are going to contribute their power for thirty or forty miles —and in the case of the Lake of the Woods Company they may very shortly be distributing electric energy up to sixty or eighty miles—then they will require a greater capitalization—

Mr. BUREAU: That would be within your power to provide for.

Mr. MEIGHEN:—than they would if they were going to use it merely for the running of a mill on their own property. You get back to the investigation of each individual case, as surrounded by its own circumstances.

Mr. BUREAU: There is provision here for surveys to determine the potentiality of the water-power and what it ought to be leased for. I suppose in the lease it is stipulated that these people shall be obliged to develop so much horse-power. That could be the basis for determining the bond or stock issue—if the power is for a mill, say so many thousand dollars per horse-power; if it is for distribution, increase the amount per horse-power, just as we regulate the issue of bonds by railways according to the difficulties of the ground they have to traverse, the number of bridges they have to build, and the cost of the land they have to acquire for a right of way. The man who takes out a lease is going to state to the Government what the power to be generated will be used for, and the Government is going to bind that man to do certain things within a certain time under penalty of forfeiture. The purpose for which the power is acquired is well-known; therefore it would be easy for the lessor to determine, according to his judgment and according to the potentiality of power and the service to be rendered, the amount of bonds that should be issued per horse-power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You cannot set in advance the value of this power. Different sites require different kinds of development, and we cannot arbitrarily fix in the Act a minimum or maximum—

Mr. BUREAU: Not in the Act, in the lease. Instead of saying "regulating and controlling," say "determining in the lease" the amount of stocks and bonds which may be issued.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we do that in the lease, then the provision stands and cannot be changed. We want to be able to change it as the development proceeds. I think the provision is all right as it is.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think so.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Has the Federal Government power to expropriate water-powers in the eastern provinces? I know it has so far as some of the western provinces are concerned, but I should like to know with regard to Ontario and the east.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it has not.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the minister intend, then, to leave this sub-clause as it is?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is better as it is. If we bind ourselves only to make the regulation in the lease as to what stock issues shall be made in each individual case, we should have to change the lease in order to enable a larger issue. I move that section 12 be amended by adding after the word "undertakings" on line 13, page 8 of the Bill, the word "and."

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was not in the House when section 4 was dealt with. This section is capable of taking away all that people may have acquired or owned by prescriptive right and have held in their possession for, say, sixty years. I do not think it should go that far. In many places throughout the country squatters have acquired certain rights by holding property a long term of years, and it would be a pity to deprive them of those rights.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I may point out that this clause was carried with a slight amendment: The word "Dominion" was added after the word "water-powers" on the first line. It applies now only to Dominion water-powers.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is what I had in mind. Certain powers and lands may belong to the Dominion so far as legal title is concerned, but persons may have acquired rights with regard to them, and to

be deprived of those rights would be a very serious matter for these people. This Act knocks everything out unless such people have a grant from the Crown.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think such people have any right to a water-power unless they have a grant from the Crown. Prescription, of course, does not run against the Crown, as the hon. member knows. It is true that the Crown recognizes squatters' rights, but it would be hard to imagine how a man could acquire squatter's rights on a water-power.

Mr. McKENZIE: Suppose a man has a mill, and that he has a race, as it is called, from the river or from a fall to his mill; and suppose he has been operating that mill for twenty, thirty or sixty years. Would it not be very serious for him if that power was cut off from his mill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not say that. We simply assert that this is our property —and it is ours whether we assert it or not. That man cannot say that he owns it. We are not taking anything from him that he owns. He is merely an interloper, a man who has assumed to use a property of the Crown without saying "by your leave." He does not get any prescriptive right. Consequently, we take no right.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister must recognize the fact that in any province in Canada sixty years' possession is absolutely good against the Crown. The term used to be twenty years, but the famous Emmerson land case from New Brunswick reversed the old law. That is the law in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and, I think, in Ontario. What is to be said after a man has had possession of such a right as I mention for sixty years if that right is to be taken away? Even if he has had possession for a shorter period, I do not think the arbitrary measures which the minister desired to take should be tolerated. If a man went away into the woods and built a mill which was of the greatest possible utility for the settlement and he owned that mill for a long time, he should be considered as improving land in the West. The rights of squatters have always been considered, and they have been paid for any improvements they have made. The same right should be extended to any man who has acquired using powers of that kind for a long time, and who has meant no harm by his action. He should not be ruined by the application of this law, but should have some consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid I must take exception with the hon. member on his law. In New Brunswick there may have been provincial, or even pre-Confederation legislation which acknowledged, even as against the Crown, a possessory title after twenty years at one time and sixty years now. But apart from statutory concession, there is no prescription as against the Crown, and there is no statutory concession in Dominion law, so that there cannot be any prescriptive right in the three provinces to which this Bill applies. Therefore, the section as it stands takes away nothing that the holder has.

Mr. McKENZIE: Even in that case, does the minister think that the Government should stand absolutely on its legal rights and take away a man's property without any consideration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This does not say that it shall be taken way. It is not his property now. It is quite true that if we found a man in possession and properly using a water-power and that he had used it for a long time, that man would have the preference as regards the leasing of that power, but all this Bill says is: We now assert that this property is ours. We do not say that we will throw the man out. It is for us to say what we shall do with the property.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the preamble carry?

Mr. BUREAU: I should like to know where the preamble is in this Bill. We do not want to carry a thing that does not exist.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill does not need any.

Mr. BUREAU: Then we do not need to carry it.

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly there is no preamble to the Bill, but in a Bill in which there is no preamble, an opportunity for discussion of the principle is always given on the enacting clause. An enacting clause is in this Bill as in all others.

Mr. BUREAU: Bourinot says that there shall be the title, the preamble, and statement of the enacting authority, so I thought I would not vote for a thing that did not exist.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the enacting clause carry?

Enacting clause agreed to.

Bill reported, and amendments concurred in.

ROYAL NORTH WEST MOUNTED POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Council): With the consent of the House, I move for leave to introduce Bill No. 116, to amend the Royal North West Mounted Police Act. It is based on the resolution passed this afternoon.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

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. 35, respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill No. 63, respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Kennedy.

Bill No. 23, respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cruise.

Bill No. 33, respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Richardson.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 92 (from the Senate), respecting the Fire Insurance Company of Canada and to authorize the use of a French equivalent of its name.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of David Jamieson.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian North.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Davies.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Millman.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Irvine Tuck.—Mr. Wallace.

Bill No. 103 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wilmot Orley Wiles.—Mr. Ball.

Bill No. 108 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary King.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 109 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Herman Depper.—Mr. Cronyn.

[The Chairman.]

Bill No. 110 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Rogers Latimer.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 112 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Pinkerton.—Mr. Mowat.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

HOUSING SCHEME—$25,000,000 LOAN.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. ROWELL AS TO POLICY OF GOVERNMENT.

Loan of $25,000,000 to provincial governments to encourage the erection of dwelling houses in congested districts throughout Canada, on the terms and conditions set forth in the Order in Council of the 3rd of December, 1918—the amount of loan to any one province not to exceed the proportion of the said $25,000,000 which the population of the said province bears to the total population of Canada, as shown by the last federal census.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL: As this proposal constitutes a very important part of the Government programme of reconstruction for this year, it is but due to the Committee and the country that I should briefly outline the proposals of the Government. The members of the Committee will recall that during the four years of the war, building operations so far at least as they related to the building of private houses, largely ceased in many cities, while in others they were very materially curtailed. So that we find ourselves at the close of the war in arrears in the normal erection of dwellings in our principal cities throughout Canada. Besides this, the war had the effect of stimulating early marriages. A large number of young men, who enlisted from the English-speaking provinces, married earlier in life than was the custom prior to the war. Not only did large numbers marry in Canada, but many thousands married in Great Britain, and they are now returning to Canada with their wives. These married soldiers, particularly those who enlisted in the larger cities and a number of our towns, are finding it exceedingly difficult if not impossible to secure homes on their return to Canada, with the result that there has been a very great demand for increased housing accommodation. We all recognize that the home is the unit of the nation, and that it is in the national interest that a man may have opportunity to rear his family in a comfortable house of his own, equipped with modern sanitary conveniences. The fact that a man owns his own home undoubtedly induces him to

take a more practical interest in the affairs of the country and thus tends to the strength and stability of our national life.

Good housing has a great deal to do with good health. It has a great deal to do with the whole character and tone of the community, and we in Canada should guard against the repetition of what has happened in so many of the cities of the Old World where slum conditions have developed with consequent deterioration in the character of the population. However, the primary reason why the Government decided to take action was the demand for increased housing accommodation due to the return of the soldiers to Canada, and that fact made it a matter that came within the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament and one in which the Government must take a very lively interest.

Another consideration was the importance of providing employment, under conditions that would really add to the national wealth and the strength of the nation, for the many men who might be thrown out of employment through the cessation of war activities. Obviously, if building operations could be stimulated on a substantial scale in many of the cities and towns of Canada, suitable employment for workingmen would thus be found at remunerative wages, which would prevent the growth of unemployment and so safeguard the national interest. For these reasons the Government decided, after the conference held with the provincial premiers who gathered in the city of Ottawa about the latter part of November last, to take action along the lines indicated in the resolution.

Before going into the resolution I should like to point out that action to secure the same object was taken by the Government of Great Britain. Action for not quite the same object, but dealing with the housing problem in another aspect, was taken by the United States. The British Government, as hon. members will recall, for many years, by its legislation and by its administrative measures, has been endeavouring to improve the housing accommodation in the United Kingdom, and one of the existing departments there has been organized with a view to providing advice and assistance to municipalities throughout Great Britain in laying out improved sites for town planning and in erecting houses along modern lines. That machinery has been utilized as the basis for the British Government's present proposal. What is contemplated is the erection of three hundred thousand houses—that is the objective, the minimum number, the British Government has in view. The British Government is not erecting these houses itself, but is loaning money to municipalities throughout the country that will embark in municipal housing schemes. It is also loaning money to housing companies, with restricted dividends, on favourable terms, in order that they may erect comfortable houses for the workingmen of Great Britain. I believe it is estimated that those houses will each cost on an average about £500, or $2,500. Hon. gentlemen will see what an enormous expenditure it would involve on the part of the Government of Great Britain if no less than three hundred thousand houses are erected at an estimated expenditure of $2,500 each. But the British Government look upon that expenditure, which is a loan, as I have explained, to municipalities and housing companies, as not only being in the national interest but as being necessary in order to improve social conditions. I know we all realize that conditions in Canada are very different from conditions in Great Britain, but nevertheless there is a shortage of houses in the Dominion for people of moderate means which this proposal is intended to meet. Personally, I do not think the federal, provincial, or municipal governments can contribute more largely to improve social conditions than by aiding in a housing programme which will ensure the erection of suitable houses equipped with modern conveniences, and with adequate breathing space and playgrounds around them where children may have an opportunity of breathing the fresh air of heaven. I do not know of any way in which they can contribute better to the social welfare of the country than by adopting this method.

With these objects in view the Government passed an Order in Council on the 3rd of December, 1918, to give effect to the decision which was arrived at at the Interprovincial Conference. I have had a large number of copies of this Order in Council distributed to hon. gentlemen so that they may have the opportunity of carefully studying its provisions. The Order in Council which was made on the recommendation of the Minister of Finance, recites the reasons for making this loan. First, it refers to the Interprovincial Conference recently held in Ottawa between premiers and other members of the governments of the several provinces and members of the Dominion Government. One of the important objects discussed at the conference was that of creating better housing conditions for the industrial population of our

larger centres. Then it is pointed out that owing to the cessation of building operations during the war there is at present a great scarcity of housing accommodation in most of our cities, and that this condition will become intensified with the return of our soldiers from overseas and their re-establishment with their families in civil life and occupation. The Order proceeds:

In view of the national importance of the matter, which touches vitally the health, morals and general well-being of the entire community, and its relation to the welfare of returned soldiers and their families, together with the fact that the carrying out of such a policy on a substantial scale by provincial governments would afford considerable employment during the period of reconstruction and readjustment of industry following the war, the minister recommends as follows:

And the Committee will see here the practical proposals upon which the vote is asked to be granted:

1. That the Minister of Finance be authorized under the provisions of the War Measures Act upon request of the government of any province of Canada to make loans to such government for the purpose mentioned.

That is the purpose I have already outlined in the preamble:

2. That the aggregate amount to be loaned to all provinces shall not exceed $25,000,000 and the amount of loan to any one province shall not exceed the proportion of the said $25,000,000 which the population of the said province bears to the total population of Canada.

3. That the loans made hereunder may be for a period not exceeding twenty years, with the right to any province to pay off the whole or any part of the principle of the loan at any time during the said term.

4. That interest at the rate of five per cent per annum, payable half-yearly shall be charged upon advances from the dates thereof respectively.

5. The Minister of Finance may accept bonds, debentures, or such other form of security as he may approve evidencing the indebtedness of any provincial government for loans made hereunder.

6. Advances shall be made from the War Appropriation.

7. Advances may be made as soon as a general scheme of housing shall have been agreed upon between the Government of Canada and the government of the province applying for a loan hereunder.

I would like to point out in passing that the rate of interest at five per cent is a lower rate than the rate at which the Government could borrow the money. The Government to that extent was rendering direct practical assistance towards the construction of houses under this programme. If the provincial governments loan at the same rate of interest, it means that the working man, particularly the returned soldier, will be able to acquire his house and lot at a rate of interest on the investment very much below the rate at which he could possibly secure it under existing conditions from private sources.

Of course, at the present time—indeed, at any time a workman could not expect to get nearly the full amount necessary to purchase the property and erect the house. If he did get the full amount it would be only by means of a second mortgage on which he would have to pay a very high rate of interest. To arrange for a rate of interest of not more than 5 per cent on the total amount that he is called upon to borrow from the Provincial Government is a very substantial contribution by this Government to the building cost.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: Is it intended to restrict the provinces to that rate of interest, or to give them liberty of action to charge more if they so desire?

Mr. ROWELL: We have not imposed any restriction on the Provincial Governments, but I understand they are loaning at that rate. We all recognize that the cost of building at the present time is greater than it was before the war, and it is greater now than we hope it will be when we get back to anything like normal conditions. Therefore the man who builds a house at the present time is called upon to put more money into it than the property may be worth in four or five years when values come back to something more approaching normal. Consequently, if the State is to encourage the building of houses at this time it is necessary that it should make some contribution. When it has arranged for repayment of the loan over a period of twenty years and fixed the interest at 5 per cent, it seems to me, the Government has rendered substantial assistance.

The other clause to which I desire to draw particular attention is No. 7:

7. Advances may be made as soon as a general scheme of housing shall have been agreed upon between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Province applying for a loan hereunder.

The Government had in view not only assisting the provision of houses, but the importance of insuring that those houses would be of a certain standard as to size or rooms, air space, size of the site, and sanitary conditions. In short, they had in view the direct object of improving the housing conditions, particularly in our larger cities. Therefore they stipulated that before any money could be advanced a housing scheme must

be agreed upon between the Provincial and Federal Governments.

In order to work out the provisions of that Order in Council, that is, to take up with the Provincial Governments and endeavour to agree with them upon housing schemes, a further Order in Council was passed on the 12th of December, 1918. Hon. members will find it in the pamphlet already distributed. By the way, this Order also was made on the recommendation of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White). It says:

> The Minister observes that in view of the national importance of adequate and suitable housing accommodation, which affects vitally the health, morals, and general well-being of the entire community, it is desirable that the financial assistance thus provided should be utilized at the earliest possible date in the provision of the housing accommodation contemplated by the said Order in Council.
>
> The Minister further observes that it is therefore desirable that a Committee of the Cabinet should be appointed to be known as the Housing Committee, which shall be authorized to take up without delay with the several Provinces of Canada the question of their need for additional housing accommodation and the housing programme they have in view in order to secure an early agreement with the said provinces under which the said moneys may be utilized for housing purposes.
>
> The Minister therefore recommends:—
>
> 1. That there be constituted a Committee of the Privy Council known as the Housing Committee, consisting of the following members:—
>
> Hon. Mr. Rowell, President of the Privy Council;
>
> Hon. Mr. Robertson, Minister of Labour;
>
> Hon. Mr. Maclean, Vice-President of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of Canada;
>
> Hon. Mr. Crerar, Minister of Agriculture.
>
> The Honourable Mr. Rowell is to be Chairman of the Committee.
>
> 2. That this Committee formulate the general principles which should be followed in any housing schemes in order to secure the results aimed at by the said Order in Council.
>
> That the Committee communicate with the Governments of the several Provinces of Canada in reference to the matters above mentioned with a view to agreeing with the Governments of the said Provinces, respectively, upon any such general schemes of housing, so that the moneys provided by the said Order in Council of December 3, 1918, may be applied for the purposes contemplated by the said Order.
>
> 4. That the Committee be authorized and empowered to do and perform all such further acts as may be necessary in order to carry out and give full effect to the said Order in Council of December 3, 1918.
>
> The Minister further recommends that the said Committee be authorized to secure the assistance and co-operation of Mr. Thomas Adams, the Town Planning Expert of the Commission of Conservation, and of any other person or persons specially qualified to advise or assist the said Committee in carrying on its work.

Pursuant to that Order in Council, the Committee did take up the question of the principles to be embodied in the housing schemes which the Federal Government might be asked to approve. Drafts of those principles were furnished to all the Provincial Governments, and received consideration at the hands of those Governments. Some modifications were suggested, but on the whole the principles as laid down and submitted by the Committee were accepted. An Order in Council was then passed setting out those principles. The members of the Committee will find this third Order in Council at page 9 of the pamphlet. The important clause of this Order is No. 2:

> The Housing Committee observe that they have submitted the general principles to the Governments of all the provinces, and requested suggestions from the said Governments, with reference thereto, and after duly considering all such suggestions, the Committee submit the following statement and report, and recommend the approval thereof by Your Excellency in Council, and further recommend that upon approval, copies of said memorandum be furnished the Governments of the said Provinces of Canada.

Now, what are these principles which underlie the Government's housing policy and which must be embodied in the policies of the different Provincial Governments? You will find a statement of the object the Government has in view at the top of page 10:

> (1) General object in view.—The object of the Government in making provision for a loan of $25,000,000 at 5 per cent to the Provincial Governments for housing purposes is—(a) to promote the erection of dwelling houses of modern character to relieve congestion of population in cities and towns; (b) to put within the reach of all working men, particularly returned soldiers, the opportunity of acquiring their own homes at actual cost of the building and land acquired at a fair value, thus eliminating the profits of the speculator; (c) to contribute to the general health and well-being of the community by encouraging suitable town planning and housing schemes.
>
> (2) Promotion of Housing Schemes matter for Provincial and Municipal Jurisdiction.—The provision of houses, so far as it may be regarded as a public duty, is a matter which comes more properly within the jurisdiction of the provinces and municipalities, and in ordinary circumstances, the question of what regulations should be imposed, and what policy should be adopted, in regard to the administration of housing schemes, are matters for these Governments. As the Federal Government will lend the money on the general security of each province, it is not necessary to impose financial regulations as to the means which should be employed to safeguard the loans.
>
> Conditions on which Loans will be Granted by the Federal Government.
>
> Having regard however, to the responsibility incurred by the Federal Government in providing the money, and to the object for which the money is proposed to be lent, loans will be

made to the Provincial Governments on the following four conditions:—

1. Approval of General Provisions.—Each province shall prepare and submit to the Federal Government for approval, a general housing scheme; setting out the standards and conditions to be complied with in connection with local housing schemes. The general scheme of each province should include a schedule of minimum standards in regard to grouping of houses, provision of open spaces, sizes and heights of houses, sizes and heights of rooms, provision of light and ventilation, heating, lighting, character of materials, etc., which it is proposed should be enforced as the minimum requirements for health, comfort and convenience.

Each province, before it can obtain a loan from the Federal Government, must submit its housing scheme, setting out the particulars with regard to the administration of its own housing proposals.

The second condition is in regard to the maximum cost of dwellings. As the object of the Federal Government was to ensure that workingmen particularly returned soldiers and men of limited means, should have the full advantage of this loan, the Government decided that no money loaned by it should be used for the building of large houses for people who could well afford to build their own houses. The Government, therefore, imposed these restrictions as to the amount that could be loaned on any house:—

2. Maximum cost of dwellings, etc.—The object of the Federal Government being to facilitate the erection of dwellings at a moderate cost suitable for working men, particularly returned soldiers, it is necessary to place a maximum on the amount which may be loaned per dwelling, and the following maximum has been fixed having regard to the conditions existing in the different Provinces.

(a) Detached or semi-detached dwellings with walls constructed wholly or partly of frame, stucco on frame, brick veneer, inclusive of the capital value of the site and necessary local improvements:—

With 4 or 5 rooms exclusive of bathroom and summer kitchen, $3,000.

Having regard to the present cost of building, it was considered that that was a fair amount for a house of that size and character:—

With 6 or 7 rooms exclusive of bathroom and summer kitchen, $3,500.

(b) Detached, semi-detached, groups of three or more or duplex (cottage flat) dwellings with walls of brick, hollow-tile, stone or concrete and roofing of fire-proof materials, inclusive of the capital value of the site and necessary local improvements:—

With 4 or 5 rooms exclusive of bathroom and summer kitchen, $4,000.

With 6 or 7 rooms exclusive of bathroom and summer kitchen, $4,500.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Does "dwelling" here mean a building which may contain several families, or a building which will contain only one family?

Mr. ROWELL: A dwelling containing only one family. Provision is made for flats, which, of course, may contain two families. With reference to the limitation of the amounts that may be loaned to any one building a house of the character mentioned in this condition, the provinces which so far have taken advantage of the scheme have accepted these limits, except Ontario. Ontario originally fixed their standards at a lower figure than this. They put the maximum amount that might be expended in a building at a somewhat lower figure than ours.

Mr. BELAND: Before the Order in Council was passed?

Mr. ROWELL: After the Order in Council was passed. All we require is that the amount shall not exceed the amount stated; those who take advantage of the loan may accept less if they see fit. I say, Ontario fixed their maximum at a lower figure than this, but since then they have revised their figures and have now fixed as their maximum the figures mentioned in this Order in Council:

(3) Ownership of land.—Public money may be advanced for building houses on sites owned by:—

(a) The Provincial Government or municipality.

(b) Housing Societies or Companies comprising groups of citizens associated to promote good housing, supplied with proper improvements; such Societies or Companies to have not more than a statutory limitation of dividends payable on stock of 6 per cent.

(c) Owners of lots for the purpose of erecting houses for their own occupancy.

The reasons for limiting the use of the Government money to loans on properties of the classes mentioned were the following. In the first place, if the province itself or the municipality was prepared to undertake a housing scheme, to provide dwellings at cost for workingmen and returned soldiers, we were glad to advance money for that purpose. If they did not agree to go into it for themselves, or if they went into it only partially, and public-spirited citizens who desired to improve housing conditions and who were prepared to limit their dividends to six per cent would form housing companies in order to promote good housing, the moneys might be loaned to such housing companies. But it was not the intention to lend the money to men interested in real estate speculation or to builders for speculative pur-

poses. Then the terms of the loan follow:

(4) Terms of years for repayment of loans.—The Federal loan will be repayable by the Province over a period of twenty years. Provided that in order to encourage the erection of more durable buildings, and to bring the financial terms within reach of a large number of workers, the period of 20 years may be extended to 30 years in respect of any portion of the loan which the Provincial Government may decide to re-lend for thirty years for such purposes as purchasing land or erecting buildings under the above class. Repayments by the Provinces on account of Federal Loans may be made quarterly if so desired, or otherwise as may be agreed upon.

These are the four conditions which the Federal Government imposes in connection with loans to any of the provinces. But we have recommended to the provinces that they themselves should impose certain standards in their housing schemes, and the provinces which have taken advantage of the loan have largely followed these standards.

Mr. McMASTER: What provinces so far have taken advantage of it?

Mr. ROWELL: Ontario and British Columbia have submitted their housing schemes, and these have been duly approved. The province of Quebec has submitted its housing scheme, and only one small matter requires consideration before it is approved. Manitoba has submitted its scheme; the general principles have been agreed upon and I believe it is about to be approved. New Brunswick passed the necessary legislation last session; it has prepared its scheme, which is now under consideration. Nova Scotia passed an Act at the last session of its legislature to take advantage of the loan, but has not yet submitted its scheme.

Mr. McMASTER: All their schemes must be based upon this?

Mr. ROWELL: They are all based on this; they must comply with the four conditions. Before these conditions were laid down they were submitted to all the provinces for their consideration and for any suggestions which they might like to make before the conditions were agreed upon. I believe that Prince Edward Island also has submitted its scheme. Alberta and Saskatchewan are the only two provinces which have not intimated that they intend to take advantage of the loan.

Mr. FIELDING: In the case of the formation of a housing company as described by the minister, the company may remain the landlord provided they do not take a dividend in excess of six per cent?

Mr. ROWELL: That is correct. I shall not go through the various general principles and standards which are recommended to the provinces. Hon. members will find them on pages 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the Order in Council. I will, however, mention two which appear to be of particular importance. Number 1 is:

Acquisition of Sites, etc.—The success of the housing movement depends upon the acquirement of suitable land at its fair value, and at a cost which working men can afford to pay. It is essential, therefore, that statutory provision shall be made by the provinces for a cheap and speedy method of compulsory taking of the land required for housing purposes. To facilitate proper planning and to secure economy in connection with housing schemes comparatively large sites should as a rule be chosen so as to permit of comprehensive treatment. Such sites should be conveniently accessible to places of employment, means of transportation, water supply, sewers and other public utilities.

It is the first part of the clause to which I direct attention. All who have taken an interest in this question of housing, particularly for workingmen, must realize that one of the difficulties in our larger cities is the very high cost of land, especially in the majority of our larger cities. Add to this the high cost of building, and you have such a charge upon the workingman's income as to make it difficult for him to live in such a house as he and his family should be entitled to live in. If you must proceed by expropriation of land for a housing scheme—I am speaking now particularly from the standpoint of Ontario, with the laws of which I am familiar—if you took proceedings under the law regarding expropriation, and you had finally to pay what might thus be decided, after hearing experts on both sides, one boosting the price up and the other trying to beat it down, you would delay the operation of the scheme so that you would not secure the desired result. The Government, therefore, suggest this proposition. I know Ontario has adopted it; I do not know how far the other provinces have done so, but they have provided a cheap and speedy method of settling the value of property where they require to expropriate. The other principle to which I desire to direct attention is No. 4 which reads:

Limit of income of persons to be provided with dwellings.—In order to ensure that the money shall be loaned to those who most need it, no person in receipt of an income exceeding $3,000 per annum should be eligible as a purchaser or tenant of a house erected with the aid of Government funds in any schemes carried out by provincial governments, municipalities, housing associations or owners of lots.

We do not stipulate that as a condition, but we suggest to the provinces that they should stipulate it as a condition in order that a man of means, who can afford to pay a higher rate of interest and get the money from private sources, should not use this money which is intended for different purposes.

Mr. CAHILL: Have the provinces not done so in contracts they have made?

Mr. ROWELL: I think Quebec has imposed it as a compulsory condition. Some of the provinces have recommended it to the municipalities. I do not at present sufficiently recall the different housing schemes to speak accurately.

Mr. CAHILL: These are only recommendations and do not necessarily form part of the contract between the Dominion Government and the provinces?

Mr. ROWELL: No, but the majority of the provinces have embodied them in their housing schemes, and in the majority of cases they are imposing them on the municipalities.

Mr. CAHILL: I thought the minister said that only Quebec had done so.

Mr. ROWELL: I am speaking generally of the scheme. Quebec has imposed this particular condition, and some of the other provinces have made it a recommendation. I cannot recall what each of the provinces has done.

Mr. SHEARD: Is there any process of law in contemplation by which, when a workingman pays the $3,000 or whatever the amount may be for his house, he can sell it at some future time to any one he chooses?

Mr. ROWELL: We do not impose any conditions as to that. The Provincial Government must decide that matter itself in dealing with the municipalities.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In the event that Alberta does not indicate its intention——

Mr. McMASTER: Will the hon. member speak louder? We on this side cannot hear what is being said.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Talk less, and you will hear.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think that is a most discourteous remark in answer to a very reasonable request.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In the event—

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. McMASTER: I would ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The point of order raised by the hon. member (Mr. McMaster) seems to be that he has drawn upon himself a discourteous remark from an hon. member upon the other side of the House. One of the rules of the House and of the Committee is that members should always address the Chair. If the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) had first addressed the Chair, there would have been no possible occasion for the remark and I am quite willing to draw the attention of the hon. member (Mr. H. A. Mackie) to the fact that he also should have addressed to the Chair any remark which he desired to make. I did not understand that his remarks were directed to the hon. member for Brome nor that he said anything derogatory to the reputation or honour of the hon. member.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In the event that Alberta does not indicate its intention of taking the benefit of this money which is to be paid over to the provinces in proportion to population, what will the Dominion Government do regarding that province?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not see that the Dominion Government can do anything. This is a loan to the provinces, and it cannot be lent to any individual nor can the vote here be divided. If the province does not take advantage of this at once, it is up to the people of that province to endeavour to get their Government to take advantage of it.

Mr. COWAN: Has the minister received any communication from either Saskatchewan or Alberta as to why they have not accepted this? Have they any particular objection to the housing scheme? Is it not a fact that in those western provinces, for instance, in the province of Sas-

9 p.m. katchewan, that the big trouble is not that they object to the scheme—for I think practically everybody is agreed to it—but that they find it difficult to put it into operation because the municipalities have not power to deal with the loaning of money as the scheme provides because they have to go to the burgesses before they could lend this money? Is not that a fact?

Mr. J. R. WILSON: I think I can strengthen the point. Apparently, under this housing scheme as drafted the Do-

minion Government lends the money to the provinces, putting the responsibility on the provinces. The Provincial Government of Saskatchewan, as I understand the matter, wishes to pass the financial responsibility on to the municipalities or the cities, and the cities at the present time, owing to rapid development in the past, have pretty well taken up their borrowing powers and do not think they should assume this additional burden, as they look on it as a national scheme. That is the crux of the whole situation.

Mr. ROWELL: I have heard, through the premier of Saskatchewan, that that is the view of some of the important municipalities in that province. The difficulty, however, as to their exceeding their borrowing limits is one that could be met by legislation of the province. Their borrowing limits are fixed by the legislature of the province, and if it was considered in the interest of the province that their borrowing powers should be enlarged for this particular purpose I think the legislature would have the right to do that.

I have only one word to say in conclusion, and then I shall be glad to answer any further questions. It is a matter of gratification to the Government that the proposals they have submitted to the provincial governments have been received so sympathetically and that the Provincial Governments have evidenced a desire to co-operate most heartily with the Federal Government in working out the plan. Our proposal here is being watched with the greatest interest in the United States. The National Government in the United States did not proceed on the lines on which we are proceeding. As a war measure, they started in themselves to build a large number of houses, primarily for their own employees in connection with the various national enterprises upon which the United States had embarked. They have spent tens of millions of dollars in erecting houses themselves, and have certainly put up some very creditable houses or flats for their employees in the city of Washington and other places. It will be of interest to the House, I am sure, to know the views of one of the leading firms of architects in the United States who had charge of the housing programme of the Ordnance Department. Upon receiving a copy of our proposals the firm of Mann and MacNeille expressed their view as follows:

> We wish to express our unqualified admiration for the completeness, practicability and simplicity of the administration methods outlined in the data received from you. We believe this to be the most practicable step toward the provision of good housing by Federal co-operation which has yet been taken in any country.

That is the testimony of leading architects in the United States who have been concerned with the work of the United States in providing houses for their own employees. With that information, I submit the matter to the Committee.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Did the Government of Alberta give any reason to this Government for not adopting this scheme?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not think so. My recollection is that they simply intimated that they did not desire to take advantage of the plan at the present time. I do not recall the exact phraseology, but that was the substance of it.

Mr. CAHILL: The Orders in Council quoted in this pamphlet refer more particularly to the returned soldiers, but in the general recommendations there is no reference made to him. There is absolutely no provision whatever for the returned soldier in the agreement between the Dominion Government and the provinces.

Mr. ROWELL: The returned soldier was the whole reason for the programme.

Mr. CAHILL: But no provision is made for him direct.

Mr. ROWELL: Had it not been for the returned soldier there would have been no housing programme at all.

Mr. CAHILL: At the risk of sending the minister into heroics again over the returned soldier, I would ask if there is any provision in the contract between the Dominion and the provincial Governments whereby the returned soldier, or even the labouring man, has any preference over anybody else. What is the contract? We want to know what this money is being voted for. As it is now, we are simply handing over the money to the provincial governments without any contract at all.

Mr. ROWELL: The whole programme is induced by the necessity or desirability of making provision for the returned soldier. The question whether the returned soldier alone should receive the benefit of the scheme, or whether it should apply to the returned soldier and other men similarly situated, is a matter left to the provinces. The scheme submitted by the province of British Columbia, as I recall it now, is limited absolutely to the returned soldier.

The Ontario scheme provides for both, within the limits here mentioned as to the amount of loan, the ownership of the property, and income.

Mr. CAHILL: If all the provinces limited the scheme to the returned soldier, is there any too much money to take care of him alone? There are something like 300,000 or 400,000 returned soldiers, and when they are taken care of how much money will there be left? If this scheme is for the returned soldier, let that be understood, and let us make an agreement to that effect with the provinces. If not, why quote the returned soldier for the sake of handing over this money from the Dominion Government to the provinces. The Government claims to make the loan for the benefit of the returned soldier, but he is left out of the contract entirely.

Mr. COWAN: I hope we have not reached the point in the Dominion of Canada where we have no faith in the Provincial Governments giving proper or even preferential treatment to the returned soldier. I am prepared to take the Government of Saskatchewan on faith, even though their politics are not of the stripe that mine have been in days gone by. I believe no provincial government in Canada, Quebec included, would do anything else but put the returned soldier in the first place in all its legislation. I do not think there is any reason why we should go into heroics over the attitude any government takes in this matter. I think the principle of this Bill is exceedingly good, and although our Government in Saskatchewan have not signified their intention of taking advantage of it, our people are quite prepared to do so. The only difficulty, as I have already stated, is with the municipalities, and our absolute inability to take advantage of the scheme owing to our present liability. I wish our Provincial Governments had the power to pass an Order in Council removing all these difficulties, so that we might take advantage of the scheme immediately. I think this scheme is a mighty good one, for two reasons. In the first place, the returned soldier is getting the money at a very low rate of interest, lower than he could get it anywhere else. In the second place, he is getting the full amount of money he requires to build his home, and thereby become the very best type of citizen. I do not care who the man is, if he owns a home he is a better citizen than he otherwise would be. For these two reasons, I wish to see the plan made operative as far as possible. As to the difficulties in Saskatchewan, I think the Government ought to make every effort to have them removed as soon as possible, so that our returned soldiers may be able to take advantage of this plan.

Mr. ROBB: Before we go into a discussion of the details I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that this loan is granted under the authority of the War Measures Act, as provided by Order in Council passed on December 3, 1918. That Order in Council recommends:

> That the Minister of Finance be authorized under the provisions of the War Measures Act upon request from the Government of any province of Canada to make loans to such governments for the purpose mentioned.

Now from a notice of motion that was given by the Acting Minister of Justice a few days ago, we inferred that the Government had some doubt in their minds as to the legality of the War Measures Act when peace was signed, and I am not clear as to whether or not this proposed legislation will not fall down unless the minister brings in a Bill for this Parliament to ratify the scheme.

There is another point. The scheme provides for four classes: Provincial governments, municipalities, housing societies, and the owners of lots. I inferred from the minister's remarks that all the provinces except Alberta and Saskatchewan have signified their willingness to take advantage of this sceme. Representatives of Saskatchewan have told us in the House to-night that that province is not able to take advantage of it because the borrowing powers of their municipalities are exhausted.

I read somewhere recently that a member of the Saskatchewan Government had given another reason why this project of the Dominion Government did not appeal to them, and that reason was that building would be rather expensive. But it was said that if this Government gave an assurance that the 7½ per cent extra duty would be taken off the project might appeal more readily to the province of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that this is a good time for the Government to make a statement of policy. They are advancing $25,000,000 for the purpose of building houses throughout Canada, and this 7½ per cent tax will add very considerably to the cost of the labourer's houses. I think it would have been better and more in order had the minister, before introducing this scheme, brought down the Budget so that we might know the fiscal policy of the Government in this regard.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I supose no member of this House would take much pleasure in opposing this proposition outright when it is represented as being something to help the returned soldier. But we are bound to examine the proposition and see what is really in it. It is a proposal to build houses—the minister will correct me if I am wrong—costing about $3,000 each, and to lend $25,000,000 for the purpose. A very simple calculation will reveal the fact that if the houses were all up now at a cost of $3,000 apiece and were used to accommodate families averaging five in number, we should have done something for 42,000 people.

Mr. McMASTER: To be exact 35,710.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Well,we may split the difference and say around 40,000. The houses are not all up now, and I do not know whether the minister can give us any idea how long it will take before the provincial governments will have come into agreement with the Dominion Government and started the operations at all. So that, after all, it is not possible to represent this scheme as one of hurricane relief to any housing conditions needed to make returned soldiers comfortable. I very much fear that the scheme partakes of the nature of a pill to cure an earthquake, if there is any housing condition of a serious character to relieve. I sympathize very much with the last remark that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). What I think the country is looking to this Government for, and what it will look for to any government that may rule the destinies of this nation in the immediate future, is something in the way of fundamental reform. Now this kind of social welfare relief—I desire to make myself clear—will be better the sooner it takes effect, and I repeat that this thing seems small. It seems likely to be tardy, and I do trust the Government will try to couple with this, which no one wants to oppose, something very much more substantial when the Budget comes down. I have an idea, Sir, after seventeen years in this country which I began by putting up a shack of some kind in six weeks that did not cost very much and was built without help by way of loan from any government,—I have an idea that if this country were properly governed, and its wealth properly distributed, as far as it can be distributed, by wise acts of governments, every man with much in him would soon get his own house. The reason he does not do so is that there is too much wealth in the hands of few and too little in the hands of many, and it is possible for the Government to take steps, through proper fiscal arrangements, to alter this state of affairs. As I said, I do not want to offer any flat opposition to this or any other measure of the kind that seems to offer a chance of some kind of relief to the conditions that are unfavourable amongst our population. The fact of the matter is that we have too much paternalism in a country like Canada, where you have a continent of resources and only eight millions of people. There is a tendency in the Government to imitate, I think, whatever they see being done in other countries under post-war conditions. The minister has been in England and I am perfectly sure he has given a great deal of sincere study to the conditions there; but I want to put it to him that in the British Islands there are forty-five millions of people living on what are practically two pin points compared to the immense area of natural wealth we have here; and measures that are suitable for the relief of conditions which have grown up during centuries in England may be entirely unsuited to us in Canada. We may want to go back in the history of the world to find out what Britain was doing for her population seventy years ago when she destroyed tariffs and repealed the corn laws. It might be better if we got our inspiration from that period. I throw that out as a suggestion that should be helpful to the Government, and hope they will communicate it to the Minister of Finance. And I want to tell the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) that if he would take that prescription he would find that it was not a pill to cure an earthquake but that it would operate almost immediately in giving the people social welfare, neither in clauses nor in preambles, nor in health bills, nor even in a tardy and small housing scheme, but social welfare in their stomachs and upon their shoulders and on their feet. For that is where the people want primarily to feel social welfare. They want it at once, and I agree with my hon. friend from Chateauguay-Huntingdon that they ought to get much through proper fiscal arrangements. I hope I shall not be taken as being very truculent in my criticism of this scheme. The figures I have given, are, I am sure, correct when they are brought up to date by my hon. friend from Brome.

Mr. McMASTER: I made a mistake. The hon. member's figures were arithmetically correct. I was dividing by thirty-five hundred.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am charmed to think that I should have excelled my hon. friend in accuracy. He is invariably very careful in these things. I generally deal more in principles than in details, but we may leave it at, say, 40,000 people, approximately. It would be well for us to reflect that if the houses were up to-morrow, that is all that we should be doing for the people under this scheme; and to get that done we will have to get started and get the Provincial Governments into line quickly. I do not oppose the measure on principle, but I would like to see something bigger and better from the Government pretty soon; and a lot of the folks in the country, in Winnipeg, for instance, feel the same way.

Sir HERBERT AMES: If I may be permitted to bring the thoughts of the hon. member and the Committee back to the subject under consideration, I would like to offer a few observations with respect to the general question covered by this proposal, and the broad methods outlined by it. For twenty-five years I have been deeply interested in the matter of the housing of the working people, and have had some personal experience which may perhaps at this juncture, be of some value to the Committee.

I want in the first place to congratulate the Government upon this venture in, I will admit, entirely new and untried fields, but a venture which I hope will be received by the provinces in the spirit in which it is made, and a venture which I hope may bring fruit from co-operation with all those other organizations whose assistance is necessary to make this a success. I have listened with very close attention to what the minister has said, and I have read the memorandum which he has submitted with some care, and I must say that in one respect I feel disappointed in the proposed measure. I am quite willing that the returned soldier should be assisted in securing a home; I am quite willing that the workingman should find it possible to build a residence in the outskirts of a city; but I feel that this money, if it is to do the most good, should be expended in the centre of the big cities where the slum conditions exist. The proposition as it at present stands, I think, does not meet that need.

I had occasion some years ago to make an intimate social study of the constituency which I represent in Montreal, and I know that the conditions which were found then still persist to-day, and probably will continue to persist until they are dealt with by the Dominion or Provincial Governments in a drastic way. There are districts in the constituency I represent where five hundred human beings live on an acre. There are blocks in the constituency I represent where, if every man, woman and child in that block should go and stand shoulder to shoulder they would make a line entirely round the four sides of the block on the four streets. When you come to undertake a building scheme in an area like that, what do you find? You find that the properties are held by scores of proprietors. You may acquire a little space here, by paying for it; you may acquire a little space there; but you cannot acquire an area that will be sufficiently large to let light and air into the district and thus do some real benefit. There will always be some proprietors who will hold you up for a large amount or will not sell at all—and I am very glad to see that this Bill not only contains the necessary financial provisions, but also the power of expropriation which is absolutely necessary if you are to improve any of the slum areas of our great cities.

Now the city of Montreal, as hon. gentlemen know, lies between the beautiful mountain and the still more beautiful river. The space available for habitation is limited, unless you go away out to the north or away out to the west. There are immense industries down near the water front. These industries employ large numbers of men, women and children. They open early and they close late, and the working people have to be at their employment sometimes before sun-up in the morning, and remain there until after sun-down at night. They cannot live three, four, or five miles out in the suburbs in the beautiful little homes you propose to build for them; many of them being night workers as well, they must live in the centre of the city near their work. I remember twenty years ago in my city making an industrial census of an area which contained thirty thousand people, and ascertaining the wages, the rents, the sanitary conditions, the number of rooms occupied, the death rate, the crime rate, and a great many other figures in connection with it. Then, after ascertaining what was the social condition of the thirty thousand people that lived there, we were able to put up a certain number of model dwellings in the place where they were most needed, and where the largest number of people had to dwell to be near their work. And more, as a result of the study we were able to determine what rent

they could pay, the number of rooms they would be able to occupy, and the class of accommodation they should seek; and I want to say as one who has had experience with this problem that there is no work that a human being can undertake in a big city that brings in greater returns of satisfaction than an investment well placed for the housing of working people. You sometimes are told that they do not appreciate property of that kind. You sometimes are told that they will not pay the rent. That has not been my experience. I cannot say that the properties have yielded six per cent, but I can say that there is never a vacant house for more than a week, and that there are forty families who are always grateful and self-respecting.

I would like to see many of the areas in the city of Montreal that are slums wiped out. I would like to see it possible for a building corporation, or an individual, or a group of citizens, to select the worst area there is in the city, wipe out four or five blocks, and re-plan those blocks so that there would be plenty of playground space, so that all the courts would be paved, and so that there would be elbow room for the people that live in that block. I do not think you can do that under this Bill.

As far as I can see this Bill provides that the houses must be practically individual houses. Suppose you start to build individual houses in a congested part of the city of Montreal. You cannot put one of these little cottages on a lot less than twenty-five feet front by eighty feet depth. There is an area of two thousand feet right away. You would have to pay at least $2.50 a foot for that property. That would represent an immediate expenditure of $5,000, and if you put another $2,500 into the building, which is the smallest amount you could possibly use to house a family, you have a total of $7,500 to provide a dwelling for one single family. The only way in which that can be done is by erecting buildings of a size sufficient to enable three or four families to live one above another. In that way you can spread the cost of your land over the four families, and you can bring it within the allowance that is permitted here. It would seem to me that instead of using our money out in the suburbs, where there is already plenty of air and light, in building nice little houses with a garden patch and plenty of space around them, which would be done by the ordinary speculator and land developer anyway, we should do what these other men will not do—go into the heart of the city, take the most congested area you can find, and use this money in turning a place which is a byword and a hissing in the neighbourhood into a place where a hundred families can live decently, comfortably and under conditions that would put them near their work, enable them to send their children to school, and enable them to live in a comfortable and happy way together.

I think the Government has made a splendid advance in this direction, but I would like it to give serious consideration as to whether this scheme is really meeting the congested city area difficulty. We speak of building for the returned soldier. Well, this, in a sense, we do. Still, I do not suppose that these houses are to be exclusively retained for the returned soldier; the necessity for them is in a large degree created by the return of the soldier. Now, I know from the returns of the Patriotic Fund that during the war a great many families doubled up; that is, a couple of soldiers' families lived together. Now that the men are coming back we have the same report from every one of our large cities: they cannot find homes for the re-constituted soldiers' families.

In Toronto in our rest rooms we keep families for a long time while the ladies of the Patriotic Fund search up and down the streets trying to find a place where they can be housed. And one of the most difficult problems we have in Montreal is to find adequate accommodation for the newly linked up and reconstituted families that have returned from overseas. So I trust the Government will get on with this scheme as speedily as possible, for the present condition will grow worse unless it is quickly remedied, and the sooner we get it remedied the better it will be for this country in the years to come.

There is one canny feature in connection with the scheme that I cannot help admiring from the financial point of view, in that it involves no addition to the permanent debt of the country. The Government, it is true, is providing $25,000,000, but it is loaning that sum, and whatever it adds to the debit side it will add to the credit side, and consequently the net debt of the country will not be increased. Those who view with alarm the very rapid increase of our national debt will be glad to see that at least one expenditure is bound to be reimbursed. Therefore so far as the investment feature is concerned no criticism can be coming to the Government. But I trust

they will arrange to utilize a fair share of this money for the purpose of wiping out those blots on our modern civilization which every large city has to-day—the old broken-down buildings, held by some speculator at a rack rent, unfit to live in, and yet not condemned and not removed, but which, if replaced with decent dwellings, would support a contented population.

Mr. MORPHY: May I ask for a little light upon this subject? I have the pamphlet published by the Government showing the principles upon which the Act is to be administered, and on page 11 I find under the heading of "General Principles and Standards Recommended for Consideration in Schemes," Section (4), which reads:

(4) Limit of Income of persons to be provided with dwellings.—In order to ensure that the money shall be loaned to those who most need it, no person in receipt of an income exceeding $3,000 per annum should be eligible as a purchaser or tenant of a house erected with the aid of Government funds in any schemes carried out by provincial governments, municipalities, housing associations or owners of lots.

I take it that if a man has $50,000 in vested at 6 per cent, bringing him in exactly $3,000 a year, he can take advantage of the scheme; but if he has $3,001 of income he can not. My mind has been all along directed to the idea that this scheme was to help the man who had no money of his own; but if it is to help the man with a capital of $50,000 capable of investment at 6 per cent, I am going to oppose it. I would like the minister to tell me if he intends to apply the scheme to a man who has $50,000, which at 6 per cent would bring him in an income of $3,000.

Mr. ROWELL: No, it is not the intention. I do not know whether my hon. friend was present when I was explaining that these general principles and standards are recommendations to the provincial governments for embodiment in their schemes, and those governments determine as between themselves and the applicants what class shall be eligible. The class intended is men of limited incomes those earning not more than $3,000 a year. I agree that it might be urged that that figure should be lower, but the Minister of Labour,—who knows labouring conditions pretty well,—was strongly of opinion that we should make it as high as $3,000, and we have put the limit on that basis. He no doubt hopes there are working men who now earn or will earn that income. It is not intended that the moneyed man should get a loan, and I am quite sure no provincial government would make a loan to the class of men the hon. member has referred to

Mr. MORPHY: Why put in that figure expressly unless it is intended to be operative?

Mr. ROWELL: That means earned income. My hon. friend has to interpret that in the light of the whole scheme. The whole scheme is limited to working men, particularly returned soldiers. Working men who earn that income is what is understood in the paragraph quoted.

Mr. MORPHY: I have no quarrel with helping the working man, but I think the Bill should be framed to help the poorer working man, not the working man who has got an income of $3,000. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the working man who earns $3,000 a year is able to get his own home without asking the Government any questions about it. I think his individuality would carry the strength and pride which would make him want his own home without asking any paternal help from the Government. It seems to me that the scheme should be limited to the class of working men earning from $1,200 to $1,500. Those men would no doubt need help. A working man earning $1,500 a year—and there are many of them—might be very thankful to take advantage of this scheme because of his family conditions, the expense to which he is put, and so forth. But to say that a man in receipt of an income of $3,000 should be eligible would probably leave the Act open to a rush of that class, who would take up the money in the various centres—and it could not be reasonably refused with this clause standing upon the Government's advertising matter—with the result that the man for whose benefit the Act would be put upon the statute-books, as I see it, would be crowded out, and with the further result that we would be forced later on to enlarge the scheme because the money already provided had been taken up by a class who did not need it and had not any right to be helped.

Mr. ROWELL: I quite agree with my hon. friend that men of means should not be entitled to take advantage of the provisions of the Government loan. I would again draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that this is simply a recommendation to the provincial governments, that in no case should the money be loaned to a man who earns more than this specified amount. It is within the competence of the provincial governments to limit the amount to $1,000,

$1,200, or $1,500—whatever they may determine. We are simply fixing that limit as a safeguard. I think the figure might be fixed lower; however, it was fixed at that amount. The provinces have the same object as the Dominion Government in keeping the money for the class for which the loan is provided, and may limit the amount as low as they like.

While I am on my feet may I answer the question put by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) with reference to the form of the proposal; and also a question suggested by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames)? The order is under the War Measures Act, and if any money had been advanced before Parliament met it would have been advanced under that Act, because that was the only authority the Government had for taking such action. But it so happens that no money was advanced; in other words, the provinces did not put themselves in a position before the meeting of Parliament to take advantage of the scheme. Therefore the advance will now be made by the House, if the House votes this amount, on the terms set out in the third Order in Council. The War Measures Act has no effect on it one way or the other.

Coming to the next question my hon. friend suggested, that this should be deferred until after the Budget. I do not think he was really serious. My hon. friend from Red Deer emphasized that suggestion too. I quite recognize that the question of the tariff may have a bearing upon the cost of living and the cost of materials. I am under the impression, however, that the bulk of the materials that would enter into the construction of an ordinary house are produced in Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: Does the minister suggest that the tariff has nothing to do with the price of goods which are produced in Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: I did not express any opinion on that point.

Mr. BUREAU: It was merely insinuated.

Mr. ROWELL: I shall have an opportunity of expressing my opinion on that point when the Budget is brought down. I have the greatest respect for the opinions of the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). I almost always find myself in agreement with him, but I am not wholly in agreement with him on this matter. If the result of this proposal is to provide houses for forty thousand people, it will be a very real factor in the solution of the housing problem in our cities. Moreover, by erecting a good type of workingman's house, sanitary in all its appointments, with a breathing space around it, under the conditions outlined in these Orders in Council, you set a standard for workingmen's houses which should affect—experience shows that it does affect—all other workingmen's houses erected in the same town or city. You improve the general character of the workingman's house when you have a good type of house erected, because men prefer the better rather than the less favourable.

My hon. friend thinks that there is a danger of our copying legislation enacted in other countries without considering whether it is adaptable to our own country. I cannot agree with him in that. I frankly recognize that the adoption of some policy in Great Britain is not necessarily a reason why it should be adopted here, the conditions in the two countries are, as my hon. friend has said, very different. We have this immense expanse of territory; we have these great opportunities in Canada; but the startling and the disappointing fact is that notwithstanding the potentiality of these great unoccupied areas we are rapidly developing slum conditions in our larger cities. I think that we should profit by the experience of Great Britain. My hon. friend has paid me the compliment of assuming that I have looked into this matter. I tried to get all the information I could when I was in Great Britain in reference to their housing policies and programme. I visited some of their garden cities and discussed the matter with experts of the British Board of Trade. In 1915, when in Great Britain, I discussed with Right Hon. John Burns, who was then President of the Local Government Board and who had direction of the housing scheme, the various pieces of social legislation which the Lloyd George Government had introduced in Great Britain. I said to him: "Suppose we decided to make a start in Canada on this social legislation, which one of your various measures do you think we could adopt with the greatest profit?" Without a moment's hesitation, he said: "Housing and town planning." He went on to say that he was astonished beyond measure to see the conditions in some of our cities. He mentioned particularly what was known as "Shacktown" in the northern part of Toronto. He emphasized the fact that in a well laid-out district, where the people live in clean and com-

fortable houses, you have people who are more law-abiding and better citizens than they would be if they were brought up amid disorderly slum conditions. These things have a real effect, he said, upon the character of the people—upon their outlook, upon their respect for and observance of the law. That really is one of the fundamental questions to which my hon. friend has referred. I do not doubt that the other is a fundamental question; but I believe that the provision of good, clean, sanitary houses is fundamental to the best social conditions in this or any other country.

In my investigation into this matter I have actually looked into the housing conditions in my own city of Toronto. In the winter of 1914, when unemployment was very conspicuous, I took occasion to visit many of the homes in the poorer districts of the city. I went in and talked to the people, I saw the conditions under which they were living; and I have no hesitation in saying that it is a disgrace that with all our natural resources and advantages, such conditions of housing and poverty should exist. It is our bounden duty, by every possible measure that we can adopt, to try to improve these conditions.

My hon. friend has suggested that one particular measure might solve the problem. To-night is not the time to enter into a discussion of that question; we shall get that on the Budget. Only as a justification for this measure, not in answer to my hon. friend on the other point, I suggest that although Great Britain has enjoyed the benefits of free trade for the last sixty or seventy years, she does experience these conditions of unequal distribution of wealth in a most acute form. In other words, that one measure to which my hon. friend referred has not brought about an equitable distribution of wealth. I agree that measures should be taken to help meet the condition; we cannot go on in the future with the unequal distribution of wealth that has prevailed in the past. I believe that that unequal distribution is in a very substantial measure responsible for the world-wide social unrest. We must recognize the fact that in the future division of the results of the joint effort of labour and capital, labour must have a larger share, and any wise administrative act that may be carried out with a view to bringing about this result will tend to improve and stabilize social and industrial conditions.

The hon. member (Sir Herbert Ames) said that he thought these proposals did not meet a condition which existed in Montreal. This scheme does cover the duplex house—the two-story house—which is almost a standard house in certain sections of that city. With reference to the larger problem that my hon. friend has suggested, I recognize its great importance. He has made a real contribution to the discussion in what he has told us of the situation in his own city and of the steps which might be taken to relieve it. But I am rather of the opinion that a condition of that kind is a question to be taken up and dealt with by the city itself. That is the way these questions have been dealt with in Great Britain. Whole sections of the city of London have been cut right through with a view to opening up a highway between certain sections of the city. The result is that they have cleared out the old houses in the district through which this street runs, and by appropriating the land and laying it out with this fine highway running through it they have been able, through the increased selling value of the land bordering on the highway, largely to recoup themselves for the expenditure incurred in that connection.

I am rather of the opinion, while I do not know the conditions in Montreal, that if any one took up the proposition and undertook to clear up certain of those sections, and lay them out in improved style, the city should not be a great loser by the cost of doing it. In other words, the return, under the improved conditions, should compensate the city for the outlay in clearing up the situation.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Might not some of this money be made available for that purpose?

Mr. ROWELL: I suppose the only reason is this, the reason which the hon. member has mentioned, that this sum will not do everything. Certain limits must be placed upon it. My hon. friend might suggest that the Government should vote more money for this purpose; but the Government, having regard to the many demands on it, thought this was a fair amount to provide. I cannot say whether, if the Quebec Government requested that we should endeavour to meet the situation, the Dominion Government might not see its way to consider the matter, but at the present time we have had no request from the Quebec Government to deal with it in that way.

In conclusion, let me say one word in reference to the observations of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) as

to the provinces taking advantage of this scheme and how soon they will put up houses. Two or three weeks ago, I wired the premiers of all the provinces to find out how much of this sum they would need this year, with the view that if they did not require the whole of the $25,000,000 this year, I might reduce the estimate in view of the other very heavy charges on the country. The replies I received from all the provinces that are taking advantage of the loan indicate that they will require the full amount, and some of the provinces are, I am glad to say, adding a substantial sum themselves to the amount they are receiving for this housing scheme.

Mr. PARDEE: Is any specified sum to be given to each province?

Mr. ROWELL: Ontario, at an early date, stated $2,000,000, but I think it has increased that amount. I cannot give the exact amount, but it is increasing the amount by a substantial sum. Ontario was, I think, one of the provinces that intimated that it would require the whole amount and would be glad if more was available.

Mr. PARDEE: How will the loan be apportioned?

Mr. ROWELL: Each province gets its proportion according to population. I have heard that Quebec is also putting up an amount. I am not officially informed of the fact, and therefore I cannot submit it to the committee.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: The object of this resolution is practically to expropriate land and start new suburban residences, and in that case probably many streets would have to be laid out. Sewers would have to be put in and a considerable amount of money spent in engineering, architectural designing, and so on. Is it the intention ultimately to apportion all this on the cost of dwellings to the working men?

Mr. ROWELL: No. While municipalities may have the power to spend this money in developing suburban areas, there is no obligation on them to do so. The money might be spent in the heart of the city in unoccupied areas available for buildings, just as it might be spent in suburban areas. With reference to the case mentioned by my hon. friend, that is a question with which the province would deal absolutely. Under the Ontario system, where local improvements are provided, a certain percentage of the cost is assumed by the municipality and a certain percentage charged to the lots, and I presume that law would apply to any sections laid out under these proposals.

Mr. PARDEE: I am quite in sympathy with the principle of this resolution, but it appears to contain some incongruities. In connection with the question raised by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), I think the Government has gone too far in that section in putting the maximum income of those to whom this scheme may apply at $3,000. Let me take the minister's own words for it. If I understand aright the principle of a Housing Bill, it is to help those who are in congested districts and who are more or less, or who may be classed as, the poorer portion of the population. They are necessarily the poorest class of the population; otherwise they would not reside in the congested districts. Taking that as a premise, may I refer to the illustration given by the minister himself, that when he asked John Burns what measure of social reform he would most gladly recommend him to apply himself to, John Burns immediately mentioned a housing scheme. The Housing scheme in Great Britain is, I understand, applied to the class of people I have mentioned. If that be so, is it right to bring down in a resolution or a Bill a principle that those men who are earning incomes to the extent of $3,000 shall be entitled to come in under exceptionally good conditions?—to apply to the Government, to receive their loans, and to get the amount that they are allowed to get under those resolutions, while those who are not nearly so well off are not allowed to do so? Does not that mean that a man who is earning $3,000 a year is in a much better position to apply for and obtain this loan. and as a consequence will get more out of it than any other man will? I think that is unquestionably so. Let us take Shacktown, for instance, which the minister mentioned. I have been there and I wonder how many of those people are in receipt of an income of $3,000 a year. If they were, they would not be living in that district and in that class of houses. This loan should be applied with a much smaller maximum income than is here set out. It is true, the minister says, that the Provincial Government has a right to make it less, but we all know that Provincial Governments—and my experience is that they are all much alike in this respect—if they have the right to take advantage of a maximum in a Bill will take it, and will say: The Dominion Government gave us the right to go as high as

10 p.m.

$3,000 and we shall do so. I strongly urge upon the minister—and I am not criticising in any hostile spirit—that the maximum ought to be considerably reduced, so that it might and would apply to those who are much more in need of the assistance which this resolution will give to them than those who receive incomes amounting to $3,000. I think that would be the right thing for the Government to do, and under those circumstances they would be helping the class of people who are much more in need of help than the people to whom this resolution would, at the maximum rate, apply.

Mr. M. CLARK: I am sure the Committee will agree that we have had from the minister a very sympathetic speech and a speech of great debating excellency. I rise only to clear myself from a misapprehension which I should have not expected to arise in his very clear mind. I have frequently met the same argument in other quarters, but I was a little disappointed to hear it from the minister. He seemed to think that I suggested that by some fiscal arrangement the milennium could be brought about. That was not in my mind by any means. He pointed out that under a certain fiscal arrangement in Britain there are slums, and inferentially he argued that slums are the product, perhaps, of that fiscal arrangement.

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. M. CLARK: Well, that they have not been cured by that fiscal arrangement.

Mr. ROWELL: They have not been cured by it.

Mr. M. CLARK: While that fiscal arrangement has been in existence in Great Britain, to my hon. friend's intimate knowledge as well as to my own, it has made the people so prosperous that before the war they were drinking intoxicating liquors as beverages to the sum of $800,000,000 or more. That is conduct on the part of the people of Great Britain which I am sure meets with the absolute disapproval of my hon. friend; but his disapproval does not alter the fact as to their conduct, nor does it alter the sum that has been spent in that way, nor does it alter the other economic fact with which he is very well acquainted, that if people spend too much money on intoxicating liquors out of comparatively limited incomes they will very likely get into slums under whatsoever fiscal arrangement they may live.

I wanted to clear myself from the misapprehension which appears to have arisen in the mind of my hon. friend. I have no panacea for society, I have no panacea for poverty; none of us have. It might easily be argued on very high authority that there is no panacea for poverty because we were told by a very high authority two thousand years ago that the poor we have always with us, and a straining of the interpretation of that statement might lead us to think that we always will have them with us. While we do have the poor with us, their poverty is produced by many causes, and none is more potent in Great Britain than that which I have mentioned, which is totally unconnected with any fiscal arrangement. I was anxious to make a contribution, if possible, from the back benches to the wisdom and effort of the Cabinet, and I am sure my hon. friend will allow me to clear myself from possible misapprehension on this point.

Mr. BUTTS: Are we to understand that under this Bill a man living in a county like my own with large coal mining and steel manufacturing industries, if he is able to acquire half or a quarter of an acre of land, can apply to the Government and receive a loan to the amount of $3,000 for building a house? The reason I ask is that I have some land myself, and I was just thinking that if I were to distribute it among a number of indiscriminates perhaps I might get some money out of this Government that I never expected to get.

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid my hon. friend would not qualify under this Bill. He would have to apply to the provincial government and satisfy them that he was a workman and came within the conditions set out.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I am not altogether in accord with this measure, because I believe with the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) that the object should be to remove slums. If that were the object, so far as the West and the cities of the western provinces are concerned, we have no slums. There is only one alternative to consider, and that is the one which was put forward this evening by the minister, namely, that most of the money should be spent in assisting the returned soldier. If that really be the object, the distribution of money proposed under this legislation is improper; the distribution should be in proportion to enlistment instead of in proportion to population. In that case the province of Alberta would

be entitled to a greater share of this appropriation than we shall get under the present proposals. If it is not the object of this legislation to assist the returned soldier, let the money be diverted to the cities to remove the slums and establish better social conditions.

I ask the minister to take into consideration my suggestion that the money should be paid to the provinces in proportion to enlistments, and not in proportion to population. Inasmuch as he has stated, and it is amply demonstrated in the Orders in Council that have been passed, that this plan is primarily for the benefit of the returned soldier—the appropriation is made from the War Vote—then let the provinces that have given the most men to fight for their country get the most money.

Mr. McMASTER: The first remark I have to offer to the Committee is that this debate plainly shows the impropriety of the way in which this legislation was introduced. Although we all recognize without the slightest reserve the ability of those gentlemen who compose the Cabinet Committee that dealt with this matter in council, this debate has showed very clearly that there are in this House opinions and views and experience which would have been valuable to the Government in drafting this legislation. Why was this plan effected by Order in Council instead of being introduced in this House by a Bill founded upon a resolution? It will be stated that Parliament was not sitting. Why was not Parliament sitting in the month of December? Parliament rose in the latter days of May, 1918; the armistice was signed in November, but Parliament was not summoned to meet until almost the end of February. I believe that the Government should not have launched upon a scheme absolutely new in this country, an absolute departure from anything the Government had done before without consulting the representatives of the people. I believe that if the Government had consulted the representatives of the people they would have got a very much better plan than the one before us to-night.

My next submission is that this discussion is more or less of an academic character. The scheme must be worked in co-operation with the provinces. The provinces have been consulted upon a plan prepared by Order in Council and many of them have formulated their schemes on the plan submitted to them Therefore, although the minister kindly pays the closest and most courteous attention to our suggestion, after all the matter is largely concluded, and it is practically impossible for us at this time, even if we were able to convince the minister that we were right, to change the plan. That only goes to prove how well it is to stick to sound constitutional usage, and not to attempt short cuts. Very often the shortest road to any objective is the travelled road —the road which is lighted by the lamps of experience.

There were some good suggestions offered by the hon. member for St. Antoine whose contribution to the evening's discussion was most valuable. I agree with the minister on that score, but he seemed to think that the member for Red Deer had been beside the point because he had spoken about fundamentals. Suppose that instead of being called upon to give his opinion upon a national question, the member for Red Deer had been summoned as a physician and had found the patient lying on the bed in a superheated room suffering from fever, while the member for St. Antoine was busy administering a small homeopathic pill. And suppose the member for Red Deer had ordered the windows to be thrown open to let in the air. Would he have gone beyond his duty as a medical practitioner? I do not think so, and my opinion is that he was absolutely within his province as a member of the House when he said—and I agree with every word that he said—that the present measure is a mere palliative, and that this country can never prosper under the application of palliatives. It is just as if a man came in hungry after a hard day's work and were offered a little cube of beef tea. We have overcrowding in this country in some of the large cities, and this proposal will not obviate such overcrowding. Men will live near their work if they possibly can, and what the member for St. Antoine said is absolutely right, that putting up nice houses of $3,000, $4,000 and $4,500 in pleasant suburbs will not remove congestion in the congested parts of cities. What are the slums due to? They are due, I take it, among other things to a bad system of municipal taxation. I think this has more to do with congestion than perhaps almost anything else, and that is something that is not in the purview of this House. Then I believe that effective means of transportation have a great deal to do with slum congestion; and thirdly slum congestion in our large cities is, I think, due to a false and unsound economic practice which this country has been following for thirty years and more. This is a time of reconstruction,

and it is a time for the Canadian people to examine these questions to the very core and make up their minds as to what is the right thing to do. I am afraid that this is a mere palliative. We have all sorts of plasters in the pharmacopoeia and this is almost a shinplaster. If we take the average cost of houses at $3,500—they run as I understand it from $3,000 to $4,500—I am afraid that at the present cost of building, the houses will probably cost nearer the larger than the smaller figure. But let us take the next smallest figure as our basis, $3,500. If we divide the $25,000,000 by $3,500, we have 7,142 houses. Let us suppose that the average family will consist of five persons, and we shall have 35,710 persons to be accommodated. Now, this is not restricted to the returned soldier; anybody can get it by meeting the necessary requirements. As it is not mentioned that the applicant is to be a returned soldier, the authorities administering the Act must of necessity take applications as they come forward indiscriminately as to whether they are returned soldiers or not. If they did not, they would not be carrying out the intention of the legislation. I think that if we find housing accommodation for two or three regiments we shall be accomplishing as much as we can expect, and therefore I am very much afraid that we are going to spend a great deal of money and will not help the returned soldiers to any large extent. The member for St. Antoine said that we would not be increasing the financial debt by this system. Well, if all the money is well laid out and is all paid back we shall only lose the difference between what it costs us to borrow the money and what is paid back, but meanwhile we shall increase the debt although the net debt will not be increased by a large amount. I am not altogether opposed to this measure, although I do not think it is a wise one. I am thoroughly convinced that under our federal system it would be infinitely better for such matters as this to be dealt with by the municipalities or the provinces. If that is not done you are going to have the spectacle which we see now of trying to suggest types of houses for half a continent with climates and local, physical and geographical conditions altogether different. The plan which has been laid down for houses may be quite suitable to Nova Scotia and be absolutely inapplicable to Alberta, and this, I think is a very serious defect. It is centralization as against decentralization and as a rule in matters of administration I prefer the system of decentralization. Of this I am thoroughly convinced and my words are borne out by what the Minister of Labour said yesterday or the day before in another place, that we cannot expect to have lower cost of living in Canada until we get more people on the land. And if you are going to endeavour by governmental aid to effect a return to proper living conditions, it is your duty to encourage the flow of population from the city to the soil, which will not be done by this project. The scheme does not contemplate the building of farm cottages for farm servants, and I think that one thing that would help the development of rural life in Canada would be this assistance to farmers where necessary, in the furnishing of proper building accommodation, in order that a man who had a liking for country life might find proper accommodation for himself and his family. I believe that one of the obstacles that keep people from rural pursuits is the fact that the young man who goes on the farm has to live with his employer, very often to the disadvantage of the latter, as well as unpleasant to the hired man, who likes to have a time for himself away from his daily work. But the great obstacle to the development of farm life is the fact that the hired man cannot look forward to marriage because he cannot get a house of his own with facilities for founding a family. I believe that this proposal is absolutely wanting; that it fails to go to the root of the matter in view of the fact that it makes no provision for the development of proper living conditions in the rural parts of the country.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member (Mr. McMaster) has just said that the proposal is unalterable in its terms. I did not so understand the minister who is in charge of the proposal. Am I to understand that the matter has not yet been crystallized in the form of legislation, that the negotiations with the provinces are almost in a tentative state at present, and that nothing is absolutely and finally agreed upon.

I suggested that it would be well to reduce the application of the Bill so that a man with an income of $50,000, on a six per cent basis, could not take advantage of it, and the minister said that that sum might well be reduced; therefore, I assume that it is still within his power to assure the House that the point will be taken up and dealt with. If so, the argument of the hon. member falls to the ground. I would like

the minister to assure me as to that point and also to give an assurance that he will reduce the sum, I would say, to an amount not exceeding $1,800.

Mr. MICHAUD: Make it $1,000.

Mr. MORPHY: I would not like to go any further than that just now until I have some stronger reason for doing so. With regard to the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMaster) in regard to this country following a false economic policy, I would invite his attention to the slight divergence of opinion between him and his leader (Mr. McKenzie). I should think that the quarrels on that side—

Mr. McMASTER: I did not catch the hon. gentleman's remark.

Mr. MORPHY: I would invite the hon. gentleman's attention to the divergence of opinion between himself and his leader, who claimed that he was not an extremely high protectionist, and I understood got a scolding from some of his friends because he dared to make such a statement in this House. The quarrel, Mr. Chairman, is on the Opposition side, and I think that the hon. gentlemen sitting there should settle it between themselves.

An hon. MEMBER: Do not lose any sleep over it.

Mr. MORPHY: I will not lose any sleep over it, and I do not think anybody else will, even if the row is a noisy one. We can continue on lines that have been settled by the country and maintain a fiscal policy that both political parties have agreed upon for many years past. I do not think there will be much trouble about it, adapting the policy, as it always has been adapted, to the amelioration of conditions of hardship, and to the betterment of conditions in places where they can be bettered. I would like the minister to state now, if he can, whether or not the proposition can be limited to a man who has got an income of, say, $1,800 a year?

Mr. ROWELL: I would point out that the clause to which the hon. member refers—in fact all the clauses under that head, from 1 to 12 inclusive—are simply recommendations to the provincial governments. If he will turn to page 14 he will see it is expressly provided that additional recommendations may be made from time to time, as experience is gained and comparative information is collected, from different provinces. It is open to the Federal Government at any time to make new recommendations to the provincial governments in connection with any of the twelve or fourteen conditions referred to.

Mr. MORPHY: My objection still stands, notwithstanding a reading of the provisions of the Bill. If a provincial government knows that this Parliament has approved of the larger sum there will be a tendency to work up to it. If the provincial governments know that the smaller sum is the maximum there will be a tendency to work to that; and I feel, recognizing the human elements of governments, the friendships that men form with ministers, and the avenues that get them "next" here and there, that men of wealth will get in under this scheme, although the minister will admit to me that he does not intend that they should. If it is possible to so arrange with the provincial governments that no man possessing $50,000, which on a six per cent basis would bring him in an income of $3,000, can get in under this housing scheme, I want it done. It seems to me that the limit of $1,800, based on the investment of $30,000 at six per cent is not intended to be covered by this scheme. I do not believe the country is looking for a man who owns that much money to be assisted in the way proposed by this Bill. Therefore I want to know now, if the minister is at liberty to answer me, whether it is too late to make the change I have suggested.

Mr. ROWELL: First, I do not think any change is necessary to meet the point my hon. friend mentions. It would not be in accordance with the principle upon which this Bill is framed for any provincial governments to allow a man under such conditions to take advantage of the scheme. The whole thing is predicated on it being help for the workingmen. At the same time, if my hon. friend thinks the plan is open to that interpretation I have not the least objection to communicating with the provincial governments, and to point out that it is not the intention of these regulations, or the view of the Government, that in administering them the money shall be expended in the way referred to. It is quite open to us to do that. We have not deemed it wise to impose any of these features as conditions; they are only recommendations. The provinces are borrowers; they must take a certain measure of responsibility. If we are granting money to them outright we should define exactly what the conditions are; but we have only felt justified in suggesting four main conditions, or rather re-

commendations. I say to my hon. friend now that I will draw the attention of the prime ministers of the provinces to the fact that this question has been raised in the House, point out that it is entirely contrary to the whole spirit of the regulation, and state that we do not expect the money to be expended in any such way.

Mr. MORPHY: Just one word more. The pamphlet which I hold in my hand is entitled "Housing in Canada. General Project of Federal Government." It is printed by the King's Printer, and I presume is issued at the instance of the Government?

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so.

Mr. MORPHY: It is set forth in the section I have already read:

> No person in receipt of an income exceeding $3,000 per annum shall be eligible as a purchaser or tenant under this scheme.

Now, inferentially that says, as plainly as language can do so, that a person who has got an income of not more than $3,000 can get in under the scheme. If the proposition is sent forward in that shape to the provinces, they will say: "Your own data furnished by yourselves, gave us the latitude to let Mr. John Brown, who has got $50,000 out at interest at six per cent, and earning not a cent more than $3,000" (providing possibly he was a returned soldier) "come in if he complies with all the other condtions." I do not think that is the intention of the Government; it surely cannot be. It is declared in this very paragraph that the money shall be loaned to those who most need it. I do not think a man who owns $30,000 or who has $50,000 could possibly need any assistance from the Government. I think it would be monstrous that he should be allowed to get such assistance, and yet the propaganda published by the Government says that he may.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: We in Western Canada, particularly in the city which I represent, when the Order in Council providing for this housing scheme was passed early in the year, were very much taken with it. But since that time, conferring in our cities with our Provincial Government as to how the scheme is to be worked out, we find that it does not seem to be making the progress expected, and does not appeal to our people so strongly as it did at the first blush. In Western Canada our country is new, and our cities are of recent growth, and we have not the slums that exist in some of the eastern cities which have been mentioned this evening.

Nevertheless, we have an acute shortage of houses. In my own city since the House assembled I have had to get permission from the Public Works Department for the use of the local immigration hall to house returned soldiers and their families, there being no places of residence available.

What our people object to is that although this is taken hold of as a national scheme, it is hardly fair that the municipality should be saddled with the financial responsibility, that is, to the extent of reducing its borrowing power. Apparently the policy as propounded by our provincial government was for them to accept the money from the Dominion Government and pass it on to the city authorities, that money then becoming a charge against the borrowing power of the city. Now, during the past four years all public works in Western Canada practically ceased, with the result that at the present time many public works are needed, and the municipal authorities feel that the urgency for those public works is so great that it will take up pretty well all their borrowing powers to finance them. Therefore they do not wish to load those borrowing powers with this extra burden, viewing it as a national scheme.

I would like to ask the minister if he thinks it possible in any way to so work out the scheme that the money can be advanced the same as it is in Great Britain, the national Government taking the full responsibility of advancing to the municipalities, leaving them to administer the loan? Our people view with some little apprehension the present high cost of building material, and they feel that in four or five years there will be a considerable depreciation in property corresponding with the depreciation in the prices of building materials, with a possible loss to them. In the British housing scheme the Government bears 75 per cent of that loss. To sum up, I have here a clipping from a newspaper which gives the views of our cities as expressed in a resolution passed at a convention held to discuss this matter. It reads:

> Resolved that this meeting of delegates from towns and cities in the province of Saskatchewan is of opinion that the proper housing of the workers and returned soldiers at this time is extremely urgent and is a national question, and requests the provincial Government in cooperation with the other provincial Governments of Canada to bring the matter before the Dominion Government and urge it to assume all responsibility in financing housing schemes, the municipalities being made responsible only for administration.

I received a communication a few days ago from an association in our city requesting me to bring this to the attention of the Government. At the present time, so far as we are concerned, unless there is some change of our view point, it seems that we are not likely to take any advantage of this scheme, although when it was first mentioned our city of Saskatoon went so far as to make application for a loan of $500,000; but when they found it was to be made a direct charge against their borrowing power they felt it was not of such very great advantage to borrow from the Government. At the present time we could borrow $500,000 from other sources, but might have to pay a cent and a half more interest.

Mr. ROWELL: I have listened to my hon. friend with very great interest. He has presented very clearly the views of the people of Saskatoon as they have been communicated to us. Let me point out that this matter first came up at the Interprovincial Conference at the instance of one of the provinces to see if the Dominion Government would loan the money. All the provinces were represented. Hon. Mr. Martin, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, Hon. Mr. Dunning, and Hon. Mr. Turgeon representing Saskatchewan. The matter was discussed, and the Dominion Government decided that it would make advances to the provinces, imposing certain conditions which I have outlined. Therefore it is a provincial scheme with Federal co-operation.

With reference to imposing an obligation on the municipalities, this Governmeut does not impose any such obligation. This Government loans the money to the province. The province itself may loan it direct to the applicants for loans; it may loan it to housing companies, citizens organized for the purpose of erecting suitable houses, or it may loan it to municipalities; it may loan it to private individuals, or it may buy land itself and develop it. The province has full and complete jurisdiction over the matter, and it is purely a question between the municipality and the province as to whether any obligation should be imposed upon the municipality.

With reference to the Government changing its policy and loaning to municipalities or handing the money over to them for administration, I can only say that the Government has considered the representations which have been made to that effect. We have not seen our way clear to adopt that suggestion and I think my hon. friend will agree that the Government would be assuming a very great responsibility if it turned over large sums of money to various municipalities throughout the province for them to administer without having any direct control over such administration. It would be changing the whole basis upon which this policy is framed.

As to the high cost of building, and the fact that there might be some loss consequent upon building at the present time while we all hope that present conditions will not become the normal condition and that the cost of building will be reduced, I am afraid that there is not the evidence of a decline in the cost of building which a good many people thought would come about after the signing of the armistice. In view of the rate of wages being paid and being demanded, and in view of many other considerations entering into the cost of building, it does not seem probable that we shall get back for many years to come, if ever, to the conditions which prevailed prior to the war. Therefore, people should not be deterred from building at the present time. A private citizen seeking to borrow the whole amount necessary to build a house—as he could under this scheme—could not get it in my hon. friend's province at less than over eight per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: Could he get the whole amount on any terms?

Mr. ROWELL: Probably he could not get it on any terms. But assuming that he could go into the market and get the bulk of the money, it would cost him eight per cent for at least fifty per cent of the amount required, and he would have to pay a good deal more for the next twenty-five or thirty per cent if he was able to obtain it. That means that the total loan —if he could get it— would probably cost him nine or ten per cent. When he gets it under this scheme at five per cent on the twenty-year payment plan, the Government is contributing twenty-five or thirty per cent of the cost, because of the lower rate of interest. I think the cost is not likely to be reduced below that figure for many years to come. A workingman who builds a house within the next few years with money borrowed at five per cent for twenty years and with the right to pay back principal and interest will not be a dollar out of pocket and will be in no less favourable position than the man who builds his house three, four or five years hence. In fact, I am inclined to think that he will be money in pocket, on the basis of that rate of interest and plan of repayment.

The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) objects, first, because we did not bring down a Bill when Parliament met, instead of taking action by Order in Council; and, second, because, he says, this is only a palliative. Why did we act before Parliament met? For several reasons. First, the provinces wanted to know what the Dominion was going to do in order that they might formulate their own plans. Second, the provinces wanted to know at once the terms on which they could get the money. Third, if housing was to be proceeded with this spring, it was necessary that the provinces should have this information at once in order that they might proceed with their plans. Fourth, the soldiers were returning; they were in need of houses, and it was essential that progress should be made in providing houses for them. An additional reason was that employment might be available this spring to help meet the anticipated serious unemployment because immediately after the armistice was signed last November the majority of the people looked forward to a serious condition of unemployment. The Government felt, therefore, that in order to meet the conditions it was well within their power to agree with the Provincial Governments to make these advances on the terms they did.

My hon. friend referred to the question of orders in Council. I admit that the question whether the Government should act in a particular matter by Order in Council or by a Bill is a proper one for discussion and for legitimate difference of opinion. I promised the committee the other evening, when we were discussing the Northwest Mounted Police Estimates, that I would make a statement with regard to the matter of Orders in Council. But we went on to discuss other points, and I passed over it. As the hon. member for Brome has brought it up on this occasion, I shall say a word on the subject now.

I think it was an article in Le Devoir that first brought forcibly home to me the enormity of the offences which I was committing as President of the Council in grinding out so many Orders in Council. It was stated in that paper that more Orders in Council had been passed in one year while I was President of the Council than had been passed in eighteen or twenty years previously. I think the number of years stated was eighteen or twenty; in any case, it was very many years. I really commenced to think that I must be a very bad man indeed if so many Orders in Council were being turned out while I was President of the Council.

Mr. BELAND: I thought Le Devoir was the minister's organ?

Mr. ROWELL: Well, not recently—to put it mildly. Upon seeing this statement of Le Devoir I was interested in looking the matter up, and I got some figures from the Clerk of the Privy Council. I went back for ten years; let me read the figures. Nobody who has been a member of the Privy Council, as the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and some other members opposite have been, takes seriously this talk of "Government by Order in Council". You might just as well say that municipalities should not legislate by by-law.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I point out the difference? On matters of simple routine, of course, we must pass Orders in Council; the Government is carried on by Orders in Council in matters of routine. But when you rule by Order in Council on a question of policy at a time when Parliament is in session you are making a mistake from the constitutional point of view.

Mr. BUREAU: It is legislation by Order in Council that we object to.

Mr. ROWELL: I am glad to have my hon. friend's statement that we carry on Government by Orders in Council. That is the way the Government acts.

Mr. BUREAU: You carry on Parliament by Order in Council.

Mr. ROWELL: I will touch on that in a minute. As I say, that is the way the Government acts; it is the manner in which the decision of the Government is given on matters of routine and on matters of policy. In the same way a municipality acts by by-law or resolution; the Cabinet acts by Order in Council or by Minute of Council approved by the Cabinet. Now, what is the record? In 1908, 4,832 Orders in Council were passed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With all due deference to the minister, may I say that these statistics are purely childish?

Mr. ROWELL: It is very well for my hon. friend to say so, because they completely undermine all that he has said on other occasions.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Mr. ROWELL: I will give the figures, anyway. I have told my hon. friend that

the occasion for my looking up the figures was because of the statement that so many more Orders in Council had been passed recently than had been passed in previous years. The figures are as follows:—

Year.	Orders in Council passed.
1908	4,832
1909	4,865
1910	4,769
1911	5,732
1913	6,728
1914	5,815
1915	6,245
1916	7,282
1917	6,991
1918	6,246

Mr. CAHILL: How many of those Orders in Councils were passed under the War Measures Act?

Mr. ROWELL: I have not the figures of that. There would, no doubt, be a substantial number, but the great majority of them in every year are purely routine. My hon. friend knows that not an Order in Council can be passed unless this Parliament has given the executive authority.

Mr. DUFF: By closure.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend was not in the House when that Act was passed. The War Measures Act, under which action has been taken, was passed unanimously, if I remember aright, by the House of Commons. There was not a dissenting voice, and the Government has acted only under an Act passed with the unanimous consent of the Parliament of Canada, and passed for the very purpose of giving to the Government power to act in case of emergency during the progress of the war. In passing this particular Order in Council, the Government were simply exercising that authority. My hon. friend may say that a measure like this should have been held over and dealt with by this House. That is perfectly legitimate criticism, and men may honestly differ as to whether that may be the case or not. I take the view, and I believe the Government will take the view, that they were justified in the action they took under the conditions that existed at the time.

With regard to the remark made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) that this was a mere palliative, I shall not argue the matter further. It is a good deal more than that. All these social measures are matters of vital moment affecting the social and industrial welfare of the people.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am very sorry to see any minister obstructing his own Estimates, and if I could, by Order in Council or otherwise, restrict the minister's time or put him under closure, I think he would get his Estimates through very much more quickly. It is a great gift and a great privilege to have masterful command of the King's English, but sometimes it is rather a drawback to be so generous in the use of it, as sometimes we find the President of the Council. If I had any advice to give him, it would be to be a little more sparing in replies. He will always find opportunities to continue speaking for the next six months if he will reply to everybody who seems to be seeking information.

Mr. ROWELL: I thought it a matter of courtesy to my hon. friends on the other side.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is such a thing as too much courtesy. I am very glad to find courtesy, and I have no reason to complain of the courtesy of hon. gentlemen on the other side. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy)—and I am sorry he is not in the House—thought that he had occasion to refer to myself and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), by saying that we were not on friendly terms.

11 p.m.

He is entirely misinformed; he is almost lacking in information in that regard as the President of the Council is about this Housing scheme. Let me assure the hon. member for North Perth that, while there are many things on which he could with profit look over to this side of the House for information and light and guidance, when he is looking for quarrels and schemes and divisions and subterfuges, he can find plenty of that in the Government and in the benches on his own side of the House without coming over here. Let me assure him again: The Opposition is getting along quietly, nicely, with the very best of feeling, not only amongst themselves, but with their friends on the other side of the House.

I refrained purposely from saying anything about this housing proposition, as I really had no fixed ideas about it, simply because of the way in which this has been put through. It is a new idea, a new scheme, a new principle in this country, and whenever people launch upon a new principle, the matter should come before Parliament and be threshed out in the form of a resolution and legislation passed based upon that resolution. That is the constitution and the safe way to proceed. The President of the Council says that he finds many Orders

in Council passed in different years and not many more since the war than before. That is not the question, and as the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has said, a comparison of those figures does not make us any wiser. We do not complain that the War Measures Act was passed, that that power was given to the Government, but we claim that the Government has put constructions on that Act and has done things under it which they should not have done; that they have strained the powers which were given to them under that Act, and that the powers given to them under that Act should be interpreted by the Government in the light of the reasons for which that Act was passed. It is a well known principle that history must be read according to the conditions at the time at which it was written, and Acts of Parliament ought to be construed by courts or Governments according to the reasons for which they were passed. Will the President of the Council, with his training as a lawyer, say that Parliament, when this Act was being passed, had in mind that it should be used for the purpose of putting railroads into liquidation or appointing receivers for railways put into liquidation? No man would think of such a thing at the time; but the President of the Council, and the rest of the Government, have used this Act for that purpose and for many other things equally as bad. We on this side of the House say that there is no justification whatever for using the War Measures Act for any portion of this housing scheme except one. The minister would be perfectly justified, and the people of this country would justify him, in using that power in order to provide homes for returned soldiers, if that is necessary. The minister's department is not the department in which returned soldiers should be looked after. We have a Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, with a minister at the head of it, and it has all the necessary machinery and ought to look after the returned soldier in every phase of his requirements. Why not, then, leave the housing of the returned soldier to that department? If it is in a position to bring in here proper information as to the scale of housing required in the different cities and towns for the returned soldier, and if those requirements are properly set forth in Parliament, there would be no criticism at all. But here is a scheme which does not touch the returned soldier more than any body else. Everybody and everything are put into the boiling-pot, and, as has been pointed out by some of the supporters of the Government, the wealthy man, the capitalist can take advantage of this scheme to get cheap money and build houses which he can rent at any price he thinks fit. I submit—the minister is not to blame for this—that the Government has not the information on this subject which they should have. They simply jumped at a conclusion, passed an Order in Council under the War Measures Act, and accepted the scheme of the provinces whatever it was. The members on this side of the House have often complained of the armies of commissions that have been appointed by this Government for different reasons, some of them good, some very bad. I submit that during the last ten years no scheme has been submitted by a Government in this country that would more fully justify the appointment of a commission to inquire into and report on the conditions than this very subject of housing. A commission is travelling through the country to-day on the very proper mission of ascertaining the social and industrial conditions of the country, and I submit that one of the matters that that commission could legitimately and properly inquire into is this very question of housing. They would then be able to tell the Government what was really required, and the minister could bring down to the House information that would be of value and which would justify us in agreeing to the expenditure of this money. But that information is not here, that inquiry has not been made. Without the slightest intention of being unkind or lacking in courtesy, let me say that in my judgment we are not in possession, much less is the Government in possession of the detailed information that they should have about this scheme before launching upon a loan of $25,000,000 of money which they have not got. If they had the money it would be all very well, but they have to borrow this money from somebody else, and then lend it to somebody else who is going to lend it to somebody else. It is only in the most extreme and necessitous cases that we should undertake to spend money in view of the financial conditions of the country to-day. If we can by any possibility get along as we have been getting along for the last ten or fifteen years, let us try to do so until the financial condition of the country improves. It is represented to us by members of the Government who have addressed themselves to the question of national fin-

ance that we are short some hundreds of millions of dollars of what we need. In face of these conditions we find the Government proposing to borrow $20,000,000 for highways, $25,000,000 for housing, and from $25,000,000 to $100,000,000 to create trade with foreign countries. The debt of this country is something over two billion dollars; our revenue is falling off, and our sources of revenue are less promising. These are the conditions which the Government should take well into consideration before launching upon schemes to borrow money which we can do without. The hon. member for Brome has very well said that a housing scheme belongs naturally to cities and provinces. The laws to-day are too lax respecting the way in which concerns who hire men look after them. In the province of Nova Soctia, though it is not very large, we have thousands upon thousands of working men, and as a rule they are very well housed. In the town of Glace Bay in Cape Breton, you will see thousands upon thousands of workmen's houses, each with its plot of land and all the equipment necessary for comfort. The different companies for which these men work are obliged to keep the houses up in that style, or they could not get the men to work for them. If the manufacturers and other large employers of labour throughout the country were given to understand that one of the conditions under which they would be permitted to hire men and carry on their business was that their employees should be properly housed, we would be beginning at the right end. We would be dealing with the people who had the power to bring about the right conditions, and if it was necessary, money could be lent to them. That would be better than beginning where we are beginning now, because from what information I have been able to gather from the minister, a poor man cannot take advantage of this plan at all. It is mere talk so far as the poor man is concerned. If anybody wants to borrow money from the Government he must show that he owns the land and that he is in a position to make a start. It is very much like going to a land company to borrow.

Mr. ROWELL: Perhaps I did not make myself clear if I left that impression on my hon. friend's mind. The man who owns the lot may borrow the money. The whole plan is based on the view that the provincial government may buy property and sell it again. The provinces, of course, accept the responsibility. We impose no limit on the provinces, but the provinces themselves in a good many cases do impose some limit. Ontario, for instance, loans 85 per cent of the total cost of the land and the house. This whole scheme is designed just for the purpose of aiding the working man of limited means.

Mr. McKENZIE: All I have to say in conclusion is that I am in hearty accord with any scheme that will provide a home for the returned soldier, if it is gone about in the proper way and if the soldier is not kept waiting too long. In my part of the country I do not think there will be very much trouble about the returned soldier. Most of them came from the steel and coal works and from the farms. The soldier who left the farm, when he comes back, naturally wants to go back to the farm if he is physically fit, and it is the same with the coal miners and the steel workers. So we have not had very much trouble in Nova Scotia in that respect. If we were having trouble we would be very glad to have provision made. Of course, it may be quite different in other places. If the minister in co-operation with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, could formulate a concrete scheme for accelerating conditions which would help the returned soldier and his family to be properly housed he would have the hearty co-operation and sympathy and support of hon. members on this side of the House. But in view of the financial condition of the country to-day, I am not in favour of a general housing policy upon which we have not sufficient information.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many applications have been received from returned soldiers?

Mr. ROWELL: We only loan to the provinces. The applications are made to the provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the minister not know the number through the provinces?

Mr. ROWELL: No, the provinces do not return that to us. The provinces act on the applications—Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. BUREAU: I desire once more to protest against the manner in which we are called upon to vote this $25,000,000. This expenditure ought to have gone through the usual channel. The item in the Estimates says that this $25,000,000 is to encourage the erection of dwelling houses in congested districts. In the discussion that has taken place this evening suggestions have been made that the money could be used to buy suburban lots or to

create new subdivisions, to have new towns planned, and so on. My hon. friend contends that it was necessary to invoke the War Measures Act and pass an Order in Council. I think he is going too far. The Order in Council was passed on 3rd December, 1918, but the armistice was signed in November, 1918, and the War Measures Act, as has been remarked by my hon. leader, did not contemplate such things as this. If any power can be derived from the War Measures Act in connection with the present measure, it is under section 6 of the Act, the marginal note of which reads, "Special powers of Governor in Council." The general clause of the War Measures Act says that it shall cease to have force and effect upon proclamation of the Governor, duly published, that the war is at an end. Section 3 of the Act says that the provisions of section 6 shall only be enforced during the war, invasion, or insurrection, real or apprehended. We need not quibble on words. We know very well that to all intents and purposes the war ceased with the signing of the armistice, and in fact demobilization started from that time. The Order in Council was subsequent to that, and there is no justification whatever for the Government introducing this estimate based on an Order in Council. Generally when the Government want money they introduce a resolution and a Bill is presented. The resolution is discussed and the Bill is put through its various stages, and when it is agreed upon it becomes a concrete statute and every citizen of Canada can refer to it and know where to find it. I do not want to bore the Committee but I certainly desire to register my protest against this procedure, and will go further. We have not been credited on this side of the House with a superabundance of loyalty, but I may say that we never created such a condition of things as to make the representative of the King in this country falsify himself or break his promise. Yet this is what the President of the Council is doing to-day. On the 20th of February, 1919, an extra of the Canada Gazette contained the following:

Chamber of the Senate.

Ottawa, Thursday, the 20th February, 1919.

This day, at three o'clock, p.m., His Excellency the Governor Genaral proceeded in state to the Chamber of the Senate, in the Parliament Buildings, and took his seat upon the Throne. The members of the Senate being assembled, His Excellency was pleased to command the attendance of the House of Commons, and that House being present, His Excellency was pleased to open the Second Session

of the Thirteenth Parliament of the Dominion of Canada with the following Speech:—

In this speech I find the following·

Your attention will also be invited to Bills providing for aid in the construction of highways, etc.

I pass that paragraph. The other paragraph says:

Bills will also be submitted for the promotion of vocational education; for the creation of a Department of Public Health; for promoting better housing conditions throughout the Dominion by loans made for the purpose to the several provincial governments, and for the validation by Parliament of Orders in Council prohibiting the importation and manufacture of intoxicating beverages,—

and so on. It will be observed that in this speech by the Governor made to both Houses of Parliament it is promised that during the present session a Bill will be introduced providing for a better housing scheme. But what have we to-day to discuss? We are called upon to discuss an item which occupies about five or six lines in the Estimates, and no Bill has yet been introduced. Will my hon. friend explain why the promise contained in the speech from the Throne has not been kept, and why he is now proceeding by Order in Council when section 3 of the War Measures Act limits the general powers contained therein to the end of the war, the provisions of section 6 being in force, to use the words of the Act, only "during the war, invasion, or insurrection real or apprehended?" My hon. friend knows as well as I do that the war has ceased, and if he did not know, the great rejoicings that occurred at the signing of the armistice would certainly convince any one that at least it was taken for granted that at that time the war had come to an end. And when that time arrived section 6 of the War Measures Act which gave special powers to the Governor in Council ceased to be of effect. My hon. friend so well understood that, and that it was necessary to confirm the Order in Council of 3rd December and have its provisions embodied in legislation, that he advised His Excellency the Governor General to include in the speech from the Throne the promise that a Bill would be presented in order that there might be no equivocation as to authority and that the House could understand the matter fully and discuss it in detail. As has been remarked by some one preceding me, this is a new departure in policy, it is a new experiment, and my hon. friend the President of the Council will agree with me that we cannot discuss this measure which is before us to-night in pamphlet

form as adequately as we could a Bill. When a Bill gets its second reading it goes before the Committee and every section is discussed, and we can get all the information that we require. But this thing is in the form of a recommendation, and absolute power is vested in the Governor in Council, notwithstanding the promise made in the speech from the Throne that the matter would be left to be dealt with by Parliament in the form of a Bill.

There is another ground for objection. The President of the Privy Council knows as well as I do—because by reason of his position he is aware of the Orders in Council that go through—that it is very hard for any one to keep track of all the Orders in Council that are passed; whereas when legislation is submitted in the form of a Bill members are enlightened and cannot plead ignorance. It is not difficult, however, to plead ignorance of Orders in Council, because I have known some of them not to be published until three and four months after they had been passed. For these reasons I protest for the hundredth time—even at the risk of being considered a bore, because while I sit here I will not allow one of the prerogatives that belong to Parliament to be invaded without registering an objection—at the course which has been followed. I claim that under the War Measures Act power could not be derived on the 3rd of December to pass an Order in Council such as the one that has been passed in this case. The only word in that Act which would justify it—and I will read the clause from the Act for the information of the Committee—is the word "welfare." That word was not intended to be coupled with such a scheme as the present—I do not use the word in any offensive sense, and perhaps it would be better to say "plan." Now section 6 of the Act reads as follows:

> The Governor in Council shall have power to do and authorize such acts and things, and to make from time to time such orders and regulations as he may, by reason of the existence of real or apprehended war, invasion, or insurrection, deem necessary or advisable for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada.

I consider that the word "welfare" is the only one in the statute which would give them authority to pass such Orders in Council as we are now considering. Under those circumstances, I desire to register my most emphatic protest against it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the minister will see that the information contained in the printed pamphlet which he gave us this evening is very important. That pamphlet we only received when he began to speak upon this item of $25,000,000, and nobody on this side has had any opportunity of reading it. I simply glanced over the pamphlet here and there, but I have not been able to fully digest its contents. I think, therefore, it would be advisable to let the Committee rise and proceed with this proposal a little later on when we have had the opportunity of fully studying what is proposed. When the minister comes down with a proposition to vote $25,000,000 for a proposal of this kind, he should not complain if it does not go through the first evening. I think he will be treating the Committee fairly by letting us have a little spell to study the information which he has placed in our hands.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend may have overlooked the fact, but printed copies of these Orders in Council were distributed and placed in the boxes of hon. members more than a month ago. If hon. members have not read them, it was not because they did not have ample opportunity to do so. I had hoped that after such a full discussion as we have had to-night the item would be allowed to pass. On concurrence, of course, my hon. friends will have the opportunity for further discussion, but I would like to get the item through to-night and make that amount of progress.

Mr. BUREAU: I remember getting one of these pamphlets, but members receive all sorts of literature during the session, and when I saw 'the little frills" on the front page of the document. I did not imagine it was of an official character. I therefore laid it aside and never thought of it again until I saw it being handed around this evening. I was greatly surprised to find Orders in Council enclosed within such a handsomely illustrated cover. Members are not used to that, so it may be regarded as a justification for some of us not paying as much attention as we might have done to the pamphlets when we first received them.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) has drawn attention to the fact that a measure on this subject was promised in the speech from the Throne. If that is the case does not the minister think the Government should implement that promise and bring down a Bill dealing with this vote? If the Government intends to do so this resolution will have to stand until that intention is fulfilled. If it is not proposed to do so,

we will have to deal with the resolution just as it is, and that will be the greater reason for reasonableness in permitting us to have a little further opportunity for consideration and discussion. This publication is signed by the President of the Privy Council and anything which bears his signature ought to be good reading. Moreover, if we are better informed on the subject there will not be the same need for asking questions. The hon. gentleman should let the committee go now. When the hour of half-past eleven comes it is time to go to our homes; to sit any longer is only impairing our usefulness for another day. We can sit here until six o'clock to-morrow morning if need be, but we should be good for very little that day. I think we do a fair amount of work each day, and it is not making an unreasonable request to ask that the committee rise now.

Mr. BUREAU: I would suggest that the Government bring in a Bill and redeem the word of His Excellency the Governor General, as given in the speech from the Throne.

Mr. ROWELL: It is not the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill, because this vote covers the whole situation. This is to provide for a loan to the provinces. If what is proposed here were the carrying on of a large administrative work under some new department the situation would be different; but this is a loan under certain conditions defined by Order in Council. If there is any further information I could give I would be glad to furnish it. I want, if possible, to get the vote through to-night and if more discussion is desired, it can take place on concurrence.

Mr. BUREAU: Are we not engaging the credit of the Government to extent of $25,000,000?

Mr. ROWELL: We are voting $25,000,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Are not we engaging the credit of the country to that extent?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, we are obligating the country to the extent of $25,000,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Then why not follow the ordinary procedure of introducing a Bill, since the Government promised to do so in the speech from the Throne.

Mr. MORPHY: I have listened to this discussion about a Bill, and it seems to me that if one were introduced, it would only contain one clause to this effect: It shall be lawful for this Parliament to lend the provinces of Canada $25,000,000 to increase the facilities for housing the people. What else could there be in it? I was rather pleased to know that the minister had taken so much pains as to distribute a pamphlet to members which gives more light and information about this particular subject than we ever have about any Bill. I do not think the criticism of hon. gentlemen as to the introduction of a Bill is very well founded, or has much cogency or force.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not observe the promise of the Governor General? Why make him false to his promise?

Mr. COPP: What will the Dominion Government contribute towards this scheme in the difference between the interest it will receive and the interest it will pay?

Mr. ROWELL: The Victory Loan was floated at 5½ per cent, and this is at 5 per cent.

Mr. COPP: Have you made an estimate of what the expenses were in connection with the Victory Loan?

Mr. ROWELL: The cost of the Victory Loan is a fixed matter, regardless of whether we loan the money this way or apply it to another purpose.

Mr. COPP: Has the minister made an estimate of what would be the cost of this particular loan?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. COPP: Will the minister state whether he has made any investigation or estimate as to what extra staff will be required by his department to carry on this work—what it will cost the country?

Mr. ROWELL: We have availed ourselves of the services of Mr. Adams, who is already with the Conservation Commission, and we have also availed ourselves of the services of two other gentlemen, one on the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the other in the Department of Public Works, who have been loaned for six months for the purpose of carrying out this work with the provinces. We expect that so far as this important end of the administration is concerned it will be over in six months. Then I think we have two additional officials, one for six months and the other for three months, their terms expiring concurrently, to take this matter up with the different provinces and arrange details.

Mr. COPP: That is all very well as to the number; I asked as to the amount.

Mr. ROWELL: The whole expense, including the payment of salaries of the men who are in other departments and are being paid in the meantime in connection with this work, I estimate will not exceed $10,000.

Mr. COPP: Then the cost to the country will be that much more. I notice on page 8 the minister further recommends that all expenses incurred by the committee be charged to the War Appropriation Vote. That refers to the expenses my hon. friend has already mentioned?

Mr. ROWELL: That is correct.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister has not answered my question as to the reasons why the Governor-General changed his mind and proceeded in this way.

Mr. ROWELL: This comes up in the Estimates, and it then comes up in the Supply Bill. It is covered by the Bill in that way. While my hon. friend is fair in his interpretation that a special Bill was implied, this is the method which the Government proposes to carry out the policy; and they think this is all that is required, simply a lump sum of $25,000,000 to be loaned to the provinces.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister would never suggest that a Supply Bill was mentioned in the speech from the Throne?

Mr. ROWELL: No. I said my hon. friend might fairly infer that there was to be a special Bill; but the Government decided that this was the best method of carrying it out.

Mr. BUREAU: Was that determination taken since the beginning of the session? The Government must have had some doubts as to the validity of the Order in Council under the War Measures Act for the reasons I have cited, and I suppose in the moment of recognizing the rights of Parliament the Council wavered and said: We are going to bring down a Bill now; we are having the other Orders in Council ratified. That I think would be justified by the War Measures Act, like the sale of intoxicating liquors, etc. The Bill mentioned in the speech from the Throne was not a Supply Bill, but a Bill for legislation, and that is what was meant, and there can be no other interpretation given to it. But the session went on, things were running smoothly, I suppose my hon. friends got more courage, and they said: We are going to bluff it through the House anyway, whether we make the Governor-General lie or not. I want to know the reason why that course was taken. There is the promise of the Governor-General to introduce a Bill for that purpose, and who is making him false to that promise I want to know?

Mr. CAHILL: How did the Government arrive at the conclusion that they should loan this money to the provinces at 5 per cent—or one-half per cent to one per cent less than we are really paying for the money—and not make a stipulation with the Provincial Governments as to the basis on which they should loan the money? The Provincial Governments are not obliged to loan it at 5 per cent; they may charge 5½ or 6 per cent. Then there is no stipulation that it shall be loaned to soldiers; it may be loaned to a provincial government, and that government may loan it to any person. As a matter of fact the two larger provinces are getting the greater part of the money, and they are getting it at a price less than the Dominion Government can borrow it on the market. How does this advantage the returned soldier when you simply let loose the money to the province; or the real poor labouring man who needs the money, when you let the province make its own arrangements with a city or a company or some private individual? I think the Government should explain that phase of it to us. We have not had an opportunity of reading this, as my hon. friend from Three Rivers pointed out. I saw this thing in my box, but, as you know, our boxes are filled up every day with temperance literature or something else which we throw into the waste paper basket, and this pamphlet went with the other stuff as far as I am concerned.

Mr. COPP: How many provinces have taken advantage of the scheme so far?

Mr. ROWELL: Ontario and British Columbia have submitted their schemes which have been approved. The Manitoba plans have been agreed upon, but the Order in Council has not yet been passed. Quebec's plan has been agreed upon except as to one minor detail, the question of the repayment of the money. New Brunswick has passed legislation and its plan has been agreed upon. Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have passed Acts, but their plans have not yet been submitted.

Mr. COPP: It looks as if not very much work will be done during the present summer.

Mr. ROWELL: So far as this Government is concerned, we have expedited the

matter in every possible way; if there is any delay, it is not on our part. But Ontario is going ahead very rapidly, as also is British Columbia. I believe it is the intention of Quebec to do the same.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the Government received any intimation from the returned soldiers' association that they are agreeable to this legislation?

Mr. ROWELL: The returned soldiers' association strongly approved of it. The request came from some quarters that we should lend direct, but we could not see our way clear to do that.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I have an inquiry from a returned soldier in Nova Scotia who wants to know how he can participate in this scheme. I am told that Nova Scotia requires that the municipality guarantee the loan to the province before a resident of that municipality may take advantage of it. That returned soldier, then, must call a meeting of the county council in the county in which he lives. The county council meets in April and January of each year, so that he will either have to call a special meeting or wait until next January. Then, if he secures the guarantee from the county council he will have to go to the province; the province will, in turn, guarantee the loan to the Dominion, and I suppose the money will then be available. If he has to go through all that, it looks to me like a cumbersome method of getting the money. I should like to know whether I am right in this, because I want to give my returned soldier the information.

Mr. ROWELL: If he is a workingman and comes under the terms of this proposal, it is a question between the Government of Nova Scotia and the soldier himself whether he gets the loan direct or through the municipality. We do not pretend to dictate how the province should proceed in that respect. If he is a farmer, even in a small way, he would likely come under the terms of the Soldier Settlement Act, in which case he could borrow direct.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: In that case the money would not come from this fund?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. ROBB: The minister is appropriating $25,000,000 to be distributed among the different provinces on a per capita basis. He says that only two provinces have actually taken up the scheme; others are negotiating. If only three provinces accept, will the $25,000,000 be distributed among the three?

Mr. ROWELL: No, the Bill expressly provides that they can only get their per capita share. The balance of the vote will lapse if the other provinces do not take advantage of the loan.

Mr. PEDLOW: I object to this item and to the method of introducing this proposal before the House. I object because there has been a lack of vital information regarding this proposal, because the scheme is utterly lacking in proper safeguards, and because certain provisions contained in this beautifully printed document are absurd. The minister has told us that certain agreements have been entered into with two of the provinces. It is only fair that these agreements should be placed on the Table.

Mr. ROWELL: They were placed on the Table some time ago.

Mr. PEDLOW: This is the first intimation that I have had of it. Of course so many things occur that it is impossible to follow them all. Indeed it is impossible to hear a good deal of what is said in the House. I repeat that I object to the method by which this subject was introduced. Legislation by Order in Council has of late been the rule, notwithstanding the figures submitted by the President of the Council tonight. There is no sense in bringing this matter before the Committee now, because the deal has already been put through. Why insult members of the House by spending a whole evening discussing it when it is to be put through no matter how we discuss it? Arrangements have already been made with the provinces on the basis of the terms contained in this document. It is like the case where the judge of a divisional court was about to render a decision One of the lawyers rose up and said: "Your honour, I would like to address the court." The court said "Well, you may go ahead and address the court, but it will make no difference anyway." We address this Parliament, but no matter how much we protest, that will make no difference anyway, because the decision has already been arrived at by Order in Council. I heard it stated on the floor of this House that this was specially designed for the benefit of the returned soldier. It is nothing of the kind. Under the terms of this scheme, any one who has an income not exceeding $3,000 per annum can qualify for a loan; in fact, many members of Parliament could qualify for a loan. Our salary or income for our services here is the magnificent sum of $2,500 per session, and we could

apply for a loan under this scheme and build in the city of Ottawa a house which we could occupy for a few months in the year and which would be convenient. I suggest that we incorporate in this measure a provision that members of this House may qualify for a loan to build a residence in Ottawa for use during sessions of Parliament.

An hon. MEMBER: And free from taxes.

Mr. PEDLOW: There is another feature of this resolution that I should like the minister to explain. Will he define what is a "workingman"? I should like to know where the line is drawn. The resolution puts the maximum income of those who may apply for a loan at $3,000, and as we are paid $2,500 per session for working about fourteen hours a day, I suppose we could qualify as workingmen under the terms of this proposition.

I should also like to refer to the case of a man who is in good circumstances in life and has, say $42,000 invested in mortgages and that class of security upon which he is receiving 7 per cent per annum. Such a man could qualify under the terms of this arrangement for a loan of $4,500, and he would be a very foolish man if he did not do so, because he could borrow that sum from the Government at five per cent and lend it out at seven per cent, and on the transaction he would net the nice little sum of $90, which added to his handsome income of $2,940 obtained from the investment of $42,000 at 7 per cent, would increase his income to $3,030. Notwithstanding that fact, he could still qualify for a loan under this proposition. Unless proper safeguards are thrown around this scheme as to the manner of making the advances, this loan will go into the hands of the capitalists of the country as well as of members of Parliament who are now about to vote upon the subject.

In view of the statement made that the British Columbia and Ontario Governments have already accepted contracts submitted to them by the Federal Government, it is evident that the operation of this scheme has already begun. Why then bring this matter into this House for discussion when the operation is already settled independently of the House of Commons. It would be just as well for the House to be dismissed as to ask us here day after day to discuss measures that have already been settled by Order in Council. We are mere rubber stamps, and I did not intend to come here to be used as a rubber stamp or anything of that kind. The brains of Parliament are not always included in the section of the House to the right of the Speaker; there are some brains on this side of the House, and they might be of advantage occasionally in matters of this kind.

12 m.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. PEDLOW: Hon. members need not be in a hurry, as it is early yet. In view of the statement made previously this session in this House as to the enormous liabilities we have already incurred and the enormous shortage that has been admitted, a shortage, I understand, of over $100,000,000 that is staring the Minister of Finance in the face, and that no doubt is causing him a good deal of worry and is partly responsible for the delay in bringing down the Budget, the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) should hesitate in pressing this scheme to a conclusion to-night. In view of all that, I think the time is inopportune for enforcing this proposition, and besides the amount the Government has decided to invest in this scheme is ridiculous. It will provide, on the basis of an average cost of $3,750 per house, which is the average cost of the four schemes under consideration, for the nine provinces about 629 houses to each province. It will not relieve the situation to any extent; It is a mere drop in the bucket. The House would be well advised to delay this scheme until a proper scheme is got into operation and until a more opportune time arises when money is more plentiful. I heard the acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) state that he would have to appeal to the country during the coming year for a loan of not less than $350,000,000. If the Government go on throwing around the money already received by way of loan from the people of this country, as has been the custom for the last month or so in this Parliament, I fancy they will have a difficult problem ahead of them to raise another loan, and whether it is called a Victory loan or a Peace loan or anything else, the Government will have difficulty in enthusing the people in the matter. I had a good deal to do locally with regard to raising the last loan, and I know from experience gained at that time that the Government have quite a difficult proposition ahead of them, especially in view of the manner in which the money is being spent. The Government is giving $25,000,000 to the provinces without agreements that we know anything of and without proper safeguards. They have advanced

$25,000,000 to buy merchandise to send to Roumania, $25,000,000 to buy merchandise to send to Belgium, and an unlimited amount for France and Great Britain, and they have also decided to appropriate $25,000,000 for good roads. I am not finding fault with some of those schemes, but a limit should be put to the amounts, especially when many of them are amounts which are not surrounded by proper safeguards and on which the Government is taking a big chance making a big gamble. I think the funds subscribed by the citizens of this country deserve better protection than they seem to obtain.

Mr. ROBB: Before we proceed further, or before we adjourn, I desire to draw to the attention of yourself, Mr. Chairman, and of the minister in charge, that this loan of $25,000,000 to provincial governments is asked for on the terms and conditions set forth in the Order in Council of the 3rd December, 1918. Article 6 of this Order in Council reads as follows:

Advances shall be made from the War Appropriation.

Inasmuch as we have already voted the War Appropriation of $350,000,000, I submit that the minister is asking for a duplication of that vote, and I think he should report progress and adjourn until he has time to consult as to the legality of this vote.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is under a misapprehension. That was under the War Appropriation Vote. The new Vote is not the War Appropriation Vote but the Demobilization Vote. The War Appropriation Vote under which that was payable expired on the 31st of March last, and we have no authority to pay this out of the $350,000,000 Demobilization Vote.

Mr. ROBB: The minister will admit that there appears to be some conflict between the two, and I am not sure but what the country will think he is asking for a double vote.

Mr. ROWELL: I think they are quite clearly defined. Expenditure could only be made under the War Appropriation Vote up to the 31st of March last. We have no authority to spend this money under the Demobilization Vote.

Mr. CAHILL: I think the minister should be generous enough to report progress. Every Friday night we seem to land up against some large appropriation, and I suppose it will be the same at the end of the session. Last session we passed some $60,000,000 on the last night. We have spent a good deal of time this week discussing various matters which if they had been discussed at this hour of the night would have had a very small audience, even of Government supporters. We have only been informed of what this vote actually means this evening, and I think it is only fair that the minister should accede to the wishes of the leader of the Opposition and the Opposition generally, and I think also of many of his supporters. A large vote like this requires careful consideration. We have got into the habit of talking of tens and hundreds of millions of dollars, but the day is coming when we shall have to meet the interest on our investments and repay our loans. I think it would probably be the means of facilitating legislation in the future, as well as right now, if the minister would report progress.

Mr. ROWELL: When the leader of the Opposition made the same request I gave my reasons for hoping that we would pass this vote to-night. If there is any further information required, I shall be very glad to facilitate a discussion on Concurrence. I want to have regard to the views of the leader of the Opposition, but I was hoping that we would reach the point where this item would go through to-night.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have no desire to obstruct any of the business of the House, on the contrary, I want to facilitate it as much as possible. I would say to my hon. friend, who is getting to be rather an old member of this House now, that I have been a member a long time but I have never heard anything discussed on Concurrence, and if he has nothing to promise us but that, there will not be much discussion, unless an innovation is to be made. However, whenever the House gets in a bad temper, as it is beginning to get now, I never get very much satisfaction, and I am content to let the item pass.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell, the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. Saturday.

Monday, May 19, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

TRANSATLANTIC FLIGHT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Has the Government any definite informa-

tion regarding the reported successful flight of Mr. Hawker, the Australian aviator, who is said to have reached the Irish coast? If this is a fact, will the Government convey the congratulations of this country to both the successful aviator and the Australian Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have no official information, but it was brought to my attention that a despatch had been received stating that a successful flight had been made by this aviator, and before leaving the office I dictated a suitable message of congratulation to Mr. Hawker and to his pilot. Should we have official information later we will be glad to convey it to the House.

THE WINNIPEG STRIKE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Has the Government any further report in connection with the Winnipeg strike? I observed in the papers on Saturday that a request was made that the Minister of Labour should go to Winnipeg, and I should like to know what action has been take in the matter.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (for the Minister of Labour): There is nothing particularly new to report in respect to the Winnipeg strike other than what has appeared in the newspapers. The situation, however, continues quite serious. The bakers and milkmen have been carrying on their business since yesterday, and with certain limitations the restaurants are open to the public. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Robertson) leaves for Winnipeg this evening. He considers that the situation would not have been advantaged had he left sooner.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

COLONEL MORRIS OF AMHERST.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

What is the total amount of remuneration paid to Colonel Morris, Commanding Officer of the Internment Camp at Amherst, Nova Scotia?

Major General MEWBURN: Pay and Allowances of his rank as an Officer of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, covering a period from 26th October, 1915, to 30th April, 1919,—$12,274.25.

COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. How many County Court Judges are there in the Province of Ontario, both senior and junior?

2. What are the respective salaries of a senior and junior judge in Ontario?

3. How many County Court Judges are in the Province of Nova Scotia?

4. What salaries are paid to said judges, respectively?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Senior, 36, including 4 vacant judgeships; Junior, 24.

2. $3,000 each, except the Senior Judge for the County of York, whose salary is $3,500.

3. 7, including one vacant judgeship.

4. Judge of County of Halifax, $3,500, others, $3,000 each.

LOANS TO ALLIED COUNTRIES.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Does the total amount of assets, $1,243,879,381.28, of the Dominion of Canada, as set forth in the Official Gazette, comprise the sums due by Great Britain, and the other Allied countries, to whom loans or advances were made for purchases of munitions, etc.

2. How much were the loans or advances made to Great Britain and other Allied countries, in this connection, since the 1st of April, 1914?

3. What were the total loans prior to the 1st of April, 1914?

4. Have any of said loans, or portions thereof, been paid to Canada? If so, what amount?

5. What is the total amount still due?

6. What portion of the total amount of assets, namely, $1,243,879,381.28, represents the balance remaining unpaid of the loans or advances made by Canada to Great Britain and other Allied countries?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Yes.

2. $875,313,630.05.

3. Nil.

4. Yes—$429,975,764.57.

5. $445,337,865.48. Against this balance must be set off the amount owing by Canada to Great Britain and other allied countries on the same date, $214,133,333.31 leaving a net balance of $231,204,532.17.

6. Same as No. 5.

NATIONAL SERVICE REGISTRATION—HOCHELAGA.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

Has the Government paid Mr. D. A. Léonard and the employees of Mr. Bruchési, registrar for District No. 100, Hochelaga, for their services in connection with National Service Registraton, in the month of June, 1918? If not, why?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

SAGUENAY AND LABRADOR SERVICE. COMMUNICATION WITH SAGUENAY.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Is the Government aware that during last winter the inhabitants of the County of Sague-

nay, between Tadoussac and Labrador, were deprived of communications with the other parts of the Dominion of Canada?

2. Why was the subsidy previously voted for the maintenance of a crossing between Bay Ste. Catherine, an inlet of the St. Lawrence River, and Tadoussac, revoked?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. The Department of Trade and Commerce is aware that there was no regular subsidized service last winter between Ste. Catherine's Bay and Tadoussac, but it has no information to show what communications, if any, were maintained between the County of Saguenay, from Tadoussac to Labrador, and the other parts of Canada.

2. This service was considered to be merely a ferry service of local importance, and not one properly chargeable to subsidies devoted to the assistance of trade and commerce.

MR. LOUIS COTE.

Mr. SAVARD:

Has Mr. Louis Cote, a member of the Tribunal of Exemption, No. 66 of Mille-Vaches, been entirely paid for his services in connection therewith? If not, why?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERIES—VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES COUNTY.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What rural mail deliveries have been established in Vaudreuil-Soulanges county?
2. Where are they situated?
3. Who are the carriers?
4. What are their salaries?
5. When were these deliveries established?
6. How many subscribers are there to each of such deliveries?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

Cedars No. 1, Raphael Menard, $1,116.22, Dec. 6, 1915, 103 boxes; Coteau du Lac No. 1, E. Sauve, $540, July 8, 1916, 37 boxes; Coteau du Lac No. 2, Pierre Leroux, $575, July 1, 1916, 28 boxes; Dalhousie Sta. No. 1 (in part), C. B. Poirier, $670, April 7, 1914, 82 boxes; Dalhousie Sta. No. 2 (in part), Angus A. MacDonald, $850, July 1, 1914, 72 boxes; Ile Perrot Nord No. 1, Michael Leduc, $487.50, Dec. 16, 1915, 87 boxes; Point Fortune No. 1 (in part), Peter Mark (estate), $737, June 15, 1915, 65 boxes; Rigaud No. 1, P. Chevrier, $495x, Nov. 1, 1915, 33 boxes; Rigaud No. 2, J. Cholette, $595, Nov. 1, 1915, 47 boxes; St. Clet No. 1, Arthur Bourbonnais, $490, July 8, 1916, 42 boxes; Ste. Justine de Newton No. 1, S. Marcoux, $550, July 1, 1916, 54 boxes; Ste. Marthe No. 1, Victor Dumoulin, $490, Jan. 1, 1917, 44 boxes; Ste. Marthe No. 2, Isidore Poirier, $500, Jan. 1, 1917, 38 boxes; St. Polycarpe No. 1, Honore Schmidt, $790, Nov. 16, 1914, 57 boxes; St. Polycarpe No. 2, Louis Cuerrier, $790, March 1, 1915, 66 boxes; St. Telesphore No. 1, Evariste Daoust, $717, Nov. 16, 1914, 48 boxes; Vaudreuil No. 1, J. T. Lalonde, $880.10*, Sept. 1, 1915, 91 boxes.

*Plus $1 per annum for each box served.

[M. Savard.]

MILITARY SERVICE ACT DEFAULTERS.

Mr. LEGER:

For what term of imprisonment were Edgar Allain, Joseph Doucet, Richard Grattin, Maurice O'Brien, Arthur Cormier, Alfred C. Cormier, Joseph Collette and Alfred Leger, all of the county of Kent, New Brunswick, sentenced, when their cases were tried before His Honour Judge H. M. Ferguson at Rexton, New Brunswick, for breach of the Military Service Act, and what was the fine imposed in each case.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: E. R. Allain, $250 and costs or one year; Jos. Doucett, $250 and costs or one year; Richard Gratton, $250 and costs or one year; Maurice O'Brien, $350 and costs or two years; Arthur Cormier, $300 and costs or eighteen months; Alfred Cormier, $250 and costs or one year; Jos. C. Collett, $250 and costs or one year; Eloi Leger, $25 and costs or three months.

JOHN RIDLEY.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Was one John Ridley of the town of Cornwall in the employ of the Department of Justice during any part of the year 1918?
2. If so, when did his services begin?
3. When did his work end?
4. What amount did he receive for said services?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: 1, 2, 3 and 4. No mention of John Ridley of the town of Cornwall on the records of the Military Service Branch, or Dominion Police Branch.

GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens):

1. What were the conditions under which the grants of money were made to the different provinces in 1918, to encourage greater production?
2. What amount of the $5,000 granted to Prince Edward Island did the said province receive?
3. Did Prince Edward Island make any return to the Federal Government stating how the said grant was expended?
4. If so, how was the said grant expended?
5. If not, has the Government of Prince Edward Island to make a return showing how said grant was expended?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Financial grants were given by the Federal Government to each of the provinces to assist in a campaign for greater production during the year 1918.

Such grants were given conditional upon equal amounts in each case being provided by the Provincial Governments over and above the sums that would ordinarily be expended in agricultural propaganda by the provinces.

The total amount appropriated for use in each province was to be expended by the

provincial authorities in the manner best calculated to secure increased acreage in cereals and the maximum production of live stock.

The situation in each province was carefully gone over and studied by representatives of the Federal and Provincial Departments of Agriculture as to the most effective means of getting the desired results.

General publicity, the holding of public meetings, formation of local Production and Labour Committees, assistance in special circumstances in securing fertilizers and seed, encouragement in cultivation of "War Gardens" and vacant lots, enlisting of the "Soldiers of the Soil," special attention to the hog and sheep industry, effective distribution of farm labour, were matters that received the most attention. No general uniform method of using the grant was followed, but rather, special adaptation to the individual needs of the several provinces. The arrangements for the method of expenditure of the Federal grants in Eastern Canada were in the hands of Dr. J. W. Robertson, and in Western Canada in those of the Hon. C. A. Dunning, Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan, and Mr. J. D. McGregor, of Brandon. Mr. Dunning and Mr. McGregor were both members of the Canada Food Board.

2. $2,500.

3. So far no return received.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Yes.

MAJOR A. L. POMEREY.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has Major A. L. Pomerey been appointed inspector of farms in the Eastern Townships in connection with the Soldiers' Settlement Board?

2. If so, when, and by whom?

3. What is his salary?

4. Has Major Pomerey been on active service during the period of the war?

5. If so, when, and where?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Major A. L. Pomerey is temporarily assisting as an inspector and valuator in the Eastern Townships.

2. From May 1, 1919. By the Soldier Settlement Board.

3. At the rate of $150 per month while employed.

4. There is no record of this officer having been on active service during the present war.

5. Answered by No. 4.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Were any prizes taken by the H.M.S. "Niobe" during the war?

2. If so, how many and what was their estimated value?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What amount of money was paid by the Government, or any government departments or commissions appointed by the Government, in connection with the Canadian War Loans since the commencement of the war for the following years: 1914-15-16-17 and 18, respectively?

2. To whom was it distributed?

3. What are the names of the different persons, or firms, to whom these amounts were paid?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

For a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, reports, plans and estimates relating to the construction of the retaining wall, along the shore of the St. Lawrence river, opposite the village of St. François-Xavier de Batiscan, in the county of Champlain.

DOMINION WATER-POWERS.

Bill No. 94, respecting the Dominion Water-Powers—Hon. Mr. Meighen—read third time.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals), the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

That it is expedient to extend the time within which the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company is to complete the construction and equipment of its line of railway from a point at or near Centreville, in the county of Carleton, to a point at or near Andover, in the county of Victoria, to the thirty-first day of December, 1921, both with respect to the agreement entered into under the authority of section three of The Saint John and Quebec Railway Act, 1916, and also with respect to the subsidy agreement made under the authority of section six of the said Act: Provided that the said extension shall only be granted with respect to the first-named agreement after the consent of His Majesty on behalf of the province of New Brunswick has been obtained.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minster explain?

Mr. J. D. REID: This is merely to extend the time for the completion of that part of the St. John and Quebec railway between Centreville, in the county of Carleton, and Andover, in the county of Victoria, New Brunswick. The House passed a similar Bill this session, but it omitted to

include the part of the road between Centreville and Andover.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain why it is necessary to bring this before the House instead of going to the Railway Committee for an extension of time?

Mr. J. D. REID: This is a railway that is being built by the New Brunswick Government. It is a line that was to have been built from the Transcontinental railway to St. John, and the Dominion Government have taken it over and are operating it on a percentage basis. The New Brunswick Government have not completed the road as yet. The New Brunswick Government have asked that the time for completion be extended. The House will remember that Bill No. 5 of the present session was passed authorizing an extension of time for completion from Gagetown to a point on the Canadian Pacific at or near Westfield. The Bill should have included that portion from Centreville to Andover. The New Brunswick Government have drawn our attention to the fact that in the Bill as passed we neglected that portion, and have asked us to introduce and pass this Bill to allow the time for completion of the whole line to be extended to the 31st December. It is not customary to send Bills of this kind to the Railway Committee, because this is merely an extension of a Government line.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. J. D. REID moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 117, to authorize an extension of time for the completion of the St. John and Quebec railway between Centreville, in the county of Carleton, and Andover, in the county of Victoria, N. B.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BIOLOGICAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. J. T. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), Bill No. 102, to amend the Biological Board Act, was read a second time, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Duties of board:

Mr. COPP: Will the minister explain this?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The object of this Bill is merely to remedy an error that was made quite unintentionally in 1912 when the Act was passed. It is to give the necessary authority to the deputy minister and the officers under him, without in any way interfering with the work of the Biological Board. Clause 5 in the Act of 1912 was prepared in rather an ambiguous manner, and this is simply to straighten it out.

Mr. COPP: Does this give an officer the privilege of going all over the country to investigate this question?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, the object of the change is simply to give the deputy minister, and the officers under him, the necessary authority to engage whatever scientific and technical officers, they may in their judgment deem most fit.

Mr. COPP: To investigate this matter?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply. Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Department of Immigration and Colonization —Salaries, including $6,000 to Deputy Minister, $2,500 for promotion and salary of W. R. Little as Commissioner of Immigration for Eastern District, $139,767.

Contingencies, $35,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain these items?

Mr. CALDER: There is an increase in the amount asked for. During the year the quarantine service was transferred to the Immigration Department, necessitating an increase in the staff. This department, as in the case of other departments, has several clerks who have been carried on the temporary staff for a period of years, and some of these have been made permanent. The balance of the additional amount is accounted for by promotions to the staff and statutory increases.

Mr. CAHILL: It seems unreasonable that the expenditure of this department should be increased by such an amount when there is very little immigration coming into the country. The minister might explain what his expectations are with regard to immigration and colonization; if there is any colonization work being done, or any in prospect, and what he has in mind with regard to immigration. The minister might also explain whether he expects to continue admitting Mennonites, Hutterites and Mormons to Canada, or whether he expects to obtain some other class of immigrants. If he does not, this vote should be decreased rather than increased.

Mr. CALDER: The work of the office in Ottawa has, in a sense, very materially increased during the last year or so. In addition to bringing people to the country, there has been cast upon the department the duty of closely scrutinizing those who have been passing backwards and forwards between Canada and the United States. In that regard at least the department has never heretofore had as much work to do. The increase in the expenditure is necessary for that reason. As to immigration generally, I think there is very little chance of our getting many people from Europe in the near future. Shipping conditions are such now and will so continue for some time that we cannot look to receiving any great number of immigrants from Great Britain or from the continent of Europe. On the other hand, we are continuing to receive a very large number of people from the United States, which last year amounted to somewhere in the neighbourhood of 60,000. The year before that the number was about 75,000, and I would not be at all surprised if this year we will have approximately from 75,000 to 100,000 residents of the United States entering Canada for settlement here. It is very difficult at the present time to anticipate what the condition is going to be in regard to immigration from Europe. I am inclined to the view that as soon as conditions become a little more settled we may look for a very large immigration from Great Britain, and possibly from the Northern European countries. As to that, however, one can only guess, because of the present unsettled conditions in those countries. I think we may look forward to a continuing immigration from the United States when we consider that country has now a population somewhere in the neighbourhood of 115,000,000, that the natural increase of population there is very large, and the amount of land available for settlement purposes is very greatly restricted. I think the natural growth of the population of the United States, in addition to the number they receive from outside countries, will have a tendency, for some years to come, to cause a very large number to migrate to Canada. So long as there is available in Canada large areas of arable land suitable for settlement I think we may expect that movement to grow.

Mr. MICHAUD: Will the minister kindly explain the vote in connection with immigration for the Eastern District? What does this comprise?

Mr. CALDER: During the year the outside service of the department was placed on a different basis. Canada has been divided into three immigration districts, the Eastern District, the Prairie District—called the Western District, I think—and the Pacific District. Each of these districts is in charge of a commissioner whose duty it is to see that the immigration law is enforced by all the officials under him. The Eastern District comprises, roughly speaking, all of Canada east of the Great Lakes, and is in charge of Mr. Little, formerly an official of the department here, who will have under him a staff of one hundred and fifty or two hundred.

Mr. MICHAUD: I would ask the minister to bring to the attention of Commissioner Little the fact that the position of Immigration Agent at Clair, Madawaska county, has been vacant for four or five months. I understand that the Collector of Customs has taken hold of the duties temporarily, pending the appointment of a new agent. It is urgent that an appointment should be made immediately, because during the summer a number of undesirable people come into Canada from the United States. Immigration into that district has to be watched very closely; immigrants of this kind often have to be returned. The Collector of Customs has not the time to give proper attention to this work, and the appointment should be made without delay.

Mr. CALDER: I am not personally acquainted with the situation there, but in all cases of this kind the necessity for having a permanent appointment made is carefully gone into by the department. If it is found necessary that an appointment of that kind should be made in the case my hon. friend refers to, the matter will receive immediate attention.

Mr. EULER: I gather from the remarks of the minister that immigration into Canada is now largely into the West, and consists of people who are going upon the land. I suppose that they come largely from the Western States. If that is the case, does the department still maintain agencies in the large cities of Eastern United States, and if so, for what purpose?

Mr. CALDER: That phase of our immigration work can best be considered under the main vote providing for the salaries of all our agents in United States and elsewhere. We still have our agents in the eastern part of United States. Last year we closed the Philadelphia agency; all the others that were previously maintained are still in operation.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister has not told us anything about what is being done in connection with the colonization end of his department.

Mr. CALDER: It was provided last year that only returned soldiers should settle on Crown lands lying within a distance of fifteen miles from the railways. Outside of that, homesteading is still being carried on, principally in Northern Saskatchewan and Alberta. As to Eastern Canada, we are still carrying on publicity work as through our agencies in the United States. I understand that a number of people have been induced to come from New England and settle in Northern Quebec during the last six months or so. Our agencies in the Eastern part of United States have been securing very good results in the way of inducing persons to migrate to Canada and settle on lands. I am inclined to the view that the results in that direction will be very largely increased in the near future.

Mr. CAHILL: Of the 60,000 immigrants who came in during the last year, about what number belonged to the sects that have been under discussion in the newspapers during recent weeks?

Mr. CALDER: We have not endeavoured to keep a record of the religious denomination of those who have been entering the country; we know them simply by nationality.

Mr. CAHILL: The newspaper reports gave the number of Hutterites and Mennonites who came into the country as varying from 30,000 to 60,000. They stated that some of the Mormons who came in have taken up Indian Reserves that were taken from the Indians last year, and that the greater part of the immigration last year consisted of that class of people. Surely the minister can give us within a few thousand the number of Hutterites and Mennonites who came into the country last year.

Mr. CALDER: I should only be guessing, because we have not kept a record of that kind. I asked the officials of the department for a statement along that line, but I have not been able to obtain it. I have been told—I do not know whether it is true or not—that the total number of Hutterites on this continent does not exceed 2,500; and only a certain proportion of these —what proportion I cannot say— have entered Canada. The movement of Mennonites has not been very large; I imagine that not more than five or six hundred came into Canada during the past year.

As to the Hutterites, probably one thousand entered Canada; that would be the limit. I have seen no statement in the press to the effect that 25,000 or 30,000 of these people have entered Canada. I am absolutely sure that that statement is very greatly exaggerated.

Mr. EULER: Did any of the Mennonites who immigrated into Western Canada come from the Western States or the Eastern States, and was any actual investigation made as to their character and habits? I know nothing about the Hutterites who have been confused with the Mennonites.

Mr. CALDER: The great majority of the Mennonites who entered Western Canada came from Kansas and neighbouring States, and very few of them came from the Eastern States. I cannot see the necessity for making an investigation. Unfortunately, there are Mennonites and Mennonites and those who live in Western Canada know the conditions existing there. Some of the members of the Committee know that quite recently I received a visit from six bishops belonging to that sect, who stated that they represented some 10,000 souls in the three provinces of Western Canada. They belong to the old colony of Mennonites, that portion of the sect that is absolutely opposed to sending their children to the public schools. They have been in the West for thirty, forty, or fifty years, and as members of the Committee probably are aware, the Provincial Governments in the West have had all sorts of trouble in endeavouring to induce those people to take advantage of our public school system. Unfortunately, however, they have not seen their way clear to do so, and it is that very fact that has given rise to the agitation in Western Canada for the exclusion of those people from the country until such time as they are prepared to observe the education and other laws of the country. It is very unfortunate this condition should prevail, but there it is. I am well acquainted with many of our Mennonite settlements in Western Canada and with the people, and those who have broken away from the old ideas are law-abiding, moral living people; they have no bad habits; they are great producers; they are making great progress from many standpoints, and they make very desirable citizens. But so long as a large section of those people hold out against coming under the education laws of the Western Provinces, an agitation will prevail to exclude them from entering Canada.

Mr. EULER: I would make no defence whatever for any class of Mennonites who object to sending their children to the ordinary public schools, and I am rather surprised to learn that Mennonites in Western Canada raise that objection. I would not be at all surprised to learn that all Mennonites do not so object, because Mennonites who now live in Alberta came originally from Waterloo county, and in Waterloo county Mennonites make absolutely no objection to sending their children to the ordinary schools; I do not think the thought ever entered their minds to have separate schools for themselves. They speak a language of their own only amongst themselves, it being known sometimes as Pennsylvania Dutch, a combination of English and German. These people have lived in that county for a hundred years, and they have never raised any objection to their children going to public schools. Is the chief cause for desiring to exclude the Mennonites from Western Canada the fact that they are not inclined to permit their children to attend the public schools, or is it because of their objection to compulsory military service? They are moral, industrious, honest and make very desirable citizens, as I am sure any hon. member who ever came into contact with the Mennonites as we have them in Western Ontario and saw their farms and the result of their work and intelligence, will admit, although he might find fault with them for objecting to compulsory military service. As the minister states, there are Mennonites and Mennonites. Of the old Mennonites, there is an off-shoot called the New Mennonites who have somewhat different religious beliefs, and to my personal knowledge many of the new Mennonites volunteered for military service in this war. I have not with me a letter that I received the other day, shortly after the previous debate we had on the Mennonite question, but it was written by a man well known to me and he made this statement, which I have no reason to disbelieve, that in Toronto a certain Mennonite congregation sent to the front more men voluntarily than any other congregation in that ultra-loyal city. That must have been from the branch known as the New Mennonites, and there is amongst those who are now settled in Ontario a tendency to become more assimilated with the general population, that being especially the case when they go into the towns and cities. I should like it to be understood that if the Mennonites in Western Canada object to sending their children to the public schools, there is a distinction between them and those living in Western Ontario.

Mr. CALDER: I assure the hon. gentleman that what I stated is the case.

Mr. EULER: I am not questioning the word of the minister.

Mr. CALDER: There are some thousands of Mennonites of the old sect who stand out absolutely against sending their children to the public schools.

Mr. EULER: Are they in Alberta?

Mr. CALDER: I am not sure whether any of them reside in Alberta, but they reside in large numbers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. It is only fair that I should explain to the committee the reason for this objection on their part. Before these people ever came to Canada, away back in the early seventies they sent certain delegates here from Russia. Those delegates sat down with the Government in order to ascertain the conditions under which they might be allowed to come and settle in Canada. The negotiations were held in 1872, and in 1873 an agreement was reached, the Government of the day, by an Order-in-Council, practically guaranteeing those people that they would be allowed to establish religious schools of their own, and they claim that it was by reason of that agreement that they came to Canada. Of course there were other conditions as well. Along through the seventies and the eighties they established and maintained schools of their own.

These schools are of a very primitive character, teaching practically nothing but the Bible; the English language is not used and there are no text books at all. Those who came here nearly fifty years ago and their descendants have maintained right along that they had a right to expect the Government of Canada to live up to the agreement that was then made. Now it is held, and I am inclined to think properly held, that the Government of the day had no authority to enter into any such agreement. The Government had no control over the school system of the province of Manitoba, and I doubt very much if they made provision for any such class of schools in the Autonomy Acts when the other provinces were established. At any rate, all the three Prairie Provinces maintain that so far as their public school system is concerned they do not propose to allow that agreement to stand in the way. They insist that these settlers shall send their

children to the public schools, and it is the controversy over this problem that has given rise to the very intense feeling in Western Canada against the Mennonites as a class.

Mr. COPP: I see an item of $5,000 for the Director General of Public Health, which formerly was included in the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. Is this salary for work in connection with the Department of Public Health which was legislated upon recently?

Mr. CALDER: In the Act creating the Department of Public Health there is a clause to the effect that when created the department will take over certain services from the different departments, and provision is also made that the salaries of the officials concerned shall go over with them, so that the item voted will be available when the department is created. This particular officer will go over to the Public Health Department, and his salary will go over with him.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is the minister aware that the Mormons who are entering Canada and building homes here for themselves, have left wives in their homes in the United States? If that is a fact, I should like some explanation from the minister.

Mr. CALDER: I am not aware that it is a fact.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I note with some disappointment that the minister apparently is not attempting to make any reduction in his Estimates. There is an increase over last year in practically every item. Now we all know that immigration has very much decreased, and we would naturally expect the expenditure to decrease, or at all events remain stationary. I find by page 72 of the public accounts that in 1908, when a large number of immigrants were entering Canada and we were carrying on an active propaganda in Europe and the principal cities of the United States, the expenditure of the department was only $960,000, whereas in 1917 it was $1,181,000, and in 1918 $1,211,000. The expenditure seems to be increasing with the decrease in the number of immigrants. It seems very unsatisfactory, and I should like the minister to explain this inverse ratio and why no attempt has been made during the last three or four years, when practically no immigrants were coming in, to reduce the expenditure of the department.

Mr. CALDER: I have not the figures at hand, but the statement of my hon. friend is scarcely accurate. For 1914 or 1915, the expenditure of the department ran as high as $1,900,000, whereas our total expenditure under the head of immigration last year was only a little over $1,000,000, which meant a decrease in the neighbourhood of $900,000. The staff has been very materially reduced during the last three or four years. In 1914 or 1915, I forget which year, but it was the year of our highest expenditure, we had a staff of 780. That has been cut down to about 450 all told. During the past year there has been a very material decrease of about 100 in the staff in Canada which has made possible a saving of about $100,000 in salaries alone.

There is one feature that is liable to be overlooked, and that is that under the law we have established a condition that makes it absolutely necessary to have a string of officials right along our border from ocean to ocean, and this service must be maintained whether immigrants are coming in or not. We must have a man protecting a point south of Montreal, let us say, all the time whether five or fifty or one thousand immigrants are coming in, and the same is true all along the border. We have by law made it necessary that certain work must be done along our whole border, and the staff must be maintained. With regard to our Old Country service, while the staff has not been very active in actual immigration work during the last three or four years there is no other portion of the public service that has been so busy. They have had responsibilities placed upon them entirely outside of the usual round. For months past they have been engaged in arranging shipments for soldiers' dependents to Canada. That work is very complicated and very difficult, and will continue for some months to come. Notwithstanding this, there has been a material reduction in our Old Country staff. In the United States, where we have some twenty-one agencies, two or three offices have been closed, and the staff has been reduced by about ten. We must maintain this service to prepare for the movement that is bound to come shortly. One point we must bear in mind is this: When you have trained a man in this work, you cannot afford to let him go if he is a good man, and the mere fact that immigration has been somewhat dormant during the last two or three years is no reason why we should dismiss from our service men who have been with us for a good many years and are qualified to carry on this work. I think every effort has been made to reduce our expenditure to the lowest possible

point; and while certain increases are provided for here, it does not necessarily mean that the money will be expended. If there should be occasion to spend the money wisely during the year, then the sum is necessary for the purpose.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I have no doubt the figures I gave the minister are correct, because they are from the public accounts, but we have not yet an estimate of what the minister intends to spend during the current year. I presume he has on his desk some statement showing this amount, and if he has we can judge whether he has made any reduction from 1918.

Mr. CALDER: I think we might very well leave that discussion until we come to the general expenditures of the department, including those under the head of Immigration and Colonization. We are dealing here merely with the estimates of the department itself. When we come to the other estimates I shall be prepared to give some information.

Mr. CAHILL: In previous years the Immigration Department had free lands to offer settlers. What has the minister in mind now as an inducement to immigrants to come to Canada? Of the immigrants that came last year—some 60,000—how many went on the land? I would like to know the minister's views in regard to settling immigrants on land more than fifteen miles from a railway. Are immigrants permitted to settle on any Canadian Government land regardless of distances from railways? The minister would hardly suggest that the strike in Winnipeg is an inducement to labourers to come to Canada, nor would it be contended that the high prices of lands adjacent to railways in Western Canada and held by speculators is in the nature of an inducement. If this department is not in a position to do immigration or colonization work we should re-name it, and vote sufficient to provide for the policing of the boundary, as the minister has pointed out. We should know what we are voting for.

Mr. CALDER: The inducement that is held out to people looking for homes in a new country must be very obvious to hon. members. We have enormous resources in this country; on a conservative estimate, the amount of arable land in this country suitable for settlement is at least one hundred million acres, scattered all over the provinces. Our homestead lands adjacent to railways—I am speaking of federal lands now—have to a very large extent been settled on. But there is an abundance of other land, valued at from $15 to $20 an acre, and this is a fact that is easily brought to the attention of prospective settlers. Those who have been coming to Canada from the United States during the past few years have not been seeking homesteads to any great extent, but have been purchasing this land fairly freely. It is estimated that in Alberta and Saskatchewan alone there are about 25,000,000 acres of this kind of land which, so long as it does not exceed $25 or $30 an acre, will be quite an attraction to those who are looking for farms in a new country. The work of the department is to inform intending immigrants of this fact. This is being done in the United States through our agencies, and by advertising, publicity campaigns and various other means, and it is partially as a result of the activities of the department that settlers are coming to Canada. In Eastern Canada, particularly in Ontario and Quebec, and to some extent in New Brunswick, there are still areas of land suitable for settlement, some of which will require a little development. But, nevertheless, conditions are such that the possibilities of making homes in northern Ontario, northern Quebec, and New Brunswick may be made attractive to those desirous to settle in a bush country or a country that is partially wooded. We are now in negotiation with the governments of these provinces, and have in mind the preparation of plans whereby the possibilities of settlement in these three eastern provinces may be brought before those looking for new homes in a country such as northern Ontario and Quebec. I have no doubt at all that if the plans for that work are carefully prepared and the necessary publicity work is carried out, a good many settlers can be induced to go into those regions in Eastern Canada. I think the hon member knows of quite a number of settlers who have gone into northern Quebec. I purpose to have a survey of the situation made this summer in order that we may know exactly the facts, and by consultation with the governments of Quebec and Ontario, and by necessary co-operation, we hope to be able to conduct a publicity campaign in Great Britain and the United States that will aid in the settlement and development of those portions of Eastern Canada to which I have referred. I have already had several interviews with members of the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Governments, and I trust that we shall be able to assist in the development of those provinces in the way of settlement.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the minister any idea where we shall get settlers for Northern Ontario? What countries does he expect settlers to come from? It is pretty well known that the British Isles will not furnish settlers for Northern Ontario, because immigrants from that country prefer to keep in the older settled districts or go to Western Canada. I have no doubt there is a possibility of getting a certain class of settlers for Northern Ontario to fill in that large district between the east and west on the Transcontinental and Canadian Northern. Has the minister in mind any particular settlers he expects to be able to induce to go into that country?

Mr. CALDER: I have not; but I would not be so certain that British people would not go there.

Mr. CAHILL: So far they have not done so.

Mr. CALDER: Probably not. It may be that they are not acquainted with conditions, or possibly they have ideas that are not altogether favourable, regarding that part of the country. The fact may not have been properly placed before them, but at any rate I can see no reason why British people should not be induced to settle in Northern Ontario or even in Northern Quebec. After all, when we look back in Canadian history we find that it was British stock that went out into the wilds in the early days, and there should be no reason whatever, if proper conditions were estabblished, why people from the British Isles should not settle in certain portions of these provinces.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Are the people of alien enemy origin such as Germans and Austrians who have been resident in the United States for some time allowed to come into Canada as immigrants?

Mr. CALDER: Under the law as it now stands any person who is an enemy alien is not permitted to enter Canada no matter where he comes from. If a person who came originally from Austria to the United States became a United States citizen, he would no longer be an alien enemy. He would be a citizen of the United States.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like to know where the $15 an acre land is that the minister speaks of. I have some knowledge of Western Canada and of land values there. I am afraid that if the minister's agents in the United States are telling people that they can buy land within a reasonable distance of a railway at $15 an acre they are misleading them because there are very few places where you can buy land at $15, $20 or $25 an acre within any reasonable distance of a railway. Before the minister increases his expenditure upon immigration to any great extent he should try and make some provision whereby the land can be loosened from the grip of the speculators in Western Canada who are holding it for a rise in price, using the Immigration Department and the money of the people of Canada to bring in customers for that land, to the disadvantage not only of Canada but particularly of Western Canada. We have railways running through territory where the land is all held by speculators. We have national railways running through Canadian Pacific land. You cannot buy that land for anything like $15 per acre. Any that is within any reasonable, or farming, distance of a railway is being held at $25, $30, $40 and $45 per acre. The price and the cash payments are so high that it is almost impossible for a man with little means, say $2,500 or $3,000, to get upon that land, even to get a quarter section, because the holders want a big cash payment and it takes a considerable amount of money to get stock and implements. I noticed in the press this morning that the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department have in the neighbourhood of 5,000 applications from soldiers for land and that something like 1,900 have been dealt with. If this land is so plentiful that we can afford to look for immigrants throughout the world, the soldiers should be able to get land more readily. If we have no land why are we spending money to get people to come in here to add to the number of unemployed and to go upon strike? If there is not enough work now for the people who are in the country, why should we be looking for other people to come in here and increase the difficulties that we have upon our hands? I am afraid that Parliament is living in a fool's paradise at the present time. I believe that the strike condition is very much worse than the Government consider it to be. We were told by the ministers that they were not in communication with Winnipeg and that the information they had about the strike came through newspaper reports. If that is the condition, instead of sitting here voting away money for immigration, we should be looking into the fundamental reasons for this unrest and particularly for the reason why we are not able to get people on the land and why they are flocking into the cities. I had expected that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, after more

than a year and a half at the head of this department, would have had some very definite ideas about immigration and colonization. I thought he would have evolved a plan, that he would have come to the House and told us that he did not think we could satisfactorily handle any more immigration for the present year, and that he had solved the land problem so that people could get on the land instead of being encouraged to flock into the cities working for less than a living wage, with the high cost of living outstripping their salaries and wages. If the minister does not get any more information than he has given us he is not spending this $1,500,000 of the people's money very intelligently.

Mr. McKENZIE: What I wish to say to the minister will perhaps enable him to give the House more information when he brings down another item in connection with immigration. It is rather startling to find that this department is costing so much money. I took occasion last year to remind the minister that his department is merely a subdivision, something like the situation in which a farmer finds himself when he divides his hundred acres of land between his two sons; there might be enough for one but not enough for either when he divides his substance between them. For many years we found that this work was being attended to by one department, but when it became necessary to provide for the younger son, the patrimony was divided. This younger son, in the person of the Minister of Immigration, should realize that this department is not necessary at all. At all events, it was not found necessary until an extraordinary condition arose in this country. The minister should handle the affairs of the department with great care so that no person would have any reason to say that his administration was characterized by any degree of extravagance. But as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), the extraordinary condition exists that as the number of immigrants falls off the cost per capita ascends. That is a condition which should not exist and one for which the minister should give some satisfactory explanation. There is another phase of the new department which should receive attention and that is that the minister should have everything at his finger ends in connection with it. It is only about two years old. He started on the ground floor with everything new. He is the creator, the promoter, the advancer of his department and he has been with it from the beginning. He is not like a man who took charge of a big department after it had been growing for many years and from whom it might be unreasonable to expect a knowledge of all the various details. Here is a department that started into operation with himself at the head of it. He ought to know all about it. There should not be any underground workings in connection with it with which he was not familiar. I am more or less disappointed with the degree of familiarity and knowledge of his department that he displayed in connection with these items. I suppose the minister is a busy man, has a great many things to do and that he possibly did not anticipate the questions that would be asked, but I would expect more details and greater capacity to answer the various proper questions that have been submitted to the minister. The minister tells us that there are other items under which we would have wider scope to deal with the lands that we have in the West, but, now that he has entered upon the matter himself, I would say that when he comes down again he ought to tell us in a systematic way, dealing with every province by itself, how much land the Government has to be disposed of for settlement purposes, where these lands are, at what price, under what arrangements are they available for settlement, how far are they from railways in the various provinces and particularly the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I do not understand that the Government has very much acreage in British Columbia, and possibly not a very large acreage in Ontario—in fact I do not know whether the Government possesses any land in that province. I also wish to state to the minister that I think there has been a very poor system followed in disposing of Government lands in the West. For that the minister is not at all responsible, but it is possibly not yet too late to establish a better system. I think that only certain areas of land should be set off for settlement, and until they have been disposed of and occupied, settlers should not be allowed to run away hundreds of miles from the railway by reason of a whim or fancy of their own, when the lands in those far-off districts are no better than those which are available closer to the railways. By establishing a system of that kind settlers would be located together, within range of a railway station, and we would not be called upon, as we are now, to build

a larger mileage of railways than constitutes a fair proportion per capita for the population which we serve in that country. I would suggest to the minister that he should carefully inquire into the way in which this land is disposed of, and that he will see to it in future that the allotment of the land is carried out on a proper basis having regard to the railway accommodation which now exists in the West. It would be far better in the interests of settlers themselves to follow out some such plan, because they could get their grain and other products more easily shipped. It would likewise be more satisfactory for the communities that are growing up, because they could have schools, religious services, and other facilities more easily provided when they are in settlements or villages. This is a matter which I wish particularly to bring to the notice of the minister.

The minister has observed that we have large quantities of land in the West. I am glad to hear that such is the case, because my understanding was that the Government had been disappointed when it came to take an inventory of the Government lands that were available in connection with the settlement of soldiers on the land. I am informed—I cannot say whether this is official or not—that the Government discovered when looking for land to give to the soldiers, that it did not have nearly as much as it thought it had, and now finds it necessary to expropriate lands which companies have bought, or have received as railway subsidies, and which are being held possibly for speculative purposes. When the minister comes before the Committee again he may be able to tell us, if such comes within his department, what the policy of the Government is in respect of such lands. I would like him, in fact, to give a general idea of the policy of the Government as to the disposal of lands which it owns and which will be dealt with in connection with immigration purposes. There is, of course, a close alliance between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Immigration and Colonization, and I am not expecting the minister to answer questions regarding matter which more properly come within the purview of the former department.

Mr. COWAN: I do not have to apologize for the Minister of Immigration at all, because he requires no apology. I have known him sufficiently long to realize that he is quite capable of handling his own department without any assistance from me. I must say, however, that I have been watching his administration of the department for the past year, and while during that period he has chopped off the heads of one or two of my political friends who were appointed to office on my recommendation some years ago, and to that extent I feel some regret, yet I have to admit that in pursuing this policy he has succeeded in effecting a very great saving to the country and in placing, as I see it, our immigration system in a much better condition than it was before. I think the minister was absolutely right, wherever he found an old Tory or an old Grit in office who had not enough to keep him busy, to dispense with him, and that is exactly what has happened.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. COWAN: That is my opinion, whether other hon. gentlemen agree with me or not. The expenses of the administration of the department probably are a little high, and the leader of the Opposition is quite correct in drawing attention to past expenditures when there was such a tremendous rush to this country. I wish to draw his attention, however, to this: A great deal of the trouble we have in Canada to-day is due to the fact that we did not have in former days sufficient supervision over immigration with the result that men came into our country who should not be admitted. We have these men to-day; they constitute the problem which the Minister of Immigration has to deal with. We are to-day paying for the follies of past administration, and I think it is absolutely unfair to charge it up to the present minister when it is the men who preceded him who were guilty of the wrong-doing.

For my part, I wish to see a vigorous immigration policy continued. Hon. gentlemen in the East may be quite content to sit down and suck their thumbs and do nothing to help the country, and it looks to me as if that is what has happened in some localities in the East. In the past year I took a trip through the province from which the leader of the Opposition comes and also through New Brunswick. It was the first time I had visited that country, which I expected to see so completely filled with people that it would be without opportunity to make any large increase to its population. But I was amazed to find mile upon mile of what looked to me to be exceedingly good land, with apparently no settlers. The thought was forced upon me that the people in that part of the Dominion were awfully deficient in that element of virtue which we call progress. It is about time that the

Minister of Immigration from the West went down into that part of Canada to wake the people up a little bit, because it seems to me they have a magnificent country and they are making very little use of it compared with what they might. We in Western Canada do not intend to sit down and wait for immigrants to come in of their own free will under the system which has been followed in the Eastern Provinces in days gone by. We know that we have a mighty good country, and until we get it peopled we cannot expect to have the social conditions which we would like to have, because scarcity of population is very disadvantageous to contentment. We have millions upon millions of acres of fine land. It may be true that a great deal of this has gotten into the hands of private individuals under the wrong policy which was followed in the earlier days. But is the Minister of Immigration going to sit down and do nothing to overcome those conditions which have been thrust upon him? I say no. And if he does I can assure him there is nobody in the country who will more vigorously oppose him than I. I quite agree that the endeavour to get immigrants from the Western States is a correct policy.

The best settlers we have in Western Canada to-day came from Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and the Western States. Thousands of people are crowding in from the United States. These people are very much like ourselves. In the early days, when they started to come, they had a very peculiar notion of British institutions. Many of them thought they were coming to live under—well, almost what you would expect from the Czar of Russia of those days. They believed that we were a mere colony, and that we got our laws and everything else from the King of England. Of late their notions of Canada have been entirely changed; they now know that they enjoy the same justice and the same liberty that they enjoyed in the United States. Hundreds of townships are settled by people from the American side. We are glad to have them, and I hope that the minister will continue the policy of trying to induce such people to come to Canada. There is any amount of land in Western Canada for thousands of immigrants from such places as I have mentioned, as well as for our returned soldiers. If we are finding a little difficulty in getting just the land that the returned soldiers want, that is not the fault of the land. The land is there, and it is up to us to evolve a system under which it will be made available. I am confident, from what I hear, that we will satisfactorily settle that problem very shortly. In the meantime, the Committee ought to give the minister a very substantial vote in order that he may further the objects of his department. I am quite prepared to give him a year in which to evolve a proper policy, and to give him even longer than that to remedy the defects that he found in his department as a result of the maladministration of years gone by.

Mr. CALDER: The leader of the Opposition as much as intimated that in his judgment a department dealing with immigration and colonization is like a fifth wheel to a coach; that there is really no necessity for it, and that the department was created to make provision for somebody. In my judgment, there is greater necessity for this department than there is for any other department in the public service. No matter of Government is of as much interest to the people as is immigration and colonization. When you consider what the condition is to-day in Canada—I endeavoured to make that clear in the statement I made to the House when the Immigration Bill was brought down—you must come to the conclusion that this matter should have received the attention of the Government long ago. We should have had a department of the Government in charge of a minister of the Crown who was prepared to give his entire time and energies to that part of the public service. Why have we in Canada only about 8,000,000 people, while south of the line the population is about 115,000,000? Simply because the question of the settlement and development of this country has not been properly dealt with by past Governments. There is exceedingly important work to be done, and if that work is carried out as it should be and if the necessary appropriations are made available to the minister in charge of the department, whoever he may be, in order that he may carry on his work properly, results will be secured that will re-pay Canada a hundredfold for any expenditures that are incurred. The matter has been too long neglected. True, we had an Immigration and Colonization branch of the Interior Department, but scarcely any one knew it was in existence. One minister after another paid but passing attention to it, because he had larger and what he considered to be more important duties to attend to. But if this country is to come into her own; if it is to be developed as it should; if we are to get the kind of im-

migration that we should, then this subject must not be neglected as it has been in the past. We have an abundance of room. Opportunities are lying around in every part of Canada, in land settlement as well as in the development of our resources generally. The problem which stares the nation in the face will never be satisfactorily dealt with if we pursue a niggardly policy; unless the moneys necessary for this work are made available, we shall go on drifting as we have gone on in the past. Other countries are looking for settlers. New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa know the value of this class of work and have been spending two or three times what Canada has been spending for the development of their countries. If we are to compete with them; if we are to get our share of the immigrants from the Motherland, we must be prepared to spend the necessary money.

The hon. gentleman said that I have not brought down the information asked for. Well, it is difficult to anticipate the range of questions to be asked on an occasion of this kind, but I endeavoured to give as much information as I had at hand, and I think I have fairly met the demands for information. I have been asked to bring down a statement of the quantity of lands available in every province. May I point out to my hon. friend that even the people in his own province do not know that? Not a single Provincial Premier or Provincial Government could answer that question. At the conference we had here last November, I suggested to the Premiers of the provinces that they put on their Statute Books at once a law providing for an inventory of the natural resources of their respective provinces. Some of them have done so; some of them have started to obtain this information. But at the present time, fortunately or unfortunately, neither the Dominion Government nor the Provincial Governments have real knowledge of the amount of land that is available for settlement in the different provinces. I trust that arrangements will be made by all the provinces at an early date to obtain full and reliable information on this subject.

I agree with the leader of the Opposition that some serious mistakes have been made in the past so far as land settlement in Western Canada is concerned. We have allowed settlers to drift all over the country and to settle in places many miles from railways; and the difficulties of the Western Provinces have thereby been seriously multiplied. If a plan could have been devised in the past under which settlement would have gone forward as railway development went forward, it would have meant a great saving of expense and trouble in a hundred different directions. But I wish to assure the Committee that that is no easy matter. As long as vacant lands are there, it is most difficult to hold people from going on to them. We have such things as squatters' rights, and if those lands are available anywhere within fifty or sixty miles of a railway, and if they are first-class lands, the squatter is going to get out on that land if he possibly can. That has been the experience in all the provinces of western Canada, so that I doubt very much, even if the Government desired to do so, it could have prevented settlement of that character.

The hon. gentleman also referred to the lack of land for Soldier Settlement. That, of course, had reference only to homestead lands within a reasonable distance of railways. In Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, there is an abundance of homestead land, although not all of first class character, but the great bulk of it is not within easy reach of existing railway facilities, and it was because those in authority here felt it would be unfair to ask soldiers to go to lands lying more than fifteen miles from a railway, that provision was afterwards made whereby those returned men might secure purchased land instead of having to go out long distances from railway facilities.

The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) referred to the price of land in western Canada and apparently thought I was far out in my calculation as to what lands were worth. I believe I have a fairly accurate idea as to what lands are selling and being held at in the West. Two days ago, I sold for $15 an acre a piece of land I had held for ten or twelve years, and it is not more than four miles to a railway and it is good average land. I will not say that figure will represent the average price of land in western Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the minister intend to settle in Ottawa for good?

Mr. CALDER: My home was not on this land that I sold. The average price of land in certain localities in western Canada will run as high as $25, $30, and up to $40 an acre. The price depends very largely on the locality.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This morning I was told that the average price was $20 an acre.

Mr. CALDER: I can take the hon. gentleman to old settled regions in Western Canada where good agricultural land can be purchased at from $15 to $20 an acre. In the southwestern portion of Saskatchewan lands are held as high as $30, $35, $40, $45, $50, and even $60 an acre, but in Western Canada a great deal of land can still be purchased at from $15 to $20 an acre. That, however, is not the point. In dealing with the question of land settlement and colonization, we are bound to consider the fact that conditions vary greatly in all the provinces, and a policy that would be practicable for the Prairie Provinces might not apply to British Columbia or to New Brunswick. The problem is, after all, very largely a local one. The Dominion Government owns land only in the three Prairie Provinces; it does not own Crown land in the other provinces of Canada; and while the Federal Government should establish the machinery and the agencies whereby we may induce people to come to Canada, and while the nation as a whole has a very large interest in this problem, we must not overlook the fact that every provincial government that owns its own Crown land, outside of the Prairie Provinces, has a very large interest in this problem. It was for that reason that last fall we had a conference with the provincial premiers at Ottawa to discuss the matter thoroughly, and we decided upon the fullest co-operation with them. In a comparatively short time now, when the present abnormal conditions cease, I have not the slightest doubt that all the provinces in Canada will be quite willing to co-operate with the Federal Government so as to secure the greatest possible results in this field of endeavour. I am satisfied that with that co-operation, with a wise expenditure of money, we shall be able to secure large results in the way of immigration into this country and in the settlement of our vacant lands.

Mr. CAHILL: I quite agree with the minister that we should have a very much larger population; but we have been getting immigration into this country for the last forty years, and I should like the minister to tell me, if he can—and I believe he could if he wanted to—the reason why we have not increased our population more rapidly, having regard to the number of immigrants we have secured and to the natural increase in our population. In the last forty years, we have lost upwards of 8,000,000 of our population by emigration. During that period we received over 5,000,000 immigrants, and that immigration, along with the natural increase in population, should have given us a population of at least 16,000,000 people to-day, but we have only about 8,000,000. Apparently our immigrants were coming in at one door and going out at another; we were simply a station on the way to the United States. If we kept our immigrants in Canada, the Canadian born people went to the United States. The minister has in mind increasing immigration, and that is a very good policy, but before he can hope to make a success of immigration and colonization, he must find out why people who come to Canada from foreign countries do not remain in this country. At the present time, there are over 1,000,000 Canadian born citizens in the United States, and they have been going out of Canada every year for many years. The only time that we held our immigration to any extent was between 1900 and about 1912, during which period we made some progress, but previous to that time we were losing not only a number equivalent to our immigration, but a large portion of our natural increase. After 1900, we began to retain some of our immigration and some of the natural increase, so that in one census period our population increased by over 1,500,000. It is questionable, however, whether we have increased in the last ten years. The minister is asking for an increased appropriation to spend on immigration, and he must have in mind that when he gets an immigrant here he is to keep him. How does he purpose doing better in the future than we have been doing in the past with practically the same fiscal arrangement, the same form of Government and the same internal conditions generally?

What leads the minister to believe that people are going to stay here in future instead of going to some other country, as they have been doing in the past? What greater inducements have we to keep them here now?

Mr. CALDER: There is only one thing will induce people to stay in a country, and that is contentment.

Mr. CAHILL: Nothing makes contentment but good government.

Mr. CALDER: You must have such conditions that those who come here will be content to make their homes here. Those conditions are, of course, very broad and comprehensive, embracing a multitude of

things. We have not been losing our agriculturalists in this country. Those who have been leaving are mainly urban people; or, if agriculturalists have been leaving, it is because they wished to enter business or engage in industry. I presume that the very large emigration from this country has been very largely due to the rapid expansion of the trade and commerce and industry of the United States in every direction, which has made opportunities for our young men to enter business, and I dare say that condition will continue. I quite well remember when I visited my old home town in Western Ontario after living in Western Canada for some time, that the old boys whom I used to know had practically all gone to the United States to enter business, because the opportunities there were very much greater than in Canada. In my judgment, what we need in Canada more than anything else is an increased rural population, and I quite agree with the hon. member that we must establish in this country—and this applies to the Provincial Governments and Municipal Governments as well as to the Federal Government—conditions that will make our rural people content and prosperous and happy, because unless we do that we can never succeed in holding them. The question how it shall be done is a very complex one. The Provincial Governments have a very large duty to perform in that direction; the municipalities, if you will, have also their duties, and the Federal Government has its duty to perform. The question of good roads has a very important bearing on the problem; the question of education, the extended use of telephones, the establishment of social centres, and a hundred and one other things have to be considered, and I am free to admit that the fiscal policy of the country also has a marked bearing on the question. But the main thing is this: If we are going to get and maintain a rural population in this country it is absolutely essential that all parties concerned should combine to make conditions in the rural districts such as will lead to the contentment, prosperity and happiness of the rural population.

Mr. EULER: I think the hon. member for Pontiac has directed attention to a very serious question, perhaps more serious than the Government realizes, and that is the question of keeping the immigrants we already have. It is all very well to induce new immigration, but if we continue to lose those we already have our last condition will be worse than our first. An amendment has just been made to the Immigration Act which I felt was just a little too stringent, and I believe the result will be simply this: Some of our people in this country will convey to their friends at home news of the stringent regulations now existing and the disabilities under which they labour in this country as a result of certain steps on the part of this Government, and then we shall not obtain the immigration we otherwise might have had. To-day we are pretty well circumscribed as to the countries from which immigration can be drawn, practically the only country from which we can expect immigrants being the British Isles. One hon. member a week or so ago urged that no immigrants should be admitted from the southern countries of Europe. That suggestion was pretty far-reaching and was not adopted. The Central Empires, Germany and Austria, will no longer be permitted to send immigrants to this country. The manhood of France has been so much depleted that there is no possibility of our getting immigrants from that country. I am very doubtful, indeed, whether we shall receive a large immigration from the British Isles for some time to come. As the minister must know, the United States to-day, instead of receiving immigrants, is losing its immigrants. It may be true that those they are losing belong to a class which the United States does not care to retain, but it may be otherwise. I saw by the papers a few days ago that already steps have been taken by no fewer than a million people in the United States to return to their old homes; I do not know whether all these people are aliens, or whether any or all of them were naturalized. The paper went on to state that an exodus was expected from the United States of 5,000,000 people. If that is true, I should like to know whether the minister has any knowledge of a similar movement among our population. If it is true, it would probably not be the men who are settled on our western farms who are leaving, but the people from our cities and towns. After all, we have a population of only seven or eight million, and I firmly believe that the Government ought to make every effort to keep every immigrant who shows possibility of developing into a good Canadian citizen. It would be a pity if the Government directed its energies towards bringing in one immigrant, while at the same time it was losing two immigrants that had already settled here just for want of a little effort to induce them

to stay. Has the minister any knowledge of any large amount of emigration from this country such as apparently is the case with the United States, and if so, what efforts are being made to retain these people?

I entirely agree with the minister that the one thing we want in this country is more people. We have a debt of two billions of dollars, and I do not see how we can meet our exceedingly heavy obligations unless we fill the country up with people who will develop its natural resources. I think our energies should be directed along that line, and we should also remove the restrictions under which the people of this country have been labouring for several years, in order that people who are now here will be content to stay and others who are desirable may come.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As my hon. friend from North Waterloo has said, this question of immigration is certainly a most interesting one in view of the peculiar circumstances in which the country finds itself to-day. We shall have to be very careful with regard to immigration in the future and see that we build up in our western provinces, and throughout Canada generally, a real Canadian citizenship. It is appalling to think, first, of the number of native Canadians, and, secondly, of the number of immigrants who have been brought to Canada with good Canadian money, who have left this country during the last thirty or forty years.

Sir Richard Cartwright, referring to the number of persons who had left Canada within a certain period—I think he meant the decade between 1882 and 1892—said that Canada had lost as many immigrants, whose entrance to this country had been advertised and paid for, as the Americans lost soldiers during the whole of the Civil war. A Canadian has only to travel to Boston to find that that city is practically an annex of Nova Scotia; and if he went to Chicago he would find there between 30,000 and 40,000 Canadians, both French and English, who, I know as a matter of fact, are a power in municipal and Congressional elections. Some years ago my hon. friend Senator Dandurand and I were delegated at Sault Ste. Marie to represent Canada at the semi-centennial anniversary of the Sault Ste. Marie canal. In the afternoon we were called upon to address a gathering at which the Vice-president of the United States the late Mr. Fairbanks, was also present, and I was rather surprised when we were requested to speak in French. To my profound astonishment I discovered that in that gathering of about ten thousand people there were at least 5,000 French Canadians. That was in the State of Michigan which is partly French. West Bay city and many other cities, not to speak of the city of Detroit, are largely populated with Canadians. And if you went to Philadelphia you would come across so many Canadians from Hamilton and London and Toronto that you would be under the impression that you were in Canada. In fact, the entire United States to-day is dotted with Canadian Clubs, and you cannot go into any city in the United States in which there are Canadians to any appreciable extent without finding a Canadian Club. These clubs are fashionable institutions. This will show that there is in the republic to the south of us a very large population of Canadians of both races and if what my hon. friend said a moment ago is true, and I believe it is, that we cannot hope to get from Europe as many immigrants as we got before the war, I think we should turn our attention to the Canadians who are in the United States, and who to-day, knowing the value of Canadian lands and appreciating their country as they do, would be only too pleased to return to their Mother Country if sufficient inducement were offered. I may speak particularly of those Canadians settled in the United States who belong to my own race—the French Canadian. I think I am within the mark in stating that there are in the United States to-day at least two million French Canadians. The largest French cities in America outside of Montreal and Quebec, are New England cities—Lowell, Fall River, and many others, where there are French Canadians in every municipal council, in every legislature, on the bench and in every profession. And I know from the members of the Canadian hierarchy that they are obliged to supply the clergy of the United States with French Canadian priests. The cause of the emigration of the French Canadian to the United States is very well known. First of all, the French Canadian is adventuresome, and was so under the old French regime. The King of France had to enact severe laws to restrain the French Canadians, or Canadians as they were called in those days from leaving the settlements. The term "French Canadian" dates back only twenty or twenty-five years. In the old days, even under the French, there was quite a marked distinction between a "Canadian" and a "Frenchman." Montcalm in his letters to the min-

ister in France always refers to the Canadians as the permanent inhabitants of Canada, and to the French as the men in His Majesty's troops. We all know the history of the famous coureurs des bois under the French regime. They were always away from the lands in quest of the fur trade with the redmen and by reason of that peculiar love of adventure these Canadians were encountered in every part of the continent, in the Mississippi Valley, near the Rocky mountains, in the wilds of Kansas and down to New Mexico. Later on, under the British domination you found them in Illinois, Pennsylvania, and roving all over the continent. In the forties quite a large number of French Canadians left for California, lured by the discovery of the gold mines there; and again they were attracted by the discovery of the gold fields in Australia. Later on in the seventies, as the minister said a moment ago, the industrial unrest in Canada was responsible for a considerable emigration of French Canadians, to the New England States, with the result that in all these cities in Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and New York there are large colonies of my fellow countrymen. They have succeeded, but it is surprising to know that a large number of those French Canadians would like to return to Canada. Better circumstances and a keener appreciation of the surroundings of the old homestead appeal to their imagination, and I know that if a real movement were instituted to draw from that large population some settlers to Canada, the hon. minister would undoubtedly find there a very interesting field. There are some societies and some members of the clergy who are deeply interested in bringing back to Canada as many as possible of that population, and I hope that my hon. friend will encourage that movement because it is a healthy one. The French Canadian is essentially a good settler. History proves that. Those Canadians belong to the oldest stock in Confederation and should be encouraged to return and settle on the old homesteads. There is one society in Montreal, and, if I mistake not, there is one in the city of Ottawa, and there is, or was some years ago, one in Quebec. The Quebec Government has done something in the way of subsidizing these societies, but as the question of repatriation is under the control of my hon. friend, I expect he will do his little share towards achieving what I consider would be quite a success. My hon. friend said a moment ago that the province generally did not know the value and extent of their land fit for cultivation. I believe his statement is right. It has only been in the last few years that we in the province of Quebec have realized the richness, the enormous value of our resources in lumbering, pulp manufacturing and wheat growing in the new district of Abitibi. Since the National Transcontinental railway has reached this far away region quite a population has settled there and I am told that this district is certainly full of promise. I know as a matter of fact that the Quebec Government intends to co-operate with the Dominion in connection with the land settlement of our soldiers. My friend, the Premier of Quebec, was here on Saturday and I was speaking to him about Abitibi. He then said to me that his policy was to direct, as far as possible, returned soldiers to take up lands in that new district. The Government of Quebec has accepted the views which were expressed by my hon. friend at the last Dominion-provincial conference and are willing to co-operate with him towards the land settlement of our returned soldiers. Once more let me say that I expect that my hon. friend will do something towards the repatriation movement of the French Canadians. It is really sad to think that there are in the United States such a large number of our countrymen, not only French Canadians but English Canadians. This is a great loss to Canada and if we can induce even a small portion of the large Canadian population which has settled in the United States to return, I think it will be the best work performed by the Immigration Department.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have one further word to say in reply to the remarks made by the minister as to the information he possessed about lands in the different provinces. He thought he was answering me by saying that my own province of Nova Scotia could not tell what lands it had. That is no answer. It is nobody's business what lands they have in Nova Scotia. The lands there do not belong to the Dominion of Canada. We do not pay out any money to survey land in Nova Scotia. They are not looking for immigration. The Immigration Department pays no money to bring in immigrants to Nova Scotia and has never taken any interest in whether immigrants come to Nova Scotia or did not.

Mr. CALDER: I was down to the province of Nova Scotia not very long ago, and I had an opportunity of discussing the whole question with practically every mem-

ber of the Government for four or five hours, and they were very much interested in it. While they have no Crown lands left, there is an agricultural situation in Nova Scotia that, they realize, requires attention. It is only within the last week or two that I had a communication from Mr. Cumming, who is head of the Department of Agriculture there, and he was very anxious to know what stand we are going to take to assist settlement on the abandoned farm, or the semi-abandoned farm; that is a farm which is not cultivated up to its full use. They have that trouble in Nova Scotia just as they have it all through Southern Ontario. One of the real problems in the older portions of Canada, and not only in Nova Scotia, is the question of getting a real, live new settler who will take the place of the person who is working a farm in a half-hearted way. In addition to that, you have the abandoned farm. That is a question that has grown up all through the older part of Canada, and you have there an aspect of this question which requires the most serious consideration, not only on the part of the local Government, but on the part of the Federal Government as well.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister has not answered my point at all, and he is absolutely wrong in saying that his department or the Interior Department, or any department of the Government, have ever paid one dollar towards immigration in Nova Scotia. They have not an acre of land within the limits of that province, and they have no immigration policy in regard to it. Consequently, when I am asked about the ownership of land in Nova Scotia, I answer we have no land. Under the Dominion Government, we have been for the last fifty years paying land surveyors to make surveys, maps have been laid before members of Parliament and the people showing the lands that we have in the different provinces, with different colourings on these maps, to indicate the lands we have for sale; those which are cultivable and fit for agriculture, the lands that are under the control of the minister, how much of these lands is owned by the provinces, and how much is available for settlement. Yet, the minister tells me I do not know what I am talking about, and that I do not know the state of things in my own province. That is no answer; it is a mere subterfuge. We would naturally expect the minister to be able to answer. Millions of dollars have been voted by this Parliament for the purpose of ascertaining how much land we have in the different provinces and what amount of that land is fit for settlement.

Mr. CALDER: Is the hon. gentleman speaking of Federal Crown lands?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not talking of any one class of land. It must be perfectly clear to the minister—I am speaking of the land owned by the Canadian people, by the King, in the right of the Government of Canada. That is the kind of land of which we have been making surveys. That is the kind of land that the Department of the Interior has been dealing with for the last fifty years and in regard to which they must have absolute information in the department.

Mr. CALDER: Surely.

Mr. McKENZIE: But the minister sneers at me when I ask him how much land we have available for settlement in these provinces. He answers by asking how much land we have in Nova Scotia. What difference does that make? There is this system of surveys the system of the allocation of lands, in the different provinces on which we are spending millions of money. We are ascertaining the quality of the land, the location and extent of timber limits, waterpowers and everything that appertains to our vast properties in the West. Under these circumstances have we not the right to ask the minister how much is available for immigration and settlement? A minister of the Crown who is the head of a department whose officers are all over the country getting this information, and which has its agents working from coast to coast selling this land, should be supposed to be in possession of that information and it is hardly to be expected that he will answer a question of that kind by saying: Why should you ask for such information when your own department of coal mines in Nova Scotia would not be able to supply you with similar information. We have, as incidental to the department of the provincial secretary in Nova Scotia, a sort of a little side show in the form of the Department of Agriculture which is not a department by itself. It pays some attention to immigration, but we have no well organized immigration department in Nova Scotia.

I am sorry that the minister should have replied in this way instead of answering my question as to the knowledge which we should possess in this House of what lands the Government have in the West. He has not answered that question except by referring me to what is happening in the Maritime

Provinces. Let me say to the minister that it is essential to getting immigrants to come to this country and keeping them here that we should keep our word to them and deal fairly and honestly with them. I charge the minister with having knowledge of the fact that immigrants came into Canada under the pledge of a statute of this Dominion which told them: "When you enter Canada and become naturalized, you become a British subject; the pledge of the King is handed down to you by that statute, which is that you shall always be dealt with as a British subject."

We had thousands of those people in this Dominion in 1917, but notwithstanding this pledge the Minister of Immigration was a party to violating the statute, breaking the pledge of His Majesty the King to the King's subjects, by depriving them of the franchise. Instead of allowing those people to enjoy the franchise the Government disqualified them and told them: "You are British subjects, you have taken the oath of allegiance, this statute guarantees to you all the rights of British subjects, but nevertheless we are not keeping the pledge of the King to you in extending and continuing to you these rights." Far be it from me to say that you should extend any rights to any man who shows any sign of disloyalty to the King; I would be just as bitter as anybody in saying to any such person coming to Canada: "There is no room here for anybody but a true loyal subject of the King." But what are we to do in the case of a man who comes here and takes the oath of allegiance and behaves in an absolutely right and proper manner in connection with every duty he is called upon to perform. As long as such a man does that he is entitled to the due fulfilment of the promises which were made to him. There were thousands of people in Canada in 1917 against whose loyalty not one black mark could be found; all that could be said was that they came here from countries that are possibly now at war with us, but they took the oath of allegiance and have observed to the letter every duty which devolved upon them. Nevertheless the sins of the fathers were visited upon the children to the third and fourth generation; and the Minister of Immigration, knowing that these people did not deserve it at his hands, was a party to cutting them away from that which is dearer to a man almost than any other right that he possesses—the right of participating in the government of the country in which he lives. I hope the minister will always keep in mind that whatever promises we make to immigrants coming to Canada shall be observed to the letter, particularly when we solemnly sit down here and pass a statute in which we grant certain rights to newcomers. That statute received the consent of His Majesty the King, and it then became the law of the land; and we should be very careful and have the very best proof that it is necessary to break away from the pledges and promises therein set forth before we adopt such a policy. I submit, therefore, to the minister that his department should bear in mind that people coming into Canada should be allowed to enjoy those rights and exercise those privileges which have been promised to them, so long as they will do and maintain on their part what is expected of them as British subjects. I submit that has not been done on the Government's part in the past, and it accounts to a very great extent for the smallness of the immigration entering Canada just now from countries beyond the seas. Because, the Britisher from the United Kingdom, although he is a British subject, does not like to see others unfairly treated, and does not care to go to another country which he understands has treated immigrants as immigrants coming to Canada have been treated. The minister says I was very wrong in saying anything about the synchronizing of the formation of this department with the organization of the Unionist Government. I venture to tell him that the Unionist Government had very little in mind in regard to immigration and colonization at that time. It was not a period when immigrants were entering Canada or when commercial interests were very greatly thought of. That Government was organized for one purpose, and one purpose only; and it is vain for the minister to tell me that after the Department of the Interior had for fifty years been managing all the branches pertaining to this work, that it dawned upon him in the middle of the war that it was necessary to create a new department to handle people that were not coming to Canada. I have my own views about the matter, and the minister has his; but when he makes a statement, and I make another contrary to his, the circumstances of the case strongly confirm my assertion as to the synchronizing which took place at the time of the formation of the Unionist Government.

Mr. CALDER: I hope that in rising to speak for a few minutes in reply to the leader of the Opposition, I shall not be accused of blocking by own Estimates—

Mr. McKENZIE: That will be the next thing.

Mr. CALDER: —as was a certain minister the other day. I am very sorry that I misunderstood the leader of the Opposition in reference to his question as to the amount of land available in Canada for settlement. I was viewing the situation from this, and I think from the right standpoint; that the whole question of settlement and colonization does not apply merely to federal land, it is being equally applicable to all Canada. When the hon. gentleman asked if I had information regarding the land available for settlement I naturally assumed that he had in his mind the whole of Canada, not merely that portion of it which happens to be the federal domain. I wish to assure him that I was not endeavouring to escape his question by any subterfuge, because if the Department of Immigration and Colonization is going to prove of service to Canada, that service must be to the whole Dominion. It is not right that the Federal Government should pass laws and expend money merely for the settlement of those portions of Western Canada in which it has lands. It is from that standpoint that I have endeavoured to approach this problem, and it was from that standpoint that I had a conference last fall with the representatives of all the provinces in Canada and endeavoured to secure their co-operation in connection with it. It appears to me that what the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has said is quite correct; we have found a new Canada because in the northern part of Quebec there is valuable territory that we did not know existed a short time ago, and the same is true to a large extent of Northern Ontario. The province of British Columbia is in my judgment the richest province in Canada, but it has not had the agricultural development it should have. I took this matter up with the various provinces and endeavoured to ascertain their available land resources for settlement purposes; but I have found that neither here at Ottawa, nor in the records of their own Provincial Governments, was there anything like a reliable or accurate record of one of the principal resources that we have in this country—that is land fit for settlement—I endeavoured to prevail upon them as to the necessity of our getting an inventory of this land just as quickly as we possibly could, and all the premiers and their colleagues who were present concurred in that. Some of them have already passed laws with a view to securing that inventory. In tackling the question of the settlement of Crown lands, lands in the possession of the provinces, and privately owned lands, we must first find out what we have. Notwithstanding what my hon. friend has said, I may point out that when I was in Nova Scotia I found Premier Murray and all his colleagues intensely interested in this question so far as Nova Scotia was concerned. We spent four or five hours together at Halifax, considering the problem from every standpoint. They realize that the land of that province is not being used to its full capacity; that good lands are only half used, some of them not used at all, and they want to devise ways and means whereby that land may at the earliest day be used to the full. So that in the old province of Nova Scotia, where the Crown lands are all gone, there is an immigration problem. We must not forget that the expenditures made by the Federal Government in the past for immigration and colonization have not been made for Western Canada alone. It is true that the majority of the settlers have gone into Western Canada, but in the propaganda that we carry on in the United States and Great Britain and that was carried on in the various countries of Europe, no attempt has been made to deal only with one portion of Canada. In any case, if that has been done in the past it certainly should not continue in the future. The Federal Government must be impartial in this matter; it must treat all parts of Canada alike. We must have a national policy not a sectional policy. It is of the utmost importance that the closest co-operation should exist between the Federal Government and the provincial governments; that in this House should deal with the matter not from the local but from the national standpoint, and that whatever work we carry on outside of Canada should be carried on from the national standpoint, not from the standpoint of settling only those lands in Western Canada that belong to the Crown.

Mr. McKENZIE: For the last fifty years we have been devoting our time, our money and our attention so far as immigration and colonization are concerned to lands which Canada owns in the West—because Canada does not own lands anywhere else. If the Government will announce that their immigration policy has been changed and that it will now embrace the whole of Canada, that is another matter. But we have never heard that the policy of the Gov-

ernment with regard to immigration has been changed. I do not think that there is any authority in the minister's department to take the moneys voted by this House and spend them in any province in which the Government of Canada, as such, owns land. My theory is that these moneys are voted for the purpose of dealing with lands owned by the Canadian people through the right of this Parliament. No one realizes more than I do the great necessity of developing an immigration policy in Nova Scotia. In that province much splendid agricultural land is inviting cultivation. The difficulty is that there are industries to which the people go more readily than they go on the farms. They like to work in the coal mines, steel works, factories, and so on; they are not so willing to stay on the land. If the minister can do anything to make agriculture more interesting to immigrants or to the people who now live in Nova Scotia than it is at present, no one will more heartily give him the honour that is due him than I will. I trust that if it is the policy of the Government to extend their immigration policy they will have the greatest possible success in my own native province as well as in every other old province to which they may extend their energies.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Have not the industries to which my hon. friend referred had a very beneficial effect in recent years upon the farming communities in their various localities?

Mr. McKENZIE: No doubt they have had a beneficial effect. But in Nova Scotia we do not produce more than ten per cent of the food that is necessary to maintain the people in those various industries. We buy Ontario beef and Prince Edward Island beef and agricultural products. It is pretty hard to keep a Cape Bretoner or a Nova Scotian at work on the farm; he finds it more congenial to take up other work. But farming may be made more attractive to these people, along the lines suggested by the minister.

Sir SAM HUGHES: When I visited Nova Scotia quite a number of years ago, the complaint was that the people were being attracted to the New England States as labourers and that the farms were deserted. An old farmer who had several hundred acres of splendid land near Tatamagouche, in Pictou County, pointed out that his sons had all gone to Boston and were getting ready money engaged in street work in that city, while his farm remained untilled. I happened to visit that locality on a later occasion and found the grandchildren working on the farm. I understood that there was quite a return of the people to the land in that part of Nova Scotia. I agree that the farmers should be encouraged to settle on the land in the older provinces as well as in the new provinces.

Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries, $575,000.

Sir SAM HUGHES: A number of years ago, when Hon. Mr. Sifton was Minister of Interior, immigration agents in the United States were permitted to act as land agents, and settlement agents. That policy was highly beneficial to Canada, and resulted in the bringing in of a good class of settlers. Is there any restriction now on their acting also as land agents?

Mr. CALDER: For some years past our agents in the United States have received very specific instructions to have nothing whatever to do with the sale of lands.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is a great mistake.

Mr. CALDER: They have been acting under those instructions for a number of years, and they concern themselves almost entirely with the settlement of homestead lands. Within the past six months or so I have reviewed the situation, and not very long ago I came to the conclusion that all those agents should be permitted to receive inquiries with respect to privately owned lands and those inquiries should be forwarded to associations which have recently been created in Western Canada for the purpose of dealing with them. It is only within the last month that there has been established in each of the Prairie Provinces an association representing private owners of land, and we have made arrangements whereby all inquiries reaching our offices in the United States will be forwarded to those associations. As the Committee will understand, the situation to-day is very different from what it was ten or fifteen years ago when an abundance of homestead land was available throughout the West. The landseeker from the United States is to-day looking rather for a piece of land which he can purchase within existing settlements than for outlying homestead lands, and consequently, we are creating machinery, both in the United States and Canada, whereby the prospective landseeker may be put in touch with owners of land who have them for sale.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope that amongst those agents in foreign countries the min-

ister will find his way clear to appoint one in Belgium. We have already an agent in France; the Hon. Philippe Roy is the Canadian Commissioner in Paris, and as the minister stated a moment ago, after the tremendous loss of life suffered by France during the last war, we cannot expect the French Government to facilitate the work of any immigration agent, but in Belgium, I am informed, that there are good prospects for immigration. Before the war a movement was on foot to send immigrants from Belgium to Canada and the minister knows that the Belgians belong to the better class of immigrants. As gardeners around the large cities, such as Toronto and especially Montreal, the Belgians have done wonders, and if inducements could be put forward, I believe the refugees especially who are at present in England would willingly come to Canada. I think there are in the Northwest one or two Belgian colonies, one being in Manitoba. The province of Quebec has in Brussels an agent, Mr. Langlois, formerly a journalist in Montreal, who is, I believe, publishing a paper called "Belgique-Canada," the first issue of which I saw the other day. The future seems to be very bright from an immigration standpoint, and I would urge upon the minister to appoint somebody in Brussels to act in conjunction with Mr. Langlois. Some years ago the Hon. Mr. Sifton, now Sir Clifford Sifton, appointed two agents in Belgium, and for a while we had quite a stream of immigrants from that country. If the Belgium is not a farmer, he is so thrifty and industrious that he is capable of adapting himself practically to any business in the country and from all points of view he is a very desirable immigrant.

Mr. CALDER: I quite agree with the statement made by the hon. (Mr. Lemieux). As a matter of fact, for many years we have had an agent at Antwerp and we have obtained many very desirable settlers from Belgium. According to my latest information—and I have made official inquiries—the Belgian Government will not, in the very near future, look with very much favour upon any effort made to induce its people to leave their own country. I am sure hon. members can quite understand the reason for that, because Belgium has also lost a large portion of its population, and conditions in that country, as a result of the war, are far from being what they should be and the Belgian Government are anxious that the country should be rehabilitated and put on a sound basis agriculturally and industrially as quickly as possible. So far as all that class of immigration work is concerned, that is, as regards Belgium, France, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, all those countries in northern Europe, all that we can do at the present time, because shipping under any circumstances will not be available until after September or probably after even October, is to have a very careful review made of the situation. Some person must visit those countries and get in actual touch with the situation so that we may have first hand knowledge. When that is done, we shall have the facts and we shall know what action can be taken, but until that review is made I doubt very much if any action could be taken. Until our soldiers and their dependents are home—and that will take some months yet—there will be no shipping available for such immigration.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I understood the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) to say that a periodical was being published in Brussels to induce immigrants to come to Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Mr. TWEEDIE: What kind of Canada is Belgian-Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a paper published in Brussels.

Mr. TWEEDIE: What land is Belgian-Canada? Have we any Belgian-Canada? I think if any periodicals are being published to induce people to come to Canada the sooner such periodicals drop any national or sectarian designation the better for the country. If people want to publish periodicals and call them "Canada," let them call them "Canada," but I do not think there is any reason why they should be called "Belgian-Canada," or any other Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend misunderstood me. It is a review published by the agent of the province of Quebec residing at Brussels, under the title "Belgique-"Canada," or in English "Belgium-Canada." The review discusses the problems of the two countries, their resources, etc., and invites capital. It is not sectarian in any way. It is similar to the publication we had in Paris some years ago called "Paris-Canada," which was the organ of the Commissioner in Paris.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I misunderstood my hon. friend. I thought he called it "Belgian Canada." I should like to know what is the policy of the department with regard to the

immigration offices which are now being closed down throughout Western Canada. If all these are to be closed up, how will the Government handle immigrants to that part of the country?

Mr. CALDER: During the year we have closed some twenty-one immigration halls which existed in the older parts of Western Canada, because their usefulness had passed. We are keeping open the halls which are nearer the homesteads areas in Northern Saskatchewan and Northern Alberta. We have also found it desirable to close down offices at places like Regina, Saskatoon, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat, simply because there was no work at these places for our officers to do. In the old days when homesteaders were going into these parts they had plenty of work to do, but now the homesteads in those parts have all been taken up, and it is not necessary to maintain offices any longer in the older-settled portions. We are, however, maintaining our offices on the outskirts of the homestead areas. With regard to settlers on private-owned land, these people generally have money, and the man with $3,000 or $4,000 or $10,000 in his pocket does not require much assistance or advice from the ordinary immigration agent. Most of these settlers are from the United States and know just where they want to go, and what they want, as a rule. Consequently, the time has passed for the maintenance of a large number of these offices, and during the year we have closed several of them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many offices are there in the British Isles?

Mr. CALDER: Twelve: London, Liverpool, Glasgow, Aberdeen, Birmingham, York, Carlisle, Cardiff, Bristol, Belfast, Dublin, Peterborough. None of our Old Country offices have been closed. The staffs in the provinces, however, have been cut down to the minimum. The London office has had a great deal more work to do in connection with soldiers' dependents.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You should get as many agents as possible among the Scotch Presbyterians.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. COPP: This item, "Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries," represents not only a large amount but also an increase over last year. It would be interesting to know the number of agents we employ in foreign countries, and what countries, and also the expenses in connection with the different offices and the results that have been attained—this last being the important point.

Mr. CALDER: During the last fiscal year the total expenditure in salaries in Canada, the United States, and Great Britain, amounted to $544,685. Of that amount $212,433 was expended for salaries of officials at such interior points in Canada as Victoria, Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John. Salaries paid to boundary officials amounted to $183,164.

Mr. CAHILL: Is that extra?

Mr. CALDER: The salaries are all included in this $575,000. Last year we paid our officials, placed at many points along the international boundary from coast to coast, $183,164. Salaries paid in the United States amounted to $82,013, and in Great Britain $67,072. In the United States we now have 22 offices which have been in operation for a number of years. These offices are at Detroit, Saginaw, St. Paul, Grand Forks, Watertown, Spokane, Syracuse, Kansas City, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Omaha, Columbus, Harrisburg, Des Moines, Biddeford, Great Falls, Boston, Bedford, New York, Portland, Manchester, N.H., Chicago and San Francisco. At each of these points we have a chief agent. There are twenty stenographers and six other clerks. The staff in these 22 offices number in all 48, and the salaries amounted to approximately $82,000. Last year we closed three offices in the United States, one of those three being in Michigan, one in Philadelphia, because we felt there was really no necessity for their continuance. As regards the result of the work in the United States, I said this afternoon that the number of immigrants that arrived last year in Canada was about 60,000, and in the previous year about 75,000. In Great Britain we have twelve offices, eight in England, two in Scotland, and two in Ireland. On the continent all offices were closed shortly after the war. We had an officer in Antwerp and a staff in France. Our agent in France died some months ago, and no appointment has yet been made. The work in England during the last year or two has been confined very largely to repatriation in one form or another. During the past six months our staff has been extremely busy in connection with the re-

turn of soldiers' wives and children to Canada, and the staff at London has had to be increased in order to take care of that work. Our staff in the outside offices have also had considerable work. The dependents of our soldiers are pretty well scattered over the United Kingdom and there is a good deal of work involved in arranging for transportation and so on. The total expenditure in the department last year for salaries was $544,000. We are now asking for an expenditure of $575,000. I cannot say at present what provision will be made by the Civil Service Commission in connection with the reorganization of our Outside Service. I do not know what schedules will be brought down. Our outside staffs will be re-organized and classified salaries will be provided, and I would anticipate that in the new arrangement some increases in salaries will have to be provided. During the year I have had to provide for a number of increases in salary. In our Outside Service there was no provision for the ordinary annual increase that the Inside civil servants receive, and when I came to look into the matter I found a great many anomalies that had to be adjusted in fairness to a number of first-class officials who had been in the department a good many years. We may as well be frank about the matter; we all know that in the past the Outside Service was to a large extent treated from a purely political standpoint by all Governments, and in the result many men in the service were not treated on an equitable basis. When I began to ascertain what was right and proper in these cases, I found it necessary to make many re-adjustments, and as a result our whole service outside has been very much improved. I think there is a better spirit, and I am confident that we are getting to-day in our immigration service in Canada, the United States and Great Britain far better work than has been secured for many years, simply because these little matters which had been neglected for a considerable time were attended to.

Mr. COPP: Since the minister has been in the department has there been any reduction of officials?

Mr. CALDER: Our service in Canada and the United States has been very carefully overhauled. The department was created in December, 1917. We then had an outside staff of 459. In March of this year we had a staff of 344, a decrease of 115. These figures were obtained in this way. We closed 21 halls and the salaries of the officers who were in charge of these halls, and who were retired amounted to $8,590. Most of them were simply caretakers. I found these halls open and expenditures going on for fuel, light, heat, repairs and so on, while many of them were not used at all. In a number of cases not a single immigrant had been in these halls for months. Something less than ten are still open. I do not mean to say that if we find it necessary in connection with our work these expenditures might not increase again, but I shall see to it that these halls are not reopened or kept in operation unless there are immigrants to be accommodated in them. At various interior points, such as Saskatoon, Moosejaw or Regina, in past years, when we were dealing with homesteaders in large numbers, we found it necessary to have agencies established. We have decreased the staffs of these agencies to the extent of fifty-two persons. These persons had been kept at these offices continuously for years practically after the work that they were appointed to do had very largely ceased. They were retired and their annual salaries amounted to $50,070. During the war we found it necessary to appoint a number of officials whose duty it was to issue permits to those who were leaving Canada to enter the United States. We have retired twenty of these officers with an annual saving of $14,350. Our boundary staffs were also overhauled and as a consequence thirty-one officers were retired representing an annual saving of $31,300. A number of officials resigned, some were transferred to other departments, and one or two died. In that connection we retired thirty-seven officials representing a saving of $32,490. This makes a total reduction in our staff of 158, representing an annual saving in salaries of $136,800. That is one side of the account. We found it necessary to make some appointments.

Mr. BELAND: You could dispense with those officials?

Mr. CALDER: I would not say in all cases, because some were transferred to other departments, some were retired and others were appointed in their places. But there were 158 retired. Now, I am going to give those who were added, and that will show the net reduction in the staff. In the case of boundary inspectors, there were thirty-four. Amongst those there were some officials retired where they should not have been retired. A further investigation showed that nine

of these men were absolutely needed. That makes a total of 43. Deducting that number from the 158 we have a net reduction in the Outside Service of 115 officers representing an annual saving of $98,340. In the United States we closed three offices and retired ten officials, the net saving there being about $6,000.

Mr. BELAND: But the vote asked for is a larger vote than last year?

Mr. CALDER: We have had to make a good many adjustments in the salaries of officials who are left in the Service.

Mr. BELAND: Increases?

Mr. CALDER: Yes. We have found it absolutely necessary. We found that a large number of our men were in receipt of salaries of $900, whereas the American officials are in receipt of salaries from $1,500 to $1,800. We found we simply could not retain the right kind of men in the Service with that condition prevailing. We found it necessary to assure the efficiency of the Service, as well as to retain our men, that there should be many increases.

Mr. COPP: I understood the minister to say that during the past year there were about 60,000 immigrants partly from the United States and partly from European countries.

Mr. CALDER: Practically none from European countries.

Mr. COPP: All from the United States?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: We have been told that a good many people left Canada for the United States but we have not had any figures to show what the number is.

Mr. CALDER: We do not keep any figures of that kind although it might be desirable to do so. We endeavour to keep a very careful record of those who come in and who declare their intention of remaining in Canada, but we have no records of transients moving backwards and forwards.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is the name of the agent at Snowflake in Southern Manitoba, and the salary that is being paid to him?

Mr. CALDER: Mr. Nesbitt. He is getting a salary from this department of $600, and I am told he also receives $600 as customs officer, making his total salary $1,200. The Immigration and Customs Departments endeavour at a great many points to make arrangements whereby one official can carry on the work of both departments.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Is the minister aware that the man who occupied that position before Mr. Nesbitt was appointed held it for twenty years? He began with $200 and, after the lapse of twenty years, it amounted to $600 or $700. He was appointed originally in connection with guarding the forest but afterwards became a customs officer, and for twenty years served this Government as faithfully as any man ever served his Maker. In addition to being a customs officer he performed duties for the Immigration Department at $100 a year. About the 3rd of last October he received notice from the Government that he was dismissed, and his dismissal took effect at the end of the previous month, so that he was removed before he got notice. I took the matter up with the Customs Department, and they wrote me a very curt note that the offices had been combined for economy's sake. Now we discover that his successor is receiving $600 or $700 a year as customs officer, and is paid an additional $600 a year by the Department of Immigration, whereas the man who served his country faithfully for twenty years at a salary of $600 or $700 a year was dismissed for economy's sake. I am free to state that I do not think the minister knew anything about this little job, or the Minister of Customs either; I think it is a little bit of trickery on the part of some official. Mr. Conner held the position for twenty years; raised a family of ten children in this country; farmed anywhere from four to five or six quarter-sections; bore the burden and heat of the day during all these long years; did his duty for his country and was proud of it; guarded the boundary just as faithfully as if he owned the country; and during the long term he held the office turned in every dollar of revenue he could collect for the Government. Yet he is dismissed and that dismissal took effect two or three days before he received the notice. The statement made to him, and also to me, was that it was done for the purpose of economy. Now we find when the showdown comes in Parliament that the salary for the new appointee has been pretty nearly doubled, and James Conner, a faithful servant, is turned adrift. I do not blame the minister, because I do not think he really knew what had happened; but if this kind of thing has occurred in many other cases it is no wonder there is great discontent among civil servants. I appeal to my hon. friend the member for Lisgar (Mr. Bolton), in which constituency Mr. Conner lives, to bear out my statement. The hon. gentleman knows him as intimately as I do, and

said to me that a more decent man did not live in the province of Manitoba. I think it is the most shameful treatment I ever knew to be meted out to any official in this country.

Mr. CALDER: I am not acquainted with the facts in this case and the statement from the hon. member for Springfield will certainly have to be inquired into.

Mr. RICHARDSON: An apology ought to be sent to Mr. Conner.

Mr. CALDER: This is the first knowledge I have received of the facts as stated. In so far as our department is concerned, Mr. F. H. Nesbitt is the inspector at Snowflake, and he is in receipt of a salary from us of $600. I am informed that he also receives $600 from the Customs Department, but whether that is correct or not I do not know.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I happen to know that.

Mr. CALDER: Then the case will have to be inquired into. Our department had nothing to do with Mr. Conner's appointment, or, I daresay, with the dismissal. Apparently it was decided that one official could carry out the work at this point. I cannot say what the motives behind the dismissal of Mr. Conner were, but I shall certainly take the earliest opportunity of inquiring into it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have received a letter from the Commissioner of Customs saying that the motive for Mr. Conner's dismissal was economy, but whereas this man performed the duties of two offices for $700, another man is foisted into the position at $1,200. I do not know anything about this Mr. Nesbitt, but I understand he was engaged in Winnipeg. When the deluge came, and lots of people had nothing to do, wires were pulled to get Nesbitt appointed at Snowflake. So they got rid of poor old Jimmie Conner, than whom there never lived a more decent man. Mr. Conner, who had served his country faithfully for twenty long years, and was as competent a man as could be got, was thrown out of the job even before he received notice. The thing is an outrage and ought to be inquired into. Certainly the least Mr. Conner deserves is an apology and reinstatement to his former post.

Mr. MICHAUD: How long ago was he dismissed?

Mr. RICHARDSON: He got his notice I think on the 3rd of last October, and he was dismissed on the last of September; he was dismissed before he got notice that his services had been dispensed with, and on the alleged ground of economy.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Who dismissed him?

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is what I am trying to find out. I made up my mind that the only way we could correct a thing like this was by exposing it on the floor of Parliament. I do not know who dismissed Mr. Conner, but I do know that the Commissioner of Customs wrote to me that his dismissal was on the ground of economy. The new man, instead of getting only $600 or $700 as poor Conner did is receiving double that amount.

Mr. DUFF: I think now is the time to probe this matter to the very bottom. The hon. gentleman may say that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization was not aware of it, but he is responsible for every official dismissed or appointed in his department. We have a right now to inquire on what ground Conner was dismissed, and the other man appointed in his place.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Conner was a Customs officer before he took up work for the Department of Immigration. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Bolton) says that it was the other way round; but the facts are just as I have stated. Mr. Conner got anywhere from $200 to $600 a year extending over this long period of twenty years, and then he was thrown out without due notice, and not even thanked for his services.

Mr. COPP: The hon. gentleman says he was a capable officer?

Mr. RICHARDSON: As capable a man as ever stood in leather shoes. And he guarded the boundary just as faithfully as if he owned the country.

Mr. CALDER: I can assure the Committee that the question of readjusting the staff of the service is by no means an easy one. I attempted the task, and I think I have succeeded fairly well, but I presume I have made a great many enemies for myself. That I expected and will have to let it pass.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Will the minister promise me to look into the matter and see that justice is done?

Mr. CALDER: If the hon. gentleman will pardon me a minute I have something to say to the Committee, and I think it is very important that I should say it. I want to speak very plainly and very candidly. In my opinion, the public service

of Canada needs to be cleaned up in very many places, and in taking any steps in that direction, a minister is largely dependent upon those upon whom he casts the responsibility of making the necessary inquiries. When the inquiry is made and the minister receives the report, considers it and applies to it the best judgment that he can, he must act in accordance with that judgment. I do not care who the minister is, if he were the angel Gabriel himself, he would land himself into all kinds of trouble when he took any steps in this direction. That has been my experience—although, I say, I do not mind it.

Mr. COPP: And you are not the angel Gabriel.

Mr. CALDER: I am not the angel Gabriel; I do not profess to be. But about one hundred and fifty persons have been retired in one way or another from the Department of Immigration—and if hon. gentlemen think that I have kept myself out of trouble, they are very much mistaken. I am quite satisfied that in the interests of the department and of the country generally I did the proper thing. I should like to see the same thing take place in connection with every other department of the Government. Possibly in doing that certain mistakes will be made; possibly an occasional injustice will be done to somebody in the service. If so, it is only right and proper that the matter should be called to the attention of the minister concerned and that the necessary inquiry should be made. Not in this particular case, but for the purposes of the investigation that I caused to be held in the Outside Service, I engaged the services of two men, one of whom was Mr. A. B. Cook, of Regina. A return was brought down early in the session in connection with the matter. Mr. Cook was sheriff in Regina for many years. I have known him for twenty years or more and, as the member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) knows, he is an exceedingly competent man. I suppose that no office in Saskatchewan is as well organized and as well conducted as Mr. Cook's office. I asked Mr. Cook to come here and help me in this work, on the understanding that he would view the matter purely from a business standpoint and hew strictly to the line regardless of politics or any consideration other than that of the public interest. With Mr. Cook I sent Mr. Percy Reid, an official of the department of long standing who knows our service from coast to coast. These men went over the ground not in a perfunctory way, but very thoroughly indeed. They got actually in touch with nearly every one of these officers, checked up the work they were doing, and made a report as to what they thought should be done in the public interest. Just what report they made with regard to the particular office referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) I do not know, because I have not the report with me. It is possible that in our negotiations with the Customs Department it was decided to drop this man, who had previously been in the employ of the Government. I assure my hon. friend that, having regard to the statement he has made, I shall take the very earliest opportunity of looking into the merits of the case, and if an injustice has been done I shall do all that I can to see that it is rectified. More than that I cannot say.

Mr. DUFF: I understood the minister to say that whatever changes were made in his department were made by him or his officials. I was under the impression that all appointments were made by the Civil Service Commission. Are there two ways of making appointments—through the minister and through the Civil Service Commission—or only one?

Mr. CALDER: I was speaking of retirements, not appointments. Retirements are made not by the Civil Service Commission, but by Order in Council, if the man in question was appointed by Order in Council. Appointments, of course, are made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DUFF: Was Mr. Conner's successor appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. CALDER: If Mr. Nesbitt was previously in the Service, he would merely be transferred. Transfers are arranged by the department, not by the Civil Service Commission. We quite frequently find it necessary to make transfers.

Mr. DUFF: Was Mr. Nesbitt transferred, or was he newly appointed?

Mr. CALDER: I understand that he was transferred.

Mr. RICHARDSON: As I understand the thing, this man Nesbitt, with a whole lot of others, was loaded on the public service. There was absolutely nothing for these men to do, and when the time came for reorganization, a job had to be found for them. I exculpate the minister; I know him too well to believe that he would do anything of that kind; I do not think he knew about it. But the job was put up

somewhere and this man was foisted on the country at an increased salary. I omitted to say that this splendid old man Conner, told me that had they put a returned soldier in there, he would not have said a word; he would have been perfectly happy. But to know that another man had been put there at twice his salary, on the ground of "economy," made his Scotch blood boil—and I do not wonder. The minister has kindly said that he would look into the matter and see that justice is done. When will we get a show down on it?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Next session of the House.

Mr. CALDER: Not next session. When I told the hon. member that I would have this matter inquired into at once, I meant it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I know, but what about action? Will Conner have any chance of getting back his job?

Mr. CALDER: That all depends upon the circumstances. The hon. gentleman has put forward one view; I have no doubt he believes his view to be correct. Nevertheless, he will agree that in a case of this kind a proper inquiry must be made and the facts ascertained. Whatever action is taken will be based upon the facts and the circumstances. Not knowing the facts, I could hardly promise that any particular thing will be done.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I take it that if my statements are discovered to be perfectly true and in accordance with the facts, and Conner is found to be an A-1 man and to have served his country as I have stated, he will be reinstated in his job, and that an apology will be made to him for his dismissal. As for Nesbitt, let him go "where the woodbine twineth," if necessary. He was not rendering any real service to the country and should have been dispensed with anyway, as thousands all over the country ought to be wiped out.

Mr. McKENZIE: How can the minister promise re-instatement? That is a matter for the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CALDER: Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Well, there you are. What would the leader of the Opposition, as a "brither Scot" suggest?

Mr. CAHILL: Were these forty-three appointments made by the Civil Service Commission? How does the minister explain the additional expenditure of $25,000 when he has 115 less employees? Are they to be accounted for by the dismissal of officials and the appointment of others in their places at twice the salary? I should be glad if the minister would explain also why it costs so much to maintain the service in Canada as compared with the service outside of Canada. There is an item of approximately $450,000 for salaries of employees in Canada and about $150,000 for employees outside of Canada. I notice also that the service in Great Britain amounts to $1,500 per office more than it does in the United States. Is that accounted for by larger salaries or larger staff?

Mr. CALDER: As I have already explained, we have twelve offices in the old country as compared with twenty-two in the United States.

Mr. CAHILL: But the offices in the United States cost $4,000 per office and the offices in Great Britain cost $5,500 per office.

Mr. CALDER: The cost would depend upon the staff carried.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the staff?

Mr. CALDER: I pointed out that we have in the United States twenty-two agents, twenty stenographers and six clerks, making a total of forty-eight, whereas at the present time in the whole of Great Britain we have a staff of sixty-eight. In our London office, we have three first-class clerks, twenty second-class clerks, eleven third-class clerks, and two messengers. At our outside points in Great Britain the staff usually runs from one to three, there being not more than three in any office. The hon. gentleman inquired why the expense in Canada was much greater than in Great Britain or the United States. In Canada, we have 140 boundary inspectors, the salaries running from $900 or $1,000 to $1,500. That fact in itself will explain the reason why the salary cost of boundary inspection work in Canada is heavier than the cost of salaries paid in Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. CAHILL: Besides the salaries of boundary inspectors there is an amount of $350,000 for other salaries in Canada.

Mr. CALDER: I have already explained that we have a series of interior offices. Our Montreal office, for instance, has necessarily a pretty large staff in order to look after our work in connection with entries and deportations.

Mr. CAHILL: Principally deportations this year.

Mr. CALDER: No, they look after all entries. A careful record is kept of all persons entering Canada; then there are many rejections which have to be inquired into thoroughly, and there is also the question of deportations; so that it is necessary to have these interior offices which carry on this work. After the inquiry that was held this year, I am satisfied that there is no unnecessary staffing of our offices in Canada. We have the staffs down to practically a working basis, and the adjustments in salaries have been such as to make the situation fairly satisfactory.

Mr. CAHILL: There is an item of $212,000 for salaries in Canada, and, according to the minister's statement, there is a saving of $98,000, presumably on 115 employees, but in place of that $212,000 there is no saving on the boundary inspectors getting $183,000. According to the Estimates there is an increase of $25,000, so that there is a difference of practically $120,000 of increases to employees in Canada. What percentage of increase would that be? How many employees are there?

Mr. CALDER: I have not been quite able to follow the hon. gentleman. It is true that we have made a net reduction at the rate of $98,000; that is, if these people had all been retired at the first of the year, there would have been a saving in annual salaries of $98,000, but these changes took place at varying times of the year, so that there has not been that net saving. On the other hand, as I have already explained, we have found it necessary to adjust salaries in our outside service in Canada, and while any increases have been for comparatively small amounts, they make a large aggregate. These adjustments would have had to be made anyway, and when the salary schedules are brought down by the Civil Service Commission still further increases in salaries will have to be made if we are to retain these men in the service. We cannot expect to carry on these services at the same rate of salaries as were paid prior to 1914, and consequently we must look for increases of this kind.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is it the intention to extend the work in Great Britain during the coming year, or simply to maintain the staffs that have been there during the past year? Now that the war has ended it is important that the greatest possible attention should be paid towards bringing immigrants out from Great Britain, provided that people intend to immigrate from the old land, and I think much more attention should be paid to bringing immigrants from Great Britain than from the United States. The policy enunciated by the minister this afternoon would almost lead one to believe that the old policy is still going to be followed of paying more attention to Western Canada than to the older provinces. I have always advocated that it is not in the interest of Canada to have immigration controlled by the Department of the Interior. I should like to know if anything is going to be done towards supplying men for labour, particularly for the farms, in the old provinces. I would make special reference to Ontario, because there is no question that at present there is altogether too much land under cultivation in that province in view of the number of people who are there to take care of it.

Mr. CALDER: I think we shall find it absolutely necessary to increase very largely our expenditure in Great Britain if we expect to receive any immigration from there, not in the immediate future, but one or two or three years from now. In other words, we must arrange now for the necessary publicity and propaganda work to be carried on to secure results some time hence. That work costs money. During the war our expenditure in Great Britain for advertising and publicity was cut down to practically nothing, for reasons which must be apparent. We have carried a certain small expenditure, but that has not affected the situation. To get results, you must plan ahead. As a matter of fact, probably the most effective work that is being done in Great Britain is the work we do among the school children. Practically every person who is interested in the immigration movement realizes that. The seed sown in the mind of the child at school will bear fruit when he comes of age. That class of work costs money, and we shall have to expend money in Great Britain in a fairly large way, and begin right now, because we are a little behind time, if we want to get results either next year or the year following.

I am very doubtful whether we shall secure much farm labour from Great Britain. Only some fifteen per cent of the population of Great Britain is engaged in agriculture, and every effort is being made by the State to keep every possible man on the land and get others to go on it. It seems to me, therefore, we shall have great difficulty in getting farm labour from Great Britain. I can assure the hon. gentleman, however, that every effort will be

made in that direction, because I thoroughly understand the need of that class of labour in Canada. I also thoroughly agree with my hon. friend that a large percentage of those people, if they can be induced to do so, should be encouraged to settle in the older provinces of Canada. Our policy shall not be sectional; it should be nation-wide. In co-operation with the provinces we should endeavour to work out some plan whereby any immigration coming will be distributed as evenly as possible throughout the whole of Canada.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I was told to-day that there was a demand for 5,000 farm labourers in Canada, but that there was great difficulty in getting men for the work. Should not that situation be taken care of by the returned soldier? Does he indicate any disposition to take up that kind of work?

Mr. CALDER: I do not know exactly what the situation is in regard to farm labour, but I am told that in Western Canada it has very much improved, and that there is not the dearth there was a month ago. I understand the problem is being very well taken care of, but just where the labour is coming from, I do not know. Some time ago it was thought it would be necessary to import farm labour from the United States, but the situation has changed, and recently we have not had any request from the Western Provinces for a move in that direction.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Just a word with regard to the prospect of immigration. The hon. minister says, not in the immediate future, but in a year or two or three from now. The expenditure has been made in Great Britain already. We have had an army overseas for the last four years that has been carrying on propaganda work there which is bound to have its effect in the immediate future. The majority of the men our soldiers have come in contact with over there in the army, so far as I can learn, have signified their desire and intention to come out to Canada if they can possibly arrange to do so. I do not think it is necessary to launch propaganda in the schools or anything of that kind. I think the Department of Immigration will find that during the next few years, indeed, right in the immediate future, their efforts will be taxed to the utmost to take care of the people who desire to come to this country from Great Britain, notwithstanding all the efforts that may be made to retain them over there. There is a condition of affairs existing in the old world at the present time the effects of which no one can at present accurately determine. The condition of affairs in this country to-day is such that I can well understand the reluctance of the Government to take a stand that would aggravate it in any way. But we should not close our eyes to the situation; it is one that will have to be met. Canada is suffering as no other country in the world has ever suffered, for people to till its soil. Under the conditions that exist to-day it is absolutely impossible to keep farm help on the farm; they have been going into the towns and cities faster during the last few months than at any time in the past, notwithstanding the crying demand for men to till the soil. This is an artificial condition of affairs. You are eliminating competition in many walks of life in the industrial centres. Not only are you to-day threatening to limit or curtail competition in the rural districts, but you are being asked to enact legislation that will discourage production of foodstuffs. The demand is being made here in Ottawa, and in all the cities throughout Canada, that agricultural products should not be permitted to be exported from this country.

I could not help reflecting upon the statement made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) this afternoon that only about ten per cent of the food consumed in the province of Nova Scotia was raised in that province. We are practically reaching that condition of affairs in the older provinces generally, and if this condition continues Canada will soon be an importing, instead of an exporting, country for many essential and important food products.

I have some figures here for 1911 which show that a very serious condition obtained at that time—and do not forget that the immigrants that come to Canada do not by any means all remain here. The report of the High Commissioner for Canada shows that in 1907 151,216 British subjects came to Canada, and 33,691 returned to Great Britain. In 1908, 81,321 came to Canada, and 39,866 returned, or almost fifty per cent. That was the condition of affairs which existed for many years. We have been boasting about the tremendous immigration to this country but it has been to a large extent only transitory, from one-third to one-half going back again. Since the war we have been at a standstill in this matter, and our agricultural industries have not only been stagnant but have been going back. It may be that we have increased production, but the agricultural conditions of the land, particularly in the

old provinces, is most regrettable. The bad farming that has been carried on through these years in order to produce as much as was possible is to-day showing its effects, and the results in the future are bound to be worse than at present. If this condition continues and the price of labour in the cities and towns still goes up the cost of living will not be reduced but will go higher. No other result is possible from the conditions that prevail in Canada and elsewhere. I appreciate the difficulties with which the minister is confronted. Possibly he may have some well defined policy in mind which it might not be in the public interest to announce at this time, we may as well face the issue as it is. We have either to lose our present standing as an agricultural people, or we must put forth great efforts to the end that the people in Great Britain who intend to come here shall be enabled to do so even if assistance must be given. That may not be a popular thing to say in the towns and cities, but it is a fact which will have to be faced. I am glad that the Immigration Department will be under the control of a minister who will devote his entire time and attention to this great and difficult question which will confront Canada from now on.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: They say that the only thing you can do with a prophet is to disbelieve him, and I must say that I do not anticipate the flood of British immigrants to this country that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) expects. I do not know what conditions in Britain he refers to that are going to induce that flood. I was speaking to a commercial gentleman from Manchester a few days ago and he told me that it was tolerably well understood that in Britain they have already re-absorbed into civil occupation eighty per cent of returned soldiers. As an illustration of how that re-absorption is taking place, it might interest the Committee, who may not have noticed the figures, to know that in the month of January the shipping tonnage turned out on the Clyde was 15,000; in February it was 22,000; in March, 40,000; and in April, 86,000. I have given the figures without the odd numbers, but in thousands they are correct, or my memory has undergone a more sudden failure than I had reason to suspect. Eighty-six thousand tons constituted a record for April for the Clyde with the single exception of the month of April in which the steamer Aquitania was turned out. I have given the broad fact about the reabsorption of returned soldiers into civil occupation, and a local illustration of what is going on there; and on these grounds I very much doubt if my hon. friend's prophecies will be fulfilled in the immediate future. It would be difficult for him to find an inducement for these people to come from the Clyde, where occupation is being taken up with such haste and avidity, to settle, let us say, in Winnipeg at the present time. I would rather stay on the Clyde, and so would my hon. friend if he were there. To my hon. friend the minister, whose patience and good nature have been the subject of my admiration since I came into this House shortly after eight o'clock, I would like to offer a suggestion, which is not of a critical kind, but is of a helpful and constructive nature, in regard to the getting of immigration from Great Britain. I want him to take advantage of his closer proximity to the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), to impress upon that somewhat obdurate individual the need of an immediate, substantial and generous cut in the tariff against British goods. I wish he would explain to the Minister of Finance—and I wish that hon. gentleman would give to that explanation the same wonderful concentration of mind that he shows when eating the heart out of a document or carrying on the omnivorous reading that we all know he does,—that if vessels from Great Britain were encouraged by a lower tariff to come here with British goods, there would undoubtedly come commercial travellers who would observe this country and see the magnificent opportunities it offers, and there would follow immigrants to this country. If he would only explain all that to the Minister of Finance, his Budget might send his reputation higher than it stands even at the present time, and might astonish us all. I may be mistaken, but I feel perfectly certain in my own mind that immigrants would follow the goods; that farmers would be made out of the immigrants; they would raise other goods from the soil to pay for the goods brought in, and we would have cargoes coming and cargoes going. Capital would come with both goods and immigrants, and you would build up a great trade and a useful immigration without a single agent in Britain—just by a simple method of cutting down the tariff. This could be accomplished if only we could first operate upon the mind of the Minister of Finance.

Contingencies in Canada, British and Foreign Agencies, and general immigration expenses, $775,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: I see there is an increase of $225,000.

Mr. CALDER: This item covers the general expenditures of the department in Canada, Great Britain and the United States, including such matters as advertising, printing, general expenditures, apart from salaries, at sea ports such as St. John, Halifax, Boston, and New York, and our offices at places like Winnipeg, Montreal, etc. It covers the deportation expenditures, boundary inspection expenditures, hospitals, locating of settlers, inspection of employment agencies, inspection of British immigrant children, general expenses and bonuses. There is a range of general expenditures covering our offices in Canada, Great Britain and the United States for such items as rent, fuel, telephones, express, temporary help, and all other expenditures of that class. The heavy item in these expenditures is advertising and printing. Last year we spent $216,000 in advertising and some $34,000 in printing.

Our deportation expenditures amounted to $12,000; boundary inspections, $37,800; and general expenses $72,700. All told, our expenditures under this head last year were $501,900; we are asking this year for a vote of $775,000. Whether or not that money will be expended will depend very largely upon conditions. We may find it necessary to increase our expenditures in Great Britain. Our general expenditures there have been comparatively small. Notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), I am convinced that it is necessary that certain general expenditures should be carried on. While it is true that Canada has been well advertised during the period of the war, nevertheless we will find it necessary to carry on certain work there if we are to control immigration in any sense at all. Let me illustrate. It is estimated that at the present time, there is a surplus of 3,000,000 women in Great Britain. Let us take down the bars and invite these women to our shores and we will get them by the hundreds of thousands. It is very desirable, especially in the near future, that there should be a selection made, that we should not invite to this country people who are going to aggravate the situation existing at the present time. You cannot do that unless you expend money to control this immigration. While it is true that thousands of people may desire to come to this country, we must see to it in so far as possible, that those who come are assured of employment. We simply cannot afford to have our cities flooded with people who cannot secure employment. In speaking of the general expenditures we could very easily use $100,000 in Great Britain for carrying on very necessary work. We are also increasing our expenditures in the United States and I think probably here in Canada there is certain very useful work that might be carried on. We must consider the problem of endeavouring to get some of our people out of our cities and back on the land. If by a wise expenditure of money we can cause a movement in that direction the money will be well spent. While we are asking for an increased amount of something like $200,000, it is not the intention to expend that money unless we find there is an opportunity for expending it usefully. Last year we took a vote of $1,135,000 and I think our expenditures were in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000. We have under-expended the vote by about $130,000. It is difficult at this time, with conditions as they are, to forecast with any degree of certainty or accuracy what our expenditures in the field of immigration may be during the coming year. The Government must have some latitude in that respect. Conditions will likely change very considerably in the next three or four months, and we should be prepared to meet those changed conditions. If we find the situation such as to enable us to wisely expend money in that direction, the money should be available.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount was spent on advertising last year, and what check is there on advertising? How is the advertising done in Great Britain and the United States?

Mr. CALDER: The amount expended on advertising in the United States last year was $209,509.73. Our advertising for a period of years in the United States has been carried on through two advertising agencies, the Touzalin Agency and the Western Newspaper Union. In addition to those, Rand, McNally & Co., and one or two small concerns, have done some advertising, but it did not amount to very much. I recently received a report which states that the work carried on has been quite satisfactory and that we are securing results. In Great Britain, the advertising

carried on last year totalled only $6,483. Since the war broke out there has been very little possibility of getting immigrants from the Old Country, and we thought it advisable to close down our advertising there. I would judge that in past years our advertising in Great Britain must have been comparatively heavy. I cannot give the figures now.

Mr. CAHILL: Was this expenditure of $209,000 in the United States an increase over former years?

Mr. CALDER: There has been practically no increase. It has been running about the same amount from year to year.

Mr. CAHILL: Has there been no decrease?

Mr. CALDER: No, it has been running in the neighbourhood of $200,000 a year.

Mr. CAHILL: Are these yearly contracts?

Mr. CALDER: I think so.

Mr. CAHILL: Why did the minister spend as much money in the United States last year, for instance, as in the year previous on account of advertising for immigration, when he does not expect to get the results that were obtained before? Why not cut down the advertising there as well as in Great Britain? It seems an extraordinary amount to spend for this purpose.

Mr. CALDER: There is a great movement of people at the present time, and has been for years past, from the United States to Canada, whereas during the past three or four years it has been impossible to get immigrants from England or the continent of Europe on account of shipping conditions. The shipping conditions now are such, and will be for months to come, that we cannot expect people to come to Canada from Great Britain. On the other hand, there has been nothing to interfere with the immigration work between Canada and the United States.

Mr. CAHILL: Nothing more than that the United States being at war the younger people were not allowed to leave that country. Would it not have been economy to take that fact into account, and that we were not likely to have many people moving from the United States to Canada—at least not young people, who are usually the ones that leave?

Mr. CALDER: To a certain extent what the hon. gentleman says is true; that is, that we might naturally expect a smaller immigration from the United States than in previous years, and as a matter of fact that is the way it turned out. Nevertheless, we did receive somewhere in the neighbourhood of sixty thousand people from the United States last year, and some seventy-five thousand people the year before, and there was every indication last year that there might have been a very much larger movement. However, there is the other viewpoint: In the field of immigration you cannot always get results immediately. That is, you must carry on your publicity work in such a way as to so affect people that they will move probably in two, three, or four years from the time when they first began to read about Canada. I feel that we must keep up our publicity work with that object in view. As a matter of fact, I think we should have expended a larger amount of money in Great Britain for the same reason.

Mr. J. ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres) (Translation): May I enquire from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Calder) to what nationality belong the leaders of the Winnipeg strike who, according to newspaper reports, have just set up a Soviet or Bolshevik government?

I am informed on reliable authority that the leaders in that movement are, without exception immigrants from Great Britain, born in England and who have come to Canada directly from England.

I am pointing out the fact, so that our immigration agents in England may be instructed to put a stop to such immigration.

Should the hon. gentleman be in possession of the facts, perhaps he will deem it proper to acquaint the House with them.

Mr. CALDER: I am very sorry that I could not follow the hon. gentleman's remarks, but I understand he made inquiry as to the nationality of those who are responsible for the present situation in Winnipeg. I regret that I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman that information. If the wires were not down I might possibly be able to get the information which he seeks, but I am afraid the situation just now is such that we will have to wait a little while before it can be obtained.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT (Translation): If the hon. gentleman will take my advice, and seek information, I may suggest that he communicate with the Commissioner of the N. W. Mounted Police who has sup-

plied us with some facts in that regard. I trust that at the next sitting of the House, the hon. gentleman will be in a position to enlighten us in regard to that matter.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount of money was spent for advertising in Canada last year, and what amount does the minister anticipate will be spent in this country in the next fiscal year?

Mr. CALDER: The total amount spent on advertising in Canada last year was $955.67.

Mr. CAHILL: I cannot quite understand why this item should be increased by $274,000 this year. I do not think the minister expects to spend a great deal more in the United States in advertising, but he does anticipate making a much larger outlay in Great Britain. He has also intimated that he is going to spend some money in Canada for advertising if I understood him correctly?

Mr. CALDER: There is a possibility.

Mr. CAHILL: A considerable amount of Government money has already been spent in Canada, and I hope the minister is not holding in this item a "slush fund" to be expended in this country to provide advertising for the "Consumers' Periodical," which the Government hopes will continue friendly. I cannot understand why the Immigration Department should spend money in this country to any great extent for this purpose. If that is what the increase is for I think it would be well not to vote it, I think we can do very well without it. I am of opinion that enough money has been spent in Canada in advertising by this Government.

Mr. CALDER: I referred to the fact that it might be advisable to make certain expenditures in Canada with a view to causing a movement of our people from the towns and cities into the country. That does not necessarily mean advertising. There is one class of expenditure we are not going into at all now that would be most effective in carrying on immigration work, viz: through lectures and films. The suggestion has recently come to the department that in the United States, Great Britain, and Canada, we should establish a service of that kind. If once established it is going to cost some money. I doubt whether we would be able to accomplish anything effective in that direction unless anywhere from $75,000 to probably $125,000 were expended. Yet, that class of advertising—because that is what it really is—would be the very best the Government could carry on. You can convey a message, or represent a scene through the moving pictures in a way that cannot be effectively done by other means. There is another class of work that has been cut off during the past few years in United States and Great Britain, and that is the use of lectures. We have not had any lectures given in the United States for some years past, nor have we had any in Great Britain, and it seems to me that if the opportunity presents itself we can very wisely spend some money in that way. The proposed increase in this vote is not entirely for advertising, although I think we will have to do some more of it. I am sure we will have to expend money on publicity work in Great Britain; but there are many other directions in which money can be spent for the purpose of carrying on very necessary immigration propaganda.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Might I ask whether in this vote of $775,000, any money has been provided for emigration from France and Belgium?

Mr. CALDER: The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) raised that question and we had a full discussion of the situation this afternoon. I do not wish to delay the Committee, and if the hon. gentleman will refer to Hansard to-morrow he will be able to read the discussion. However, if he wishes to further discuss the matter I shall be only too glad to do so.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I do not wish to enter upon any discussion, but merely to learn whether any provision has been made for emigration from those countries?

Mr. CALDER: This vote will cover any expenditures necessary for that purpose.

Administration of Chinese immigration—salaries and contingencies, $32,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister hinted the other day that there was to be a change in the law with regard to Chinese immigration. Has any new policy been adopted?

Mr. CALDER: Since I made that statement in the House I have not had an opportunity of discussing the matter further with my colleagues. This matter, of course, involves a question of policy which must be carefully considered. Personally I am convinced the proper thing to do is to abolish the head-tax. It is quite possible that later in the session an announcement will be made.

Relief of distressed Canadians in countries other than the United States, $6,000.

Mr. COPP: This is the only item which does not show an increase. How much was expended last year?

Mr. CALDER: Between $1,600 and $2,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: How does the minister get authentic information with regard to Canadians who are in distress in a foreign country, and how are they provided for?

Mr. CALDER: Such cases, if arising in Great Britain, are usually brought to our attention by the British Consul. I had a case before me the other day of a Canadian who was stranded in the Argentine and wanted to get back to Canada. Then, there was a case recently of a Canadian away over in Assyria. Of course, we have a number of cases in Great Britain. They are reported to us and if they look like cases where assistance ought to be given, aid is granted.

Exhibitions—salaries and general expenses, $50,000.

Mr. COPP: What exhibitions are these?

Mr. CALDER: This work was transferred to the Department of Immigration early in 1918. In the United States we make a number of exhibits in State and county fairs. Occasionally we have very large exhibits.

Mr. COPP: Exhibits of what?

Mr. CALDER: Almost entirely agricultural. We are preparing small exhibits to be seen by callers at our own offices. We are putting the same kind of exhibits in our United States offices. We are preparing also small exhibits for schools in the United States and Great Britain. This work is very useful and interesting and very helpful to our propaganda.

Mr. COPP: Is this a new work?

Mr. CALDER: No, it has been carried on for years, varying from time to time according to requirements. I went over the matter with our chief official from the United States and officials of the department here and decided what would be a reasonable programme for this year. It is estimated that this amount will take care of the work we have in mind.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT (translation): Could the minister tell us how much money was spent, last year, with respect to those exhibitions?

Mr. CALDER: $25,000.

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT (Translation): Twenty-five thousand dollars.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—salaries, including Deputy Minister at $6,000, Assistant Deputy Minister and Naval constructor at $4,500 each, $241,650.

Mr. COPP: There is quite an increase here.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): The increases are the usual statutory increases, with the exception of two. We ask that the assistant deputy minister and the naval constructor each be given an additional $500. The duties of the assistant deputy minister have been exceptionally heavy, due to the shipbuilding programme and to the extra work arising from the war. The same applies to Mr. Duguid, the naval constructor. Both men are excellent officials in every way, and I hope that the Committee will agree to the small increase in salary that we ask for them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the naval constructor responsible for the naval ships that were built during the war?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and ice-breakers, $1,500,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hon. members will notice that this is the same amount as was voted last year. Twenty-five ships in all are being operated.

Mr. ARTHURS: I should like to call the attention of the minister to the wages that are being paid on some of the boats, particularly in the lighthouse service. I have special reference to a boat plying out of Parry Sound in the service of the Department of Marine. The answer I received from the department was that wages were being reduced on the Great Lakes, and that they could not afford to pay ordinary deckhands on that boat more than $35 or $40 per month. In view of the high cost of living and the general increases in salaries, a wage of from $35 to $40 per month is entirely inadequate and should be increased.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: While I do not know at the moment whether they are receiving as low a wage as that, I shall be glad to look into the matter.

Examiners of masters and mates, $18,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain this appropriation?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The appropriation last year was $16,500, so that there is an increase this year of $1,500. This increase is to provide for the increase in the cost of nautical supplies and other necessities in connection with the service and for the remuneration of examiners.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: At what points are there examiners?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have examiners at Halifax, Quebec, Yarmouth, North Sydney, Charlottetown, St. John; in the inland waters division, at Toronto, Collingwood and West Selkirk, Manitoba; in the western division, at Vancouver, Victoria, Nelson, Edmonton and Prince Rupert.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many men passed their examinations last year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The figures are as follows:

	Number of examinations.	Number of certificates issued.
Halifax	80	78
Quebec	30	26
Yarmouth	26	26
North Sydney	21	16
Charlottetown	2	2
St. John	6	6
Vancouver	23	23
Victoria	26	25
Toronto	44	41
Collingwood	2	2
Nelson	2	2
West Selkirk, Manitoba	4	4
Edmonton	0	0
Total	266	251

Since the war started, there has been a gradual falling off in the number of persons applying for examinations for masters' and mates' certificates.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where are those examination papers prepared? Is there one universal authority for the preparation, the papers then being distributed to the different centres for the purpose of the examination?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is a competent officer called an examiner in charge of each of those places, but if an examination is going to take place for a captain or mate, the examinations would be exactly the same in each of the places that I have mentioned.

Investigations into wrecks, $12,300.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is the same amount as was voted last year, and it is to enable the commissioner to carry on the necessary investigations when wrecks occur.

Mr. CASGRAIN: How many wrecks were there last year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Thirty, including strandings.

Expenses of schools of navigation, $8,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: How many schools are conducted in the Maritime Provinces, and where are they established?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There are schools at St. John, N.B., under Captain Owen as instructor; Halifax, under Captain John Simmons; North Sydney, under Captain James Sutherland; and Yarmouth, under B. R. Hilton.

Mr. McKENZIE: What are the salaries paid to those teachers?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Captain Owen gets $75 per month; Captain Simmons, $100; Captain James Sutherland, $75, and Captain Hilton, $66.66. Captain P. L. Lachance, at Quebec, gets $50 per month. Captain J. E. Murphy, lecturer at Yarmouth, gets $250 per season, and Captain George C. Coles, lecturer at Collingwood, Ont., gets $250 per season. Then Captain Charles Eddie, of Vancouver, gives his services free.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the teacher at North Sydney get paid the year round?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think he does.

Mr. McKENZIE: This work, I believe, takes his whole time. I know Captain Sutherland personally, and he is a very good navigator and an old sea captain, although not a very old man. He is a very capable man, and as regards making a good average of passes from the pupils that attend his school, he has done well. He has a wife and family, and as he is afflicted with rheumatism he is not very capable of doing other work than attending to this school.

Now, $75 a month is not much with which to pay rent and board himself and his family. The captain himself never said anything to me about it, but his wife did, and I promised to bring to the notice of the minister that it was pretty hard sledding for him to get along on his present salary.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I thank the hon. member for drawing attention to Captain James Sutherland's salary. It does seem rather small in these times, and I shall be very glad to give the matter my very best consideration.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are these teachers allowed to charge any fees to their pupils?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Everything is free.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Last year, if I remember rightly, there was a proposal to amalgamate the Navigation School at Halifax with the Technical College. Have any steps been taken in that direction?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Navigation and the Technical Schools have been amalgamated. We are paying Captain Simons, as instructor, $100 a month.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are our certificates recognized by the English Board of Trade?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Our certificates are recognized the same as the British certificates.

Registration of shipping, $6,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is an increase of $3,000 over last year's vote, due to shipbuilding activities in Canada which necessitated all the ships being registered.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has the minister a list of the ships registered during the past year, with their tonnage, distinguishing between steam and sailing vessels?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I have not that information at hand, but I will try and get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. DUFF: I understood the minister to say that this increase of $3,000 was due to having to pay the registrars for registering the new ships. I was under the impression that the owners of ships paid the registration fees. I know we have to do so in some parts of Nova Scotia. When a ship is launched, it costs the owner from $15 to $25 to get her registered. Is the minister aware of that fact, and what are the registrars paid for other work, such as transferring ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite right. I am asking for the travelling and office expenses in connection with supervising the registry of these ships.

Mr. DUFF: In Nova Scotia the owner also pays the travelling expenses when the registrars have to travel to ascertain the ship's dimensions.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The expenditure for 1917-18 was $2,615.90. The reason for the increase this year is that we have to supervise the registry of these numerous ships, and that entails considerable expense. If we were back in pre-war times, when not nearly so much shipbuilding was going on, the expenditure would be about $2,000.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. DUFF: If it is for the travelling expense of officials sent out from Ottawa I can understand it, but I could not understand our voting this amount for the local registrars.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not for the local registrars, but for the expenses of the officials sent out from Ottawa.

Mr. McKENZIE: If a man was launching a vessel at Sydney, for instance, who is the local official there who would take the dimensions and certify to the capacity of the ship?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The registrar is Mr. F. I. Stewart, whom I think my hon. friend knows very well.

Mr. McKENZIE: I had a sort of a notion that it was somebody in connection with the Customs that did it; but I understand it is a specific appointment by itself?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, it is a specific appointment.

Inspection of live stock shipments, $3,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Where are these shipments inspected?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The duties of the inspector are to carry out the regulations in regard to the health, security and safe carriage of live stock on ships. At points where no inspectors are appointed, the port warden or chief officer of Customs are ex officio the inspectors. No clearance is granted to ships carrying live stock unless a certificate is issued. During the season of 1917 a very large number of horses were shipped from the port of Montreal to France—1,455 in all.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: We all know that some years ago live stock were allowed to be landed in Great Britain, but had to be slaughtered shortly after their arrival. It is now reported that there is a complete embargo against entrance of live stock into Great Britain, which is in violation—not of any specific agreement—but of the announcement that some improvement would be made in the conditions. I would like to know what the situation is at the present time.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will repeat that question when the Minister of Agriculture has his Estimates before the Committee I am sure he will receive the information. It does not come within my province.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the minister any control over the provision that is made for

the shipping of stock from different ports? At certain seasons of the year there is considerable live stock shipped from the port of North Sydney to Newfoundland, and people there who are interested in the prevention of cruelty to animals complain very often that cattle are not provided with proper shelter. When they come by train and have to wait for a day or two or more for the boat, sometimes they suffer considerably through exposure and lack of proper attention. At the request of a gentleman from Antigonish who was in the cattle business I brought this matter to the notice of the Department of Agriculture last year, when I was told by the Minister of Agriculture that the Minister of Railways had to do with such accommodation. I wish to bring it now to the notice of the minister as I see he is providing for something in connection with live stock at these places. Is there any person at the port of North Sydney whose business it is to inspect cattle that are shipped to Newfoundland?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Department of Marine has no control over live stock that is landed on the wharves at North Sydney. Our regulations apply to live stock when on board ship. The Minister of Agriculture was quite right last year when, in his answer to the hon. member, he said that the taking care of cattle on the wharves at North Sydney was in the jurisdiction of the Minister of Railways. Our regulations with regard to cattle on board ship cover:

1—The number of live stock the ship is adapted to carry.
2—The number actually on board for intended voyage.
3—That the arrangements for carrying live stock are approved by inspector.
4—That the shelters or fittings are substantial enough to ensure safety of live stock for the voyage.
5—That ship is seaworthy.

Our jurisdiction begins and ends in seeing that live stock are properly taken care of when on board ship.

To continue subsidies for wrecking plants—Quebec, Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, $35,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: To whom is this subsidy paid?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The department is subsidizing two wrecking plants, one at Quebec and the other at Esquimalt, B.C. The subsidy to the Quebec Dredging and Wrecking Company is $25,000, and that to the British Columbia Salvage Company, $10,000. This is to enable the companies to maintain an adequate plant to assist effectively vessels in distress in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and on the British Columbia coast. We think it wise to have these wrecking plants ready in case a steamer should run ashore or be in distress in any way.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What has this wrecking plant at Quebec done during the past year to save property?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I regret I cannot give a detailed answer. I can only say generally that the Quebec Wrecking Company has the steamer Lord Strathcona and such other plant as may be required to the satisfaction of the Department of Marine. Some ships have run ashore and others have been wrecked, but I cannot give the name of every ship and the number that have required assistance from the company. This is a vote that has been taken for a number of years.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This is a large subsidy, and there is a question in my mind as to whether it is justifiable that we should spend this money unless we are getting results. We have wrecks frequently on the Atlantic coast in Nova Scotia and I have never heard of this company operating there, or being of any service on that coast. As we are asked to vote $25,000 to this company I think it should be shown that some service that is worth while is being rendered. The Government steamer Voyageur was in the ice in the St. Lawrence river below Quebec last January, and the Prince Edward Island ferry was called upon to take it out. But we did not hear that the wrecking plant of Quebec had shown up at all. I keep some track of these matters, and have not heard of a single instance during the past year in which this wrecking plant has been serviceable. I would not feel like voting for a continuance of this subsidy unless the minister could show that some useful work was being done.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not think I should have much difficulty in doing that. Owing to the aids to navigation by various governments for a number of years, and the depth and safety of the channel, we have had very few wrecks indeed in any part of the St. Lawrence channel. The Quebec Salvage Company are supposed to render assistance to any ships in distress from Quebec to Belle Isle and I think it would be a very unwise policy not to vote this sum. We have to keep a wrecking plant ready in case a large and expensive

passenger or freight ship should get out of the channel or run on the rocks. We could hardly say that we did not anticipate any accident, and it is no argument to say that we should not have a plant ready to help expensive ships because accidents are not frequent. With regard to the Canadian Government ship Voyageur, de did not ask the Prince Edward Island ferry to go to her assistance because she would not have been of substantial use. Of course, she had considerable difficulty in getting from Quebec to Halifax in January but she succeeded, with the assistance that was given her by the Government ice breakers. I hope the Committee will see the necessity for this vote. One keeps fire insurance on a building not because he is anxious for a fire but because of the necessity for protection. The same argument applies in this case.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister is not altogether informed on this question. They did call on the Prince Edward Island ferry to help the Voyageur out of the ice. I know that fact myself, and the Minister of Railways or some of his officials can give the particulars of the matter. They did not get assistance from the Prince Edward Island ferry because the Department did not wish to expose the boat to any risk. It is an extraordinary thing that we should be paying a subsidy of $25,000 for a wrecking plant at Quebec and that when the Voyageur was in the ice for several days endeavouring to get to Halifax nobody ever thought of getting that wrecking plant to help her. The Canada and the Montcalm had to be sent up to assist the Voyageur. The Quebec Wrecking Plant was not heard of at all.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: For the very good reason that our arrangement with the Quebec Salvage Company is for the season of navigation only. When the season of navigation closes the Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Plant is not supposed to perform any service until navigation opens the following season. We had both of our ice breakers with the Voyageur and we had asked the Prince Edward Island ferry to hold herself in readiness if we wanted her to go to the rescue of the Voyageur, but happily that was not necessary. I cannot impress upon hon. members too much the necessity of having this vote go through for the Quebec Salvage Company, because to be without a wrecking plant when there is such a large amount of shipping passing up and down the St. Lawrence would be a very serious thing.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. J. D. REID: One of the main reasons for maintaining this wrecking plant is that it helps to keep down the insurance on vessels coming up the St. Lawrence. Both Lloyds and the British American Shipping Company insisted on having a wrecking plant ready at any time in case of anything happening to a vessel.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: We had a wrecking plant on the coast of Cape Breton some years ago but the subsidy was discontinued and we never missed the plant. We have been able to get along just as well as before.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Last year the Quebec Salvage Company were the means of saving the large White Star transport, the Winnifredia. If we had not had the salvage plant I am quite certain that ship would have been a total loss.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What wrecking equipment has the company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is rather difficult to anticipate all the questions that may be asked by hon. members. But, I may say that they have a very modern wrecking plant in addition to the steamer Strathcona. I have not before me a list of the plant but I can get it if necessary.

Mr. J. D. REID: They have the steamer Strathcona, a large schooner, pumps and everything necessary in connection with a wrecking plant.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What are the names of the persons interested in the Quebec Salvage Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The late Mr. Andrew Allan was president of the company, the Canadian Pacific have an interest in it, and also the Allan line.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have no objection to a proper wrecking plant being maintained on the St. Lawrence. I think it is a very proper precaution, and I hope the minister will on some later occasion be able to give us a proper description of that company, and show that they are provided with all necessary plant. But I am sorry to say that, although we have splendid navigation and fine harbours in Eastern Nova Scotia, some times we have wrecks. We have wrecks on the west coast of Newfoundland which must be attended to from Cape Breton, the nearest point, and around the eastern side of Cape Breton on the Atlantic where steamers sometimes have the misfortune to get into difficulties. It is no consolation for the shipmaster or owner whose ship is ashore at Gabarus, for instance, in

the eastern part of Cape Breton, to know there is a wrecking plant at Quebec, because that is too far away. The Government used to give a subsidy to the Dominion Coal Company, or as it is known now, the Dominion Steel Company, who had, and still have, powerful tugs of their own, and also had steamers but these were commandeered during the war—I presume they will soon get them back again. That company used to assist wrecks and get a subsidy. I always thought until to-night that the subsidy was continued. I cannot very well understand why it was discontinued, because they were rendering very excellent service. Is there any substantial reason for the discontinuance of that subsidy? I am not talking about the desirability of the company getting the money, but I am looking to the security that shipowners would have.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The subsidy referred to by the hon. member was granted before my time. It was not in my Estimates last year, nor is it in the Estimates this year. But I will look up the records. I hope to be either on Naval or Fisheries Estimates to-morrow, and I shall be very glad to give the hon. member more information with regard to this matter than I have before me now.

Mr. TOLMIE: As far as the Pacific coast is concerned, the subsidy paid to the wrecking outfit there is very much appreciated. The company receiving that subsidy renders valuable service and has succeeded in saving a number of very valuable ships.

Mr. DUFF: I notice that the item covers wrecking plants, "Quebec, Maritime Provinces and British Columbia." But there is nothing for the Maritime Provinces, and so the item does not represent the facts quite correctly. However, I am not finding very much fault with that. If a subsidy is necessary on the St. Lawrence and the Pacific coast a subsidy should be granted for the protection of shipping on the Atlantic coast. We have more business on the Atlantic coast than there is in the gulf of St. Lawrence or on the Pacific coast. If you are going to give subsidies to wrecking plants in the St. Lawrence and in British Columbia the harbours of Halifax and St. John should have plants for the protection of shipping on the Atlantic coast. I would like to say a word of appreciation for what the Department of Marine and Fisheries does to help shipping on the Atlantic coast. Whilst we have no wrecking plant, if they have a steamer anywhere within 150 miles they send her to the assistance of a vessel in distress. We have to give the department credit for that. They have rendered valuable service both around the Magdalen Islands and at other points. In the absence of the minister some few days ago I asked the Acting Minister if the department is sending a steamer to the Magdalen Islands this spring to help vessels there in case they get into trouble. There are about a hundred ships up there. About three weeks ago there was a great deal of running ice about Grindstone island and at Grand Entry. It seems to me that if it is possible at all one of the Government vessels should be sent up there to look after these ships while they are in the North Bay and also fishing in the gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The steamer Stanley is on her route now placing the buoys, and from the information we have so far received the steamers in the ice are getting along all right. If that should turn out not to be the case we will be very glad to send them whatever assistance they need. Referring to the Dominion Steel Company, I have just been informed that the reason they discontinued work some four years ago was because they stated they no longer wished to perform any wrecking work, therefore the subsidy was no longer granted to them. Mr. Brookfield, who up to the time of the Halifax explosion owned and operated a large dry dock at Halifax, had a very modern and up-to-date wrecking plant, but unfortunately when the explosion took place his plant was destroyed. Another company, called the Reid Wrecking Company, are sending a wrecking equipment down to Halifax, and we hope before long to come to some arrangement with them, so that they will be in a position to look after the salvaging of any steamships off the Nova Scotia coast, just as the Quebec company does on the St. Lawrence route.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If the minister will explain just what this wrecking company did, and how much money they made, we will have a much better idea as to whether it is necessary to make this expenditure or not.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I was about to explain that the earnings of the Quebec Salvaging and Wrecking Company from their working plant amounted to $105,843.65. The Dominion subsidy is $25,000, which brought their total earnings up to $130,843.65. I have the details of the expenditures here on salaries and wages, supplies, repairs,

insurance, depreciation, interest, etc. They made a profit of $9,786.70. Our contract reads that the Dominion Government shall get one-half of whatever the profits the companies make, and the Government's share is $4,893.35. I will be very glad to-morrow to give the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) every detail in regard to the plant, pumps, tender, etc. I will also give him the number of wrecks and other details.

Mr. COPP: Has the Government any control of the cost of operating this plant, and of the charges made?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, absolute control. The company cannot issue any schedule of charges until it is first approved by the Minister of Marine.

Unforeseen expenses—$5,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is there an appropriation available for supplying uniforms to the officers of the steamer Champlain which plies between Murray Bay and Riviere-Ouelle wharf? Last summer I happened to be passing on the steamer nearly every week, and it seemed to me that the uniforms of the officers were absolutely worn out; they were of a shabby yellow colour, in fact, every colour except navy blue. I wrote to the department about it, and they told me that new uniforms had been supplied to the officers the previous fall. To my mind that is not satisfactory. If the uniforms, for one reason or the other, are not in good condition, I think they should be replaced at once, and new uniforms issued. Between three and four thousand people from all parts of Canada, and from different points in the United States, go to Murray Bay every summer and I think it is a poor advertisement for Canada to have the officers of the Champlain uniformed as they were last summer.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No provision is made for buying uniforms for the officers and crew; they have to provide their own uniforms.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am informed that last year and the year previous some of the officers were given uniforms by the department, and the department's answer to my letter stated that uniforms had been supplied to them the year previous.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is quite true that up to a year ago the department did provide uniforms. However, at that time it was decided on the recommendation of the officers in charge that the Government should no longer do so. Since then the officers and men have had to provide their own uniforms.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Will that policy be adopted by the department in the future?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: All Government policies are subject to the will of Parliament. We will be very glad to hear any suggestion from hon. gentlemen, but at the moment that is the policy which has been decided upon in this matter.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I have a suggestion to offer with regard to the steamer Champlain. When we were considering the Estimates of the Railway Department I advanced the same suggestion in connection with the service which is to-day in operation between the south shore and the north shore of the St. Lawrence. Next summer, on the first of July, the Quebec and Saguenay railway will be finished and in operation. Therefore, the steamship service will not be as necessary as it formerly was. I think it would be well if the department were to place the Champlain on a new route, for instance, between Murray Bay and Cap à l'Aigle, St. Fidèle, and St. Siméon, and then across to Tadoussac. The navigation is good for the steamers at all times, even in the worst season in the fall, and if this is done the people in the district will reap the benefit of the new railway; otherwise they will not have the necessary facilities to connect with the railway. Then once or twice a week, when the weather permitted, the Champlain could cross over to Fraserville and thus give accommodation to people on both sides of the river. At the time I put the question to the Minister of Railways he told me to take the matter up with the department, and that is the reason I have brought it forward to-night.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I do not want my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) to have the only say in this matter, because it touches my riding also. I would like to have the boat touch first at Riviere du Loup which is not far down, and then proceed across to Tadoussac. This would provide communication between the north shore and the south shore, for which the people on both sides of the river are asking at the present time. The Champlain could also touch at Cap à l'Aigle, St. Fidèle, St. Siméon, Murray Bay, and across to Rivière Ouelle. It would be a nice round trip, especially during the summer, would pay well, and furnish

ample accommodation to all the people on the south shore.

We used to have a service between the north shore and the south, even during the winter, but the little boat that was there has been taken away. If the minister can see his way clear to have this communication re-established, he will be given credit for his action by the people in that part of the country.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am obliged to my hon. friend, and also to the member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) for bringing this matter to my attention, particularly in view of the fact that the Quebec and Saguenay Railway is now finished. I will discuss the matter with the Minister of Railways and see if we can meet the views of the hon. gentlemen.

Amount required for two boilers for C.G.S. Montcalm, $70,000.

Mr. COPP: Last year an amount was required for the same purpose. Is it for the same boilers, or have they to be replaced again?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We could not put the boilers in last year; this amount is being voted again this year for the same purpose.

Amount required for one steamer for buoy and lighthouse service in Maritime Provinces, $150,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I wish to amend this vote so that it will read as follows:

Amount required for two motor patrol vessels for buoy and lighthouse service in British Columbia, to replace vote 205 for amount required for one steamer for buoy and lighthouse service in Maritime Province $150,000—$50,000.

Now that the war is practically over, some of the steamers that had been requisitioned by the Naval Service are free, and so I am asking for only $50,000 instead of $150,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I received a letter a few days ago from a Mr. McDonald in my county, advising me that he had picked up a buoy off the west coast of Inverness. Is it the policy of the department to compensate persons who save this valuable property?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It has always been the policy of the Government to pay at a reasonable rate, for any service rendered; but the department would have to be satisfied that the service was really rendered. Perhaps the hon. member will write me about the matter to which he refers.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I have already written the department.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be glad to look into the matter.

Mr. McISAAC: Has the minister received a communication from the crew of the steamer Brant, which is engaged in this service around the coast of Prince Edward Island? They complain that their wages are lower than those paid to the crews of other steamers engaged in similar work, and that while the wages of other crews have been increased, theirs have not. Is the minister disposed to meet the demands of these men?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: These vessels are graded in various classes. The crew of the steamer Brant are paid the same wages as the crews of steamers in the same class.

Mr. McISAAC: Has there been any increase in their wages during the last two or three years?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. I remember asking for a list of officers and crews on the various Government steamers, and the salaries were all increased according to rank. That is, captains got a little more than ordinary seamen, but there was a general increase to all officers and men on Government vessels.

Mr. DUFF: How many steamers has the department on the Atlantic coast for the purpose of laying buoys and serving lighthouses? I call attention to a letter I wrote the department some time ago during the absence of the minister and his deputy, with regard to the necessity of placing two automatic buoys in the bay and harbour of Lunenburg. Lunenburg is the most important harbour on the Atlantic coast, outside of Halifax; large numbers of ships go in and out of that harbour both in summer and in winter. But the harbour is not properly buoyed, and if the matter is not attended to there may be a bad accident. Ships come in in the middle of the night; sometimes when they get part of the way in they have to put to sea again on account of the weather. I have known ships to come into the bay, go out again and have to remain out four or five days before the weather permitted their coming into the harbour. The department should not hesitate at the expense necessary to provide one or two buoys in a harbour like that. The only answer I received from the gentleman in charge of the department at the time was that the Lighthouse Board would not grant my request. But I think that I know more about the harbour of Lunenburg than the Lighthouse Board does. Some of these ships have crews of twenty

men, and it would be a terrible thing if any of them ran on the rocks in the harbour and serious loss of life and property resulted.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The steamers engaged in placing buoys on the Atlantic coast are the Arranmore, the Stanley, and the Lady Laurier. With regard to the placing of additional buoys at the port of Lunenburg, such matters come under the review of the Lighthouse Board, although they always come to me after that board has decided whether or not the expenditure is necessary. I shall be very glad, however, to look into the matter brought up by my hon. friend.

River St. Lawrence, ship channel, $478,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is this for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The vote is the same as last year. It is for dredging, maintenance and operating of the dredging fleet, and so on. A good deal of dredging is done on the St. Lawrence route, especially on the north channel from Quebec to Grosse Ile.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this new work or is it keeping clear the old works that were completed some time ago?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is at present a thirty-foot channel at low water from Montreal to the sea, but we are deepening that to thirty-five feet, and that is what this dredging fleet is proposed to be engaged on during the coming season.

Mr. PARENT: Not long ago I saw in the newspapers that such large steamers as the Olympic and Aquitania drew too much water to admit of their coming up the channel as far as Quebec. In speaking of this matter to different navigators and pilots, I find that any of those men could have easily brought those ships up to Quebec. I should not like the impression to be spread abroad that such vessels as those I have mentioned could not use our Canadian ports on account of drawing too much water. If such a statement as I have seen in the press is not correct, I presume the minister can make a statement to that effect, so that such bad news will not be sent abroad.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not seen the press report referred to, but no doubt it referred to a question asked by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) as to why the Aquitania that brought troops from England and disembarked them at Halifax and then went to New York, did not go up to the port of Quebec. I told him at that time that I had not seen the press report, but I have since advised him that it was due to three reasons: First, the owners had the ship destined for the port of New York, and not for the port of Quebec; second, the rate of insurance would, unfortunately, be higher if the ship came up the St. Lawrence route; and third, if one of those ships like the Olympic or the Aquitania reached the Beaujean bank at low tide they would have to wait until the tide would rise suffiicently to admit of vessels of their draught passing. But there is no doubt at all that the largest steamer afloat can come up the St. Lawrence river to the port of Quebec. There is ample water all the way along until they reach Beaujean bank, and if they would wait until the tide rises they would not have any difficulty in getting over that bank. I have, therefore, no hesitation in making the statement quite clear for the public that those large steamers can come provided the owners want them to come to the port of Quebec.

Lighthouse and coast service—salaries and allowances to lightkeepers, $540,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I see that the amount is the same as last year. In my county there are many lighthouse keepers, and a number of them have asked me to endeavour, if possible, to secure an increase in salary for them. The cost of living, of course, affects these people just as much as any other. These lighthouse keepers have to endure great hardships all the year round; most of them are isolated in little houses along the coast and subject to the perils of the sea, and I do not see why they should not have increases just as the deputy ministers and others. I am making this plea for these men in my county as well as for those in other parts in Quebec and elsewhere along the coast where the same conditions prevail.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Last year, the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) will remember, in my Supplementary Estimates, I brought down an additional amount of $55,000 for lighthouse keepers, and that is incorporated in the amount of the expenditure for 1918-19 and also for this year, making $540,000 in all. I agree with the hon. member that lighthouse keepers ought to get an increase in their salaries in view of the high cost of living. Unfortunately, I was ill when the Main Estimates were being considered by the Government, but I hope to be able to persuade my colleagues to allow me to in-

clude another amount for lighthouse keepers in my Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. COPP: Have petitions been forwarded to the minister from different lighthouse keepers throughout the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. COPP: Quite an organization was started, and I understood from petitions and letters I received from different lighthouse keepers that they were practically promised this increase; that all they had to do was to lay their case before the department, and I understood they did so.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite right. The department has received petitions from coast to coast, and as I stated a moment ago, in view of the extremely high cost of living, the salaries are inadequate, and I think the Government would be justified, and the Committee also, in voting, when my Supplementary Estimates come down, an additional amount to be distributed amongst the lighthouse keepers.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals, and providing suitable boats for carrying on construction work, $400,000.

Mr. McISAAC: I made a request for an amount for the erection of a small lighthouse on a pier at Little Sands, King's county, P.E.I. I know the request was made too late for the Main Estimates, and perhaps the minister would be so good as to place an amount in the Supplementary Estimates for this service.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be glad to look into the matter, and I think possibly we can take it out of the vote we are asking for now.

Mr. CASGRAIN: In my constituency there is an island called Ile-aux-Coudres. It is about four miles from the shore, and the people from this island have to go up to Baie St. Paul, which is the nearest point for getting to the district of Quebec and other places on the north shore. The man who carries the mails has a little ship of his own, but it is not very good, as his means are not great. Would it be possible for the Department of Marine to co-operate with the Post Office Department so that each could have a vote in the Estimates to pay this man for carrying passengers as well as the mail? At the present time the passengers all cross in this man's boat to the north shore when he brings the mail over which he does twice a day. During the winter season from October to April, the weather is very rough and in this small boat the passengers are in considerable peril. I know the people would be very grateful if a vote was included so that a suitable boat could be got.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is a matter that the Postmaster General would have to look after, but if my hon. friend will write to the Postmaster General and let me have a copy of the letter I will confer with him and see what can be done.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The minister is in possession of a petition from the fishermen of Grand Etang, in the county of Inverness, asking for a light. Grand Etang has developed into quite an important port. There must be from fifty to sixty large vessels fishing from this port, two steamers enter it twice a week, and a number of schooners. The harbour was only opened a few years ago. At present there is only one light, and it is practically no assistance to vessels seeking entrance at night; it is an artificial harbour, and the entrance is very narrow. I wrote to the Department some time ago about this matter, and I have had several interviews with some of the officers of the department during the absence of the minister and his deputy. I think the minister's officers will agree that I have not troubled them very much about matters of this kind, but in this case a light is essential, and I should be very grateful, as I am sure hundreds of people along that shore would be, if the minister would take this matter into his consideration, and have his officers make a report. I understand that a steamer goes down there once a year distributing oil to the lighthouses, and carrying officers of the department. I should like them to gather the necessary information with respect to the representations I have made, because I know when the minister has the facts he will see to it that this light is placed.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have already had the facts placed before me, and I fully agree as to the necessity for a lighthouse at that point. At the first meeting of the board I shall bring the matter to their attention, and I hope they will recommend the placing of a lighthouse at Grand Etang.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The Lighthouse Board is made up of members from different parts of Canada, I understand.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will personally see that it is attended to.

Signal service, $60,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is a very old service. Stations have been established to report the movement of ships, weather conditions, etc., by means of telephone, wireless and telegraph. The system extends from St. John, N.B., to Cape Race, Nfld.

Administration of pilotage, $200,000.

Mr. PARENT: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This money is required for the ports of Montreal, Quebec, and Halifax, which come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine. I hope in the very near future to introduce a Bill seeking to bring all the pilotage systems in our important seaports under the authority of the Minister of Marine, and I shall be glad to give all the information asked for on that occasion.

Mr. LOGGIE: May I refer to the report made by Thomas Robb, James N. Bales and J. W. Harrison, commissioners who were appointed to report on the pilotage districts of Miramichi, Sydney, Louisburg, Halifax, St. John, Montreal and Quebec. The report has been received by the department, laid on the Table, and distributed to members. I direct the minister's attention especially to the recommendations regarding the Miramichi district. I was very glad to hear the minister announce that he proposes to introduce a Bill to bring certain of our great national ports under his department to a greater extent than has been the case in the past. The recommendations of the commission regarding the Miramichi district are as follows:

That the condition of the pilotage in this district has been found to be exceptional and the earnings of the pilots during the year 1917 have been exceedingly low, owing to the falling off of deal shipments by water, from the ports in this district. That it is most urgent that something should be done whereby the individual earnings of these pilots may be increased, and with this in view we strongly recommend that the number of pilots be reduced so as not to exceed twelve, and to accomplish this aim will require the retirement of four of the oldest pilots, whose ages range from 71 to 74. The enforced retirement of these men your commissioners consider will entail a certain hardship as they are well preserved and still active. Having these conditions in mind we recommend that some compensation be made to these men annually, to a sum not exceeding $300, for the remainder of their lives; but this shall be understood not to extend to any pilots who may hereafter be retired in this district. This will be in line with the precedent created by the Marine Department in the Quebec Pilotage district when reducing the number of pilots in that district a few years ago.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

The next paragraph refers to the Admiral Beatty, the vessel that is used in connection with this work, and sets out the fact that recently one of the vessels was lost at sea, and hence is no longer available for the work. The concluding paragraph is as follows:

That an additional five per centum per annum be deducted from the gross earnings of the pilots of this district for the purpose of creating and maintaining a superannuation fund for the pilots retiring in the district.

The average income of the pilots for six months or during open navigation is about $750 per man, but owing to war conditions in 1917 the net earnings of each pilot were reduced to the nominal sum of $150. It is no wonder the commissioners say that something should be done in this matter. The conditions are very exceptional, and I am glad that the minister is considering the case of Miramichi, which is one of the greatest waterways in Canada. I am sure that a large number of ocean vessels will load there this year, and from this year's operations I have no doubt the men will receive a fair remuneration. But the whole situation is very unsatisfactory. The evidence shows that only three or four of the pilots are below the age of 60. The majority are between 60 and 70, and three or four of them are over 70. It seems to me that it would be reasonable to retire men of that age and not allow them to be in charge of valuable property. The loss of one vessel would more than counterbalance any reasonable provision that might be made for these men, and I hope that when the minister is reconsidering the matter he will give his earnest and considerate attention to the claims of the pilots on the Miramichi river. I do not think he would go very far afield if he accepted the suggestion of the Commission, and granted a small amount, not to exceed $300, as compensation to these three men between the ages of 71 and 74. I trust he will see his way clear to vote a certain sum as the nucleus of a pension fund to which the pilots could pay so much annually out of their earnings, so that in the future when a pilot reaches a certain age he can be superannuated.

Mr. DUFF: Do these pilots on the Miramichi river devote all their time to piloting vessels in the navigation season, and are they paid from the ships they pilot?

Mr. LOGGIE: Under normal conditions they devote all their time to the pilotage business during open navigation. The fees are paid into a common

fund and the money is distributed pro rata among the pilots, less expenses for collection and distribution. The average earnings under normal conditions are about $750 per man, but during 1917, and probably the same will be true for 1918, their earnings were only nominal because practically no ocean vessels came to the Miramichi to load. I would like very much to have the Marine Department administer the work instead of having it done by a local commission.

Maintenance and repairs to wharves, $12,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What wharves are these?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This item is for the general maintenance and repairs wherever necessary to wharves, under the Marine Department.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Can the minister mention a few wharves under the supervision of the Marine Department, to differentiate them from those under the Public Works Department?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: All wharves after they are completed by the Public Works Department come under the jurisdiction of the Marine Department. The expenditure for the past year in the different provinces was as follows: Nova Scotia, $104.47; Prince Edward Island, $97.81; New Brunswick, $5,561.05; Quebec, $1,646.67; Montreal District, $1,210.66; Ontario, $985.01; General account, $414.22; a total of $10,019.89. Each year new wharves are transferred to the control of the Marine Department from the Public Works Department.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What do these repairs consist of? Are they gross or minor repairs?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is an informal arrangement whereby repairs up to $50 are performed by the Marine Department and larger repairs are referred to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are two wharves in my constituency, one at Baddeck and the other at Iona. They are wharves that I always contend are used in connection with the Intercolonial railway. The only connection between the Intercolonial railway and the county of Victoria is from Iona to Baddeck. The Government built the Iona wharf for the railway, because the rails ran down on the wharf. The cars are shunted down to the end of the wharf and from the cars the freight is put into the boat. The Government accept freight in all parts of the continent of America for that point, and have to deliver that freight at Baddeck. They could never do without a wharf, and have built a very fine one at Baddeck.

There is no charge on the wharf at Iona where they receive the freight from the boat and from the railway while there is a charge on landing at Baddeck. These wharves are practically a part of the railway system and without the wharf at which they could land these goods at Baddeck the railway could not receive the goods. I had that wharf built—at least that wharf was built when the Laurier government was in power and I had something to say about the patronage. There is a very excellent wharf built at Baddeck. The farmers and people generally,—particularly the farmers—complain about this little tinkering charge of 25 cents, 50 cents or $1 on their freight. It does not amount to very much but it does not leave the wharf free as it used to. The wharf at Iona is free and the same rule should apply to the one at Baddeck. I have brought this up before, but I believe the same charges are still collected at Baddeck.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend is quite correct. The wharf at Iona comes under the Minister of Public Works and no wharfage dues are collected. The wharf at Baddeck comes under Marine and Fisheries Department and we charge wharfages. I realize that it is rather inconsistent for one department to make a charge and another department not to do so. I will be very glad to look into it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister of Railways that his wharf at Iona is in a very bad condition. The outer block was destroyed by the force of the sea some years ago and it has not been fixed. For that reason cars cannot be run out to the end as they used to be. I was surprised last year to find that it had not been repaired.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am glad the hon. member has brought that to my attention. When I come before the Committee with my Estimates I will have some information in connection with it. I will nake a note of it.

Amounts required to pay pensions to the following retired pilots:—Ls. R. Demers, Jos. Lapointe, Paul Gobeil, Barthelemi Lachance, Alphonse Asselin, Chas. Normand, Nap Rioux, Elzear Desrosiers, Hubert Raymond, Arbel Bernier, Laurent Godbout, Adelme Pouliot, Edmond Larochelle, L. E. Morin, A. T. Simard, Joseph Plante, Victor Vezina, J. G. Dupil, Raymond

Baquet, Alfred Larochelle, Theophile Corriveau, Alphonse Pouliot, Emilio Couillard, Treffle Delisle, David Dumas, Alfred Goudreau, Onesime Noel, F. X. Desmeules, Adjutor Baillargeon, Joseph Pouliot, Arthur Baillargeon, John A. Irvine, Camille Bernier, $9,900.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain that item?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A few years ago there were found to be too many pilots in the Quebec district and in order to reduce the number from 116 to 75 an arrangement was made by one of my predecessors, Hon. L. P. Brodeur, as a result of which an Order in Council was passed in 1906 providing that those pilots who were retired should receive a pension of 300 a year.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has the number been reduced this year? How many are there now?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Sixty-one.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many last year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: About the same number, I think, but I am not sure. There has been a certain amount of criticism from other parts of the payment of this pension, but the Order in Council is there and the pension has been paid since 1906.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It seems unfair that the pilots of Quebec should be pensioned whilst the pilots on the rest of the coast are not provided for. Is the Order in Council going to be continued? Do not these pilots earn a lot of money and is there not a fund by which they provide for retired pilots out of their own earnings?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, the Quebec pilots have a pension fund; in fact, all the pilots have with the exception of those of Miramichi, of which the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) spoke so eloquently. But they have, in their wisdom, not provided any funds for pensions; the Quebec pilots have. In addition to that, this pension has been voted by Parliament each year since 1906, and I do not see how we can avoid paying it.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister does not see any way by which we can escape paying this money every year. Has he any plan by which we can get rid of it?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I took this matter up with the Quebec pilots within the last two or three weeks, because the Royal Commission that was appointed over a year ago to look into the pilotage system at the leading seaports drew my attention especially to the fact that the Quebec pilots were paid this pension, whereas the pilots in other ports were not. I am trying to make arrangements for another year, if at all possible, whereby we will either give pensions to the pilots in all the other principal ports or else the Government may refuse to ask Parliament to vote this amount for the Quebec pilots. It is a matter that I have under consideration at the present time, especially in view of the report made by the Royal Commission.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am not advocating pensions for the pilots in all the other ports, because I think it would involve a considerable expenditure, and I am not sure that it would be justified. But I think the department is making a mistake in treating the St. Lawrence pilots differently from pilots in other parts of the country. I think this was due to the system of patronage that existed, and may still exist, whereby too many pilots were appointed in the St. Lawrence, with the result that they were crowding one another, and the country had to take the load and bear it. I regard that as a blunder. I would like to see some arrangement by which this could be struck off altogether instead of spreading it all over the country. That would seem to me to be the better plan. We cannot afford to be throwing away money, as money is now very scarce. Economy is absolutely necessary at the present time. Spending money unnecessarily is the sin of extravagance, which is like the sin against the Holy Ghost; it should not, and it will not, be forgiven by the people.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I would not like the hon. member to think that I favour granting pensions to the different pilotage systems throughout Canada, because I do not. I did endeavour to cancel the pension that has been given to these Quebec pilots since 1906, but I have to pay due regard to what has come to be termed "a scrap of paper." The Order in Council is there, and it contains no limitations at all. It says that these pilots are to be paid $300 per year if their number is reduced to seventy-five and they reach the age of sixty-five.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who appoints the new pilots?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Department of Marine. I am doing my best to get this matter remedied, but I must frankly admit that I do not see very much chance of doing so. The Order in Council is so clear and explicit in its terms that there seems nothing for it but to give this pension.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am sorry to have to take exception to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair). If this Order in Council was passed by the late Administration, it must have been for certain good reasons and after due consideration. As the minister has well said he is face to face with a certain condition which was created by a previous minister who was aware of the special circumstances in the province of Quebec, and who, after weighing the circumstances, decided to establish this fund and make these payments. I do not see how the Government can very well get out of the payment now. If the pilots of other parts of the country have not been able to secure a pension I am very sorry for them, but they should have looked out for themselves and asked to be included in this Order in Council at the time it was passed. It is not too late to do that now when Orders in Council seem to be so popular with the present Government. It would be easy enough to pass an Order in Council providing pensions for the pilots of other provinces, and I would not object to it. It is only reasonable that these men, after their long service for the department, should get some consideration. I do not think the amount should be reduced, and personally I would be in favour of the same consideration being extended to other pilots.

Compassionate allowance to Mrs. Robert McMenemy, widow of the late light-keeper at Otter Head, Lake Superior, $500, and compassionate allowance to Mrs. Wm. Sherlock, widow of the late lightkeeper at Michipicoten Island, east end, Lake Superior, $1,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What has the minister got to say about this?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is a compassionate allowance for the widows of these men who lost their lives in getting from their stations to the shore.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I suppose the same allowance is open to persons similarly situated in other parts of Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Meteorological Service, including magnetic observatories, grants of $500 each to Kingston and Montreal Observatories, also allowance of $400 to L. F. Gorman, observer at Ottawa—$210,880.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the increase for here?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Salaries.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Result of the high cost of living?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I suppose so.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are the salaries of all the officers increased, or only some of them?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is quite a long list of them. The increases are from $150 to $200; and the director of the service, Sir Frederick Stupart, gets $1,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain why the different items are mentioned in the vote?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is a grant of $500 to the observatory at McGill university, and another of the same amount to that at Queen's university, Kingston. An allowance of $400 is made to L. F. Gorman, the observer at Ottawa.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is the minister getting results from the Meteorological Service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, most excellent results. Reports of the weather conditions are sent all over Canada.

Mr. CHISHOLM: And storm signals?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Marine Hospitals, including grants to institutions assisting sailors—$75,000; shipwrecked and distressed seamen, $3,000.

Mr. DUFF: I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that while we are increasing the salaries of other people something should be done for the keepers of marine hospitals, and the medical men who attend them. I wrote a letter last year in regard to the staff of the Lunenburg Marine Hospital, and I was told by the department that they could not increase the salaries. The high cost of living applies to these officers as it does to everybody else. The allowance they receive is small. It seems to me that these officials have to perform a great deal of work, not only in Lunenburg but wherever there is a marine hospital. The physicians have a great many patients to attend to, and their salaries should be increased proportionately with those of other officials. That applies also to the keepers of the hospitals, whose salaries have not been raised for a good many years. I would ask the minister to take the matter into his serious consideration and see if some increase cannot be granted.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will take the matter into consideration.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: A large amount of money is collected from shipping at the different ports, and I understand it is ap-

plied for the purpose of maintaining these marine hospitals. I would like to know what the revenue was last year, and how the fund stands at the present time?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have a credit to the fund of $291,572.51. During the past year extraordinary demands have been made upon the Marine Hospitals owing to the influenza epidemic, and the expenditure has been greater than usual.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: In view of the fact that there is such a large amount to the credit of the fund, something more should be done to make provision for distressed seamen. For a number of years I have been bringing to the attention of the Government the case of the town of Canso and vicinity, where there is a good deal of shipping but where no proper provision is made for the care of seamen. The banks lie off Cape Canso, and this port is the main refuge for fishing vessels. Large numbers of ships go in there for shelter, for bait, to land supplies, and so on. Many sailors frequent that port. Dr. McGarry has been appointed a physician there to give some attention to the sailors, but I am told by him that the department refuses to pay for the drugs. They give him a pittance for looking after the port, which is quite inadequate, and then they compel him to pay for the medicine he gives to the sailors. He has taken the matter up with the department, but no attention has been paid to his letters. The price of drugs has increased enormously during the last few years, and it is not fair that the doctors should have to pay for them under these circumstances. The number of cases that the doctor at this port has had to attend to has also increased, but apparently no interest is taken by the department in the necessity for providing medicines for these sick sailors. The ship-owners are paying the money; the minister is accumulating the fund—I do not know what he is doing with it. But no improvement has been made, at that port at all events, in the method of taking care of sick seamen.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be very glad to give as favourable consideration as possible to the case of Canso, and also to the matter of the expenditure for medicine. During the war we probably have not been as generous as we should have been under peace conditions, but in view of the fact that we have this surplus in the fund, I shall be glad to take the matter up.

Mr. DUFF: The medical officer at Lunenburg drew my attention to the same matter. He has had to pay for his own medicine, and as the cost of drugs and medicine has increased about three hundred per cent during the last three or four years, it takes practically his whole salary to pay for medicines.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Who is the medical officer at Cheticamp and Grand Etang?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have no officer there.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What has it cost the department to pay the bill for these two ports?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We would have to look up the Auditor General's Report to get that information.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Has any attempt been made to get the doctor there to accept an appointment as port physician? I am particularly anxious to get that information. I wish to corroborate what the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) and my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) have said with respect to drugs. The position taken by the department in this matter is ridiculous. My hon. friend says that the cost of drugs has gone up three hundred per cent. Yes, it has— and a thousand per cent in many cases. If there is much sickness, more than the amount allowed to the doctors for their services in these ports would be taken up in paying for medicines. Representations have been made to the department during the last two years with regard to this very matter, but none of the doctors seem to receive any consideration. The doctors simply cannot afford to give the men the best kinds of medicine, which to-day are exceedingly expensive, unless they are compensated therefor.

Steamboat inspection, $87,827.77.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Reference has been made to the service carried on by the steamer Champlain in my county. I understand that this steamer was taken off the service last fall and the year previous because she was not in a seaworthy condition and some repairs had to be made to her engine and boilers. I am told on good authority that this steamer, which was acquired by the Government fifteen or sixteen years ago and has voyaged in rough seas and rough weather most of the time, cannot be trusted at all seasons and in all weathers. For service on the route that I and the member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) have suggested to-night, it would be well for the department to see that the

boat is properly inspected and put in seaworthy condition in the spring, or even in the fall, so that she may remain on the service during the whole of the season when the people are most in need of her services. About the month of October the people on the north shore are absolutely cut off from all communication. If this boat was put in order during the early summer or early in September, she would be available at all times during the winter season.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Can the fishermen along the coast participate in the Sick Mariners' Fund?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They can if they are engaged on a vessel that pays sick mariners' dues; otherwise they cannot.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That is one thing that I have been trying to put before the department during the last few years. It is very unfair not to permit the fishermen along the coast to get the advantage of this Sick Mariners' Fund. There is no reason why a change should not be made in the law with a view to enabling the department to permit these fishermen to participate in the fund. Let them collect so much from the fishermen, who are ready to pay a reasonable amount in order that they may get the benefit of the fund. There could be no better way of using the surplus at present to the credit of the fund than to improve the treatment of these sick fishermen. Although I am not a very apt politician, I remember that a policy of that kind was promised to the fishermen of that part of Nova Scotia a good many years ago. The fishermen were promised free medical treatment if they would support a certain party. If they offered that policy as an inducement, they must have regarded it as acceptable to the fishermen. I know that it would be acceptable to them; it would be a splendid thing for them. In my own port of Margaree, where there are perhaps one hundred and fifty fishermen, it would be a splendid thing if these men could have the advantage of the Sick Mariners' Fund; I am sure that they would be glad to contribute to the fund in order to obtain the benefit of it. I suggest very strongly that the minister, who is disposed to look kindly on these suggestions, give this matter every consideration.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I would be glad if it was possible, but the Sick Mariners' Fund is raised, as no doubt the hon. member is aware, by dues paid by steamship owners, and the fund is for sick mariners only from ships that pay those dues. The fishermen are outside of that, and it would not be permissible, under the authority that we have for sick mariners' dues, to pay any of the fund out to fishermen.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I quite understand that, but is it not practicable to get authority to do this? I think this is a splendid idea.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The idea is good. I do not know whether I can get the steamship owners to agree to it, but I will endeavour to do so.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend referred to an old pledge given in 1911 that if the Conservative party were returned to power, the fishermen would have free medical attendance. Is the department going to carry out that pledge?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is a bit of past political history. All I know about it is what my deputy has just whispered in my ear now. Of course, I am not responsible for promises of well known gentlemen during election time.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

Tuesday, May 20, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

CONFERRING OF TITLES ON CANADIANS.

CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERROR IN REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

On motions being called:

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a clerical error in the report I presented to this House in reference to the question of titles some few days ago as a result of which one of the clauses of the report may have an ambiguous meaning. I am therefore going to move, so that the intention of the Committee may be expressed:

That clause (b) of the report be amended by inserting the words "and of a" after the word "distinction" at the end of the second line of clause (b) and inserting the word "or" after the word "distinction" in the fifth and sixth lines of the said clause (b).

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: How will the amended clause read?

Mr. NICKLE: If the amendment is carried, the clause will read as follows:

(b) "To provide that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to ensure the extinction of an hereditary title of honour or titular distinction, and of a dignity or title as a peer of the realm, on the death of a person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada at present in enjoyment of an hereditary title of honour or titular distinction, or dignity or title as a peer of the realm, and that thereafter no such title of honour, titular distinction, or dignity or title as a peer of the realm, shall be accepted, enjoyed or used by any person or be recognized."

The object of the amendment is to make the clause read as the Committee desired and to remove the ambiguity from it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it not unusual to pass a motion of this kind without having a day's notice?

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe it is customary to pass such a motion where it merely corrects what is obviously a clerical error. I understand that is all this motion purports to do.

Motion agreed to.

THE WINNIPEG STRIKE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to ask the hon. Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) if he has any news as to the conditions at Winnipeg.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (for the Minister of Labour): There is no material change in the situation at Winnipeg.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I might say further to my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) that our advices are to the effect that the municipal, provincial, and Dominion authorities are all co-operating and that measures have been taken to ensure the maintenance of law and order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What to do—to surrender?

FAMINE IN INDIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth): As relating to a matter of very considerable interest at the present time, I would like to ask if the Government has any information to give to the House and the country on the prevailing famine in India.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, a committee of public spirited citizens in Toronto some time ago organized for the purpose of collecting relief for the sufferers from the famine in India and at their request the Government communicated, through the Imperial authorities, with the Government of India tendering this relief and inquiring whether relief in grain or cash would be the more acceptable. Two communications have been received in reference to the matter. One is that the Government of India gratefully accept the offer of the Committee and express a wish for cash rather than grain. Another statement has followed. After stating that the attention of the Government of India has been drawn to certain statements which appeared in the Canadian press to the effect that millions of British subjects are starving, they point out that the statement is not correct and they send the following statement which they ask to have made public:

"Food position in India though undoubtedly grave has no resemblance to descriptions in Toronto circular which is exaggerated and in many parts untrue. Owing to failure of autumn rains, to serious epidemic of influenza which attacked two-thirds of the population, and accounted for six million deaths, and to absence of large number of young men on military service, area sown with winter crops very short. This, in conjunction with general rise in wages and in standard of living, with inflated currency and reflex action of world prices, has caused foodstuffs to rise to unprecedented prices causing hardship to many sections of the population. But resisting power of people is greater than ever before and although prices are double those of famine year of 1900 number of relief in April was only 337,000 against five and a quarter million in April 1900. Plague is less virulent than usual and no report either from private or official sources of any deaths from starvation have been received. Though there have been food riots in some places they are not as stated in circular of daily occurrence. Thanks to excellent monsoon in 1917 walls in most parts are still holding water, mails are delivered regularly and business is brisk. Stocks of food grains are low but special measures have been taken to conserve supplies and wheat has been imported from Australia. Given normal monsoon there should be enough food until autumn crops are in sight. At the same time low stocks and excessive prices have created situation which is causing great anxiety to Government of India and serious hardship is undoubtedly being experienced by many sections of population." End.

The Secretary of State for India adds that season such as now being experienced in India inevitably occasions suffering and privation to poorer and more helpless classes and gives ample scope for private charity in addition to State relief.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who is the author of this essay?

Mr. ROWELL: That is a cable from Lord Milner sent at the request of the Secretary of State for India to be made public here in Canada.

CONFERRING OF TITLES ON CANADIANS.

DATE FIXED FOR DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE REPORT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to name Thursday as the day for discussion by the House of the report of the Committee upon Titles, Honours and Decorations. I have conferred with the Chairman of the Committee, and the date is entirely agreeable to him.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the discussion take up the whole day?

Mr. McKENZIE: In what form will this discussion come up?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There will be a motion by the Chairman of the Committee for the adpotion of the report, and the discussion will be upon that motion.

THE BIOLOGICAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill No. 106 to amend the Biological Board Act—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne—read third time and passed.

RAILWAY ACT CONSOLIDATION.

On motion that the House go into Committee on Bill No. 19 to consolidate and amend the Railway Act:

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister explain the necessity of an amending Bill?

Hon. J. D. REID: The Bill that we are going into Committee on is the consolidation of the Railway Act. We did pass a Bill to amend the old Railway Act which now stands for third reading. If this Bill goes through its third reading, I intend to withdraw the other Bill.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a letter I have received from Winnipeg under date of April 11, 1919, referring to a matter that came before the Special Committee that dealt with this particular Bill. The letter is as follows:

> Enclosed please find a clipping from to-day's Manitoba Free Press, which states that Locomotive engineers in some instances deliberately kill cattle on the railroad tracks. I, for one, repudiate such a statement, and these people should be brought to time and made to prove their case. Such a statement should not be allowed to go unchallenged, and I trust that as you are an ex-railway employee in engine service, and know the danger of such an undertaking, you will see your way clear to have this matter remedied. I think our standing as a body of men is above such reproach and should not be dragged down in this manner.

Not being a member of the Railway Committee, I do not know who made the statement complained of, but I cannot conceive of any hon. member making such a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have very grave doubts as to whether the hon. gentleman is in order in raising a discussion upon the mere motion, that I do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee on a Bill. The hon. gentleman would be in order in bringing this matter up in Committee.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that this Bill has been before the House of Commons and the Senate during the last two or three sessions. A special committee of this House took evidence from a great many persons interested in the different sections. This Bill contains altogether 461 sections, and with the exception of 35 sections no changes have been made in the original Bill as passed by this House and the Senate. I thought we might take up these sections in which no change has been made either by the House or the Senate, and after passing those come back to the 35 sections which have been amended, some in the Senate and some in the House. If that suggestion meets with the approval of the Committee perhaps we can make faster progress than by taking up the Bill clause by clause. Of course, if we come to any clause on which any hon. member wishes to take issue we could take it up and dispose of it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the hon. minister give us the clauses which were amended?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have a list of the clauses in which no changes have been made, and also a list of those in which changes have been made.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister give us the list of clauses in which changes were made?

Mr. J. D. REID: The following are all the sections in which changes were made by the special committee. Sections 2, 5, 6, 10, 26, 39, 40, 80, 151, 179, 240, 250, 255, 262, 282, 285, 323, 325, 345, 347, 358, 364, 371, 373,

380, 381, 382, 383, 402, 409, 429, 436, 438, 439, 444.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Is there no change in 374?

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It has been changed since the original Act was passed.

Mr. J. D. REID: Oh, yes. There are two clauses that the member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) wishes to discuss. Then, of course, there is the power clause, with reference to the dispute in Toronto. Nearly all the others are clauses to which, I think, no objection will be taken.

Mr. McKENZIE: Which are the two clauses that the member for East Lambton wishes to deal with?

Mr. J. D. REID: 3 and 258. They are with reference to placing Canadian steamships under the Board of Railway Commissioners

Mr. McKENZIE: Are they still in the Bill?

Mr. J. D. REID: The special committee passed them without any change. Clauses that any member wishes to take objection to, we could allow to stand and discuss with the 35 clauses to which amendments have been made.

Mr. CAHILL: I suggest that the minister put on Hansard the amendments that were proposed, but defeated; also the clauses to which amendments were proposed, such as the power clause, and sections 34 and 258, that the member for East Lambton refers to. These are contentious clauses, although they have not been amended. We do not want to have it understood that only these 35 clauses which have been amended are contentious. Let us put in one class all the clauses that were amended and all that are contentious or in respect of which proposed amendments were defeated; then we can go ahead with the rest.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not before me the amendments that were proposed in the special committee, but I have had printed all the amendments made in the special committee. I have three copies here; the others will be here in fifteen or twenty minutes, and a copy will be supplied to each member. If, in considering the non-contentious clauses, we come to a clause which any member wishes to discuss, we can let it stand and deal with it when we come to consider the sections to which amendments have been made or which any members wish to discuss. I think that the whole discussion will come down to four or five important matters. There is the Toronto matter, the telephone question, the matter of railway crossings—there are not more than four or five altogether. So that if the Committee will pass the clauses to which there are no objection we shall save time.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is quite proper that we should take up first and get through with these non-contentious clauses. What has become of this contention between the Niagara Power Company and the city of Toronto? I could never understand why it was imported into the general Railway Act. However, it is in the Railway Bill, and I should like to know how the matter stands.

Mr. J. D. REID: When this Bill was before the House three years ago the House adopted a clause with reference to that matter. When the Bill went to the Senate the Senate amended that clause, and they amended it again last year. Last year's clause was put in by the Senate this year. It is section 374, which reads in part:—

> Any specific powers inconsistent with the provisions of this section and conferred on any company by any special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada or of any province shall not be affected by the provisions of this section, but if any municipality complains to the Board that any company whether incorporated by special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada is exercising its powers oppressively or in bad faith the Board may hear such complaint and if it sees fit supervise the exercise of such powers: Provided always that whenever any company incorporated by Special Act of the Parliament of Canada acquires the assets of a company operating within a municipality, which said municipality has the right by agreement to purchase any of the assets of such company, then and in every such case the municipality may enforce its rights under such agreement as fully as if such purchase had not been made and may enforce against such purchaser the provisions of such agreement as if it were the original party entering into such agreement with the municipality.

That is the way it came from the Senate, and the special committee passed it as it came from the Senate. Although this clause is in the list of those to which there are no amendments, still, when we come to it, it is for the Committee to say whether they will accept the Senate amendment as passed by the special committee, or whether they will further amend the clause.

Mr. McKENZIE: I know I have no right to go to the middle of the Bill to ask about this clause, but I want the Committee to have some general idea as to how the matter stands between the two contending

forces. Can the minister tell me whether they have reached any conclusion?

Mr. J. D. REID: The matter stands exactly as before. The Toronto city authorities were not satisfied with the clause as it now stands in the Bill, and I do not know that the others were very well satisfied either. This is a kind of settlement that the Senate thought might probably be fair to both parties, but it is now for the Committee to say whether they will concur with the Senate or amend the clause further.

Mr. McKENZIE: We certainly have nothing to do with settling the dispute. We are creating legislation under which the parties can negotiate. That is about as far as we can go.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is the situation exactly.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—definitions:

Mr. J. D. REID: We were to take up first the non-contentious clauses.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but we shall have to take the clauses in order and postpone the consideration of those that we do not desire to discuss at present.

Mr. J. D. REID: Very well. Let clause 2 stand.

Section stands.

On section 155—scheme may be filed in Exchequer Court:

Mr. McKENZIE: This section deals with insolvent companies. In the last two sessions when this Act was before us the Bankruptcy Act was not in contemplation. What bearing will the Bankruptcy Act have upon this section?

4 p.m.

Mr. J. D. REID: We will let the section stand.

Section stands.

On section 2—definitions:

Mr. J. D. REID: We now return to the clauses that were allowed to stand. Some of them are not contentious. In paragraph (b), subsection 4 of section 2, strike out the word "minister" and substitute therefor the word "Board." Under the Railway Act, returns were heretofore sent to the minister; now they are to be sent to the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. McMASTER: Why are they not sent direct to the Dominion Statistician?

Mr. J. D. REID: They are sent to the Dominion Statistician as well.

Mr. BUREAU: Do these returns appear in the annual report of the Minister of Railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, these are the regular railway statistics. Sections 380 and 381 are amended so that the statistics are sent to the Dominion Statistician and to the Board of Railway Commissioners. The former will publish them; the latter will have them for their own information.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: With reference to subsection 14, I may say that in Alberta a justice of the peace has jurisdiction over the whole province, but this subsection as drafted limits the jurisdiction of a justice of the peace to the "district, county, riding, division." I should like, therefore, to have the word "province" inserted before the word "district" in the second line of subsection 14.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not say "justice" means a justice of the peace, and stop there? The jurisdiction is defined by the local legislature.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: What I want to avoid is that there shall be no dispute as to the jurisdiction of our justices of the peace if they take cognizance of the matters mentioned in section 2.

Mr. BOYS: That would not be satisfactory to Ontario, because our justices of the peace are appointed for the county, not for the province.

Mr. BUREAU: The jurisdiction of a justice of the peace is defined by the statute. It must be so defined in Ontario.

Mr. BOYS: Only for the county.

Mr. BUREAU: Then when you come before a justice of the peace who has not jurisdiction under Dominion statute, you can simply raise the question of his jurisdiction. But I think the word "justice" should be defined as follows: "Justice" means "Justice of the Peace." That is sufficient.

Mr. J. D. REID: The clause as it stands in the Bill is the same as it has been in the previous Acts for a number of years. This is an exact copy.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: That is no reason why we should not amend it now.

Mr. MOWAT: If the word "province" is inserted before the word "district," that would cover the whole case.

Amendment (Mr. H. A. Mackie) agreed to.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I omitted to refer to subsection 13. This should be amended so that when a judge is authorized to do any act or make any order, he shall be deemed to act not as persona non designata, but he shall have all the power of the court, acting for the court, especially in directing other persons to be notified, or in making amendments, or in regard to expropriations where it appears that there are separate and distinct interests, and where one sum is offered for compensation for the whole land, and the company should make separate offers to each, so that if one person accepts, he may get out of the proceedings and not be compelled to have his interest diminished by reason of the cost of arbitration, which cost he cannot, under the circumstances, avoid. If the Committee will permit me to refer to clause 215, it will be seen that under that clause application may be made to the court or to a judge for directions. For instance, paragraph (c) reads:

A notification that within ten days after the service of this notice, or, where the notice is served by publication, within one month after the first publication thereof, the party to whom the notice is addressed does not give notice to the company that he accepts the sum offered by the company, either he or the company will be entitled to apply to have the compensation fixed by arbitration as provided in the Railway Act, 1919.

In the definitions, an owner is the person who is capable of granting title, but it is quite possible for a person to have an interest in land under agreement of sale, which, in the western provinces, is similar to a promise for sale in Quebec, and not to be able to give title. At the same time, he has an interest in the land, and it might be possible for him to accept the amount offered to him separately, if a separate amount were mentioned for him. Under present circumstances, he is not able to do that, and if any other person who is interested in the land desires to create a great deal of costs or trouble, the person who would be willing to withdraw by accepting a certain sum of money is compelled to stand the cost of an arbitration and possibly the cost of an appeal. In the case of a judge as defined, should there be an appeal, this circumstance arises: If one of the parties is dissatisfied and gives notice of appeal, the first thing that is discussed is that the judge is persona non designata, and there is no appeal from his order or direction or judgment, and if the party wishes to take any appeal at all, he will have to wait until there is an arbitration, but if there is no arbitration and one party desires to take any advantage of an appeal, then he is prevented from taking an appeal by reason of the fact that the judge is designated as a person to arbitrate and not as a judge of the court. What I am asking for in subsection 13 is that the judge shall be designated as a judge of the court, and that his decisions, orders and directions shall have the force of a judgment and not simply the force of a direction coming from a person who stands in the position of a person designated.

Mr. NESBITT: That might be better put as an amendment to another clause.

Mr. J. D. REID: In clause 232, there is an appeal from the award. Would not that cover the point?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: If clause 232 contains the amendment I desire to suggest to the Committee, some difficulty might arise about turning back to the definition of the word "judge", because the definition of the word "judge" would rule in clause 232. I am afraid the amendment must be made in clause 2, subclause 13, so as to give the judge the power of the court, and it would have to be repeated in clause 232.

Mr. MOWAT: I would ask my hón. friend (Mr. H. A. Mackie) whether he is quite sure that the laws of his province do not follow those of the older provinces which have Acts called "Judges Orders Enforcement Acts," which put any duty of a judge outside of court statutes in the same position as if he were acting wholly as a judge. We have that in Ontario, and, I imagine, also in the other older provinces.

Mr. WALLACE: Would the minister kindly postpone the consideration of this Bill until every member has a copy of the amendments sent by the special committee to the House of Commons Committee? Some of the members have not had an opportunity of considering them.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member was present on the committee and knows the amendments that were proposed, and I hardly think it is fair that we should postpone proceeding with the Bill. We know what the amendments are when they are mentioned here.

Mr. NESBITT: I would suggest that it might be well to postpone the consideration of any long amendments, but there is no need to do that in the case of small, simple amendments such as changing a word or two.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In answer to the inquiry of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), the following cases have been decided on the point on which I touched regarding the question whether a judge is persona non designata or has the power of the court:—

Marsan vs. G.T.P. (2 Alta. Law Reports): Saunders vs. E. D. & B. (6 Alta. Law Reports): Gauthier vs. C.N.R. (7 Alta. Law Reports). In every one of those cases the question was discussed whether an order given by a judge sitting as an arbitrator had the force and effect of a judgment of a court. If it has not, you may not appeal from it; if it has, you may appeal. A very peculiar situation has arisen, in this way: Where notice has been given of an interim direction by a judge, and notice of appeal has been taken from that direction, subsequently, if an arbitration was held, you could not appeal from the arbitration because, it would be contended, you had appealed from the direction. Then the question would be; should we have appealed from the direction? This question has arisen, and I should like to have the point cleared up.

Mr. McKENZIE: The doctrine which the hon. member expounds is well known to the law. I did not have the opportunity of attending the Committee when this Bill was being considered. The question is, was it the intention of the Committee that the judge should sit as a judge and discharge the ordinary functions of a judge, from whose direction there would be an appeal? If it was the intention of the Committee that the judge's decision should be final, there is no necessity for providing for an appeal. If that was not the intention, we should make it clear what was intended.

Mr. BOYS: I think there is no question that it was the intention of the Committee that there should be an appeal, because the Committee dealt with section 232 in which an appeal is provided for. I do not think the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton applies in so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, unless it be on a question of practice. If his idea is that we should expand the meaning of the word judge so that any action on the part of a judge acting under this Act should be subject to the ordinary appeals and consolidated rules of the province of Ontario, that would necessitate a complete revision of the rules and would revolutionize our practice. Section 232 lays down that an appeal shall lie, and the proceedings that are to be taken. It was the intention of the Committee that that appeal should be open either to the railway company or to the person whose land was being expropriated.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the sections make it clear what the intention of the Committee was, I think we should be satisfied.

Mr. BOYS: I do not think there can be any doubt as to the intention of the Committee, because section 232 in plain English provides for an appeal. All that paragraph (13) of section 2 does is to say that a "judge" means a judge of a superior or county court, and I think that definition is necessary, otherwise it might be held that "judge" meant only a judge of a superior court. When we say that it means a judge of a superior or county court we realize that the appeal provided for under section 232 would lie from either.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Section 232 says: "Within one month after receiving from the arbitrator . . . . a written notice of the making of the award." It is quite clear that the appeal is from the award. My hon. friend from South Simcoe has stated my position correctly. I desire to revolutionize this section so that an arbitration judge shall be constituted a judge of a court from whose judgments there shall be an appeal, just as in the case of a judge of a court.

Mr. MORPHY: I rather agree with my hon. friend from South Simcoe. I would point out to my hon. friend (Mr. H. A. Mackie) that section 232 provides for dealing directly with questions of fact upon the evidence taken before an arbitrator. Further, paragraph (7) of section 2 defines a "court" as follows:

> "Court" means a superior court of the province or district, and when used with respect to any proceedings for the ascertainment or payment, either to the person entitled, or into court, of compensation. . . . . includes the county court of the county where the lands lie; and "county court" and "superior court" are to be interpreted according to the Interpretation Act and amendments thereto.

So we have all the machinery possible under section 232 to cover anything a judge may do as arbitrator.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I quite realize that there is an appeal from every act of a judge of a court as designated here, but if he is sitting as an arbitrator in an arbitration he has not the power of a judge of a court, but of an arbitrator; he is in the position of a person designated. If there is no arbitration there is no appeal

of an intermediate character up to the point of arbitration, because one cannot appeal unless there is an award. Section 232 is the only one under which an appeal is provided for. Suppose under section 215 you go to a judge designated as arbitrator and ask him to direct that John Smith or Peter Jones be summoned before a certain board for the settlement of differences and some one desires to take an appeal from that. There can only be an appeal from the award. The judge should be a judge of the court and not an arbitrator purely and simply, and all he does should have the force and effect of a judgment from which we may appeal, whether there is an award or not.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member state his amendment?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: It would take me some time to formulate it. I did not expect that the Bill would be taken up this afternoon, nor that it would be dealt with in this way.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where is the authority in this Act to go before a judge to have an order to compel somebody else to appear before a board?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Section 215 says:

(c) A notification that if within ten days after the service of this notice, or, where the notice is served by publication, within one month after the first publication thereof, the party to whom the notice is addressed does not give notice to the company that he accepts the sum offered by the company, either he or the company will be entitled to apply to have the compensation fixed by arbitration as provided in the Railway Act, 1919.

A notice to this effect must be served upon the opposite party preliminary to proceeding to arbitration to fix compensation or damages. If an application is made under this section, it is not to a judge of the court, but to a judge appointed as arbitrator.

Mr. BUREAU: If the party to whom you serve notice is in default and does not accept within ten days you just set your case for trial. That is the law of Quebec. If the other party does not appear it is an ex parte arbitration. You do not need to have an order from the court to set your case. You set it de jure. After you set your case a man is debarred from pleading further unless he receives permission.

5 p.m.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: My point is that it is before a man acting as an arbitrator and not as a judge.

[Mr. H. A Mackie.]

Mr BUREAU: He has all the powers of an arbitrator, and you proceed the same as if you had three arbitrators under the old system. If a man is in default you do the same as in an ordinary process—we call it "inscription" in our province—for trial, and the other party may appear to cross-examine witnesses. In our province that would be allowed even though he had not disputed or filed an appearance. He may appear in person at the time of the trial, and has a right to cross-examine witnesses if he desires, but he is barred from filing pleadings. When a man declines to accept your amount and says he wants so much for his land, that is a complete answer to your notice—I am not sure what it is designated in Ontario, whether it is "bill of particulars." If he does not answer he is in default and you inscribe the case before the court and proceed.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Suppose a railway company offers a lump sum for a piece of land in which four or five parties are interested. One man may ask a certain sum for his interest, and it may not be accepted, with the result that there is an arbitration. The company or some individual interested in the land appeals, and A or B, who is willing to accept a certain sum and avoid further proceedings, has no remedy. He has no judgment in his favour. Any direction that the court gives is a direction from an arbitrator and not a judge and the man must stand the proportion of costs of all proceedings.

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is a question for the final division of the money. When there are several persons interested in the land the money must be paid into court and there must be some machinery to divide the money according to their interest, and the man who took the appeal would have to take the responsibility of costs.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: If I were permitted I could get the reports, which I have not with me, and could convince the Committee that I am absolutely right in my point.

Mr. BUREAU: If a man does not dispute a case they cannot charge costs against him. It is a case of, "Il s'en rapporte à justice." If a man wants to dispute it let him bear the costs that are incurred against him.

Mr. BOYS: Section 217 refers only to an absent party, or substitutional service. We do not want an appeal from a judge in regard

to substitutional service. That would only make the costs of arbitration so much more expensive to the parties interested. When a sum is offered by a company and is refused you proceed to arbitration under section 232, and have the right of appeal and unless we want to give further appeals the section is all right as it is. If what my hon. friend is suggesting should become law it would simply mean that when a county judge makes an award you can appeal from him to the Superior Court in the province and then to the Supreme Court, and from there to the Privy Council. We want to avoid that sort of thing and there is a remedy provided now.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—to what persons, companies and railways applicable:

Mr. J. D. REID: I move that the section be amended so as to read:

This Act shall, subject as herein provided, apply to all persons, railway companies and railways within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, whether heretofore or hereafter and howsoever incorporated or authorized, except Government railways, to which, however, it shall apply to such extent as is specified in any Act referring or relating thereto.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not mention the Canadian National Railway Act? That is the only Act that is going to regulate the railways. There is only one Act now, as I understand it, that will apply to the Canadian National Railways, the Act passed the other day. The Canadian National Railways include the Intercolonial Railway. I understand the intention is to simplify the system and have as far as possible one uniform law applicable to all. There are only two systems the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. J. D. REID: There is the Canadian Railways Provident Fund, and we might have some other railways.

Mr. BUREAU: The provident fund would not have anything to do with the administration of the railways.

Mr. J. D. REID: We have some railways that have not been transferred to the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, others that have not been transferred come under this Act.

Mr. J. D. REID: There are railways owned by the Government, but not transferred to the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. BUREAU: Owned by the Government but not transferred?

Mr. J. D. REID: They may not yet have been transferred.

Mr. BUREAU: Are there any railways that have not been transferred yet? I cannot understand how the Government can own anything and have the property of it in strangers.

Mr. BOYS: If in a year or two hence a further Act was passed this provision would be necessary. You want it to apply not only to the present but to the future, five or ten years hence. As it is worded now it would apply, but restricted in the manner suggested by the hon. member it would not.

Mr. MOWAT: I think it would be better to leave it as it is. We have to consider every Act as standing on its own legs, and this could not refer to an Act that has not been assented to by the Governor General or become law.

Mr. BUREAU: This Bill has not been assented to yet but we take it for granted that it will be law as soon as it passes the House. The Government either owns or does not own railways. If it owns railways there is only to be one law regarding their operation. The moment a railway is the property of the Government it comes under the control of the Canadian National Railways; until then it is regulated by the general Act.

Mr. MOWAT: My friend is asking that this well expressed language "except Government railways" be altered to apply only to the Canadian Government Railway Act.

Mr. BUREAU: What I suggest is "except as provided by the Canadian National Railways Act."

Mr. MOWAT: I think we should leave this language "except Government railways." Every one understands what it means. What is the use of imparting doubt or surmise into an Act which every one wants to be clear.

Mr. BUREAU: We would like to know what the other Acts are. I hate to travel all over the statutes from Confederation to find out what they are.

Mr. BOYS: Except where inconsistent with the provisions of the National Railway Act.

Mr. BUREAU: That is not what it says.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend did not understand me. If he looks at the provisions of the National Railway Act he will find a clause which makes the Railway Act applicable except where inconsistent with the provisions of the National Railway Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, but there is the general Railway Act of Canada, the Canadian National Railway Act and the Intercolonial Railway Act—three of them.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—application to:

Mr. J. D. REID: There is an additional subsection that it is proposed to insert here. When the Bill was before the House three years ago there was a subsection (c) added reading as follows:

(c) every railway or portion thereof, whether constructed under the authority of the Parliament of Canada or not, now or hereafter owned, controlled, leased or operated by a company wholly or partly within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, or by a company operating a railway wholly or partly within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, whether such ownership, control or first-mentioned operation is acquired or exercised by purchase, lease, agreement or other means whatsoever, and whether acquired or exercised under authority of the Parliament of Canada, or of the legislature of any province, or otherwise howsoever; and every railway or portion thereof, now or hereafter so owned, controlled, leased or operated shall be deemed and is hereby declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. 8-9 E. VII, c. 32, s. 11. Am.

That subsection was put into the Bill in this House, but when it went to the Senate they struck it out. The special committee inserted it again. The reason it was put in was to cover a case in the province of Quebec where the Quebec Central railway, incorporated under the Provincial Government and, of course, under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government, was leased for ninety-nine years by the Canadian Pacific. The result is that a portion of that railway, in so far as operation is concerned, is under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government while it is really part and parcel of the Canadian Pacific Railway system. This clause is for the purpose of bringing this railway, which is practically owned by the Canadian Pacific, under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. The representatives of the employees in Ottawa were very strong for having this inserted for the protection of the employees. There is also the other question of placing the freight rates under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commissioners.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know that the amendment has been distributed or seen by the members. The object of the amendment is all right, but it may be necessary to consider the wording. The intent of the law, as we understand it in discussing it in Parliament, may not be carried out when we come to analyze the words used. There must be some objection to this subsection if the Senate refused to insert it a couple of years ago. What reasons were adduced for its rejection I do not know.

Mr. MOWAT: The Senate said that Parliament's right constitutionally to declare in this general way that every railway should be deemed a railway for the general advantage of Canada was questionable. It said, further, that the question of the invasion of provincial rights bore also upon it and that it was always open to a company to apply to Parliament to have its undertaking declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. It seems to me that the clause which passed this House in 1917, and which has been read by the minister, expresses in apt words what is desired chiefly by the employees of the railway. Here is a provincial railway operated by the Canadian Pacific; the men get accustomed to the regulations of the Canadian Pacific right along and suddenly they are switched before they know it to a provincial railway, where the regulations may be different as to hand rails, height of bridges and all those things that serve for the protection of the men. They do not desire that there should be this difference between the two railways. They desire that the provincial railway, which to all intents and purposes is the Canadian Pacific, be left under the direction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I do not think there is any reason why we should not re-enact what this House did in 1917. We should put it up to the Senate that they have not considered it from the aspect I have now given, that the operating rules should be uniform to insure the safety of the men.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to be understood as objecting, but an amendment of that length ought to be submitted to the members instead of being merely shoved under our noses.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member was in the House three years ago when we discussed the clause thoroughly, and I did not think there would be any objection from him.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not referring to this clause alone; I understand certain amend-

ments have been adopted by the special committee and will be submitted to this Committee. I claim that we have not had an opportunity, not being members of the special committee, to study those clauses, I do not object to this clause going through, although I do not believe the safety of the men is any better guarded than under the Quebec Railway Act. Whether this clause is based on the Quebec Act, or the latter is based on this, I do not know, but they are alike.

Mr. J. D. REID: The employees on the Canadian Pacific railway have uniform rules in connection with the operation of the whole system.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that. I do not object to it.

Mr. J. D. REID: The representatives of the employees state that the rules are different on this particular line.

Mr. BUREAU: That may be, but they have a remedy under the local law the same as they have under the Federal law.

Mr. NESBITT: In 1917 we also wanted to put them under the Railway Board as far as rates were concerned.

Mr. BUREAU: I am only saying that we ought to have a copy of these amendments before being asked to pass upon them.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The representatives of all the railway brotherhoods urgently requested that this amendment should be included in the Bill. They called attention to the fact that the Quebec Central Railway is not under the control of the Railway Commission, and they were most anxious that the employees who are operating that road should be placed in the same position as other railway employees in Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not answer my request to have a chance to look at these amendments before they go through. I have absolute confidence in the Special Committee, but my name is Thomas—I would like to see.

Mr. J. D. REID: Does the hon. member want to see the amendment?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, I would like to have time to read it quietly.

Mr. J. D. REID: I will hand the amendment to the hon. member.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does this mean that we are putting an exclusively provincial road under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners? Take, for instance, the railroad between Sydney and Louisburg, which was built by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company under their charter from the local legislature. They are operating the line to some extent as a passenger railway, but largely as a traffic road. Do we put that road under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners?

Mr. J. D. REID: The railway the hon. gentleman has referred to would not come under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, unless, say, the Canadian Pacific railway purchased it and had it declared as a work for the general advantage of Canada. This clause would not interfere with it so long as the line was not made part and parcel of a through road. The reason for this clause is that judicial doubts were expressed as to whether the Board of Railway Commissioners had jurisdiction in such a case. If we pass this clause it gives the Board of Railway Commissioners jurisdiction after the road has been purchased or leased—

Mr. MORPHY: Or operated.

Mr. J. D. REID: —or comes under the control or operation of a through line system. Then the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners extends to it in so far as that board has jurisdiction over the main line.

Mr. BUREAU: This amendment provides that if a provincial road is leased, purchased or owned—I have no objection to ownership —by a company which is partly or wholly under Federal jurisdiction, that road comes under such jurisdiction. But at the expiration of the lease it remains under Federal jurisdiction, which is what I object to. Why not add: "Shall be under Federal jurisdiction while such lease or agreement continues?" It seems to me that would be better. Take the St. Maurice railway between Shawinigan Falls and Three Rivers. Suppose it were leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway, although incorporated by the local legislature, that road would remain under Federal jurisdiction after the lease expired and the Canadian Pacific surrendered control.

Mr. J. D. REID: It has to be declared a railway for the general advantage of Canada, and is brought under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners when transferred either by purchase or lease.

Mr. BUREAU: By purchase is all right.

Mr. J. D. REID: Where railways are being operated as part of a through system or in conjunction with each other, it is better anyway that they should be under one jurisdiction. While there might be something said for letting the road go back to provincial jurisdiction at the termination of the working agreement or lease, I do not think it is in the interest of the road or of the employees; therefore I would prefer leaving the amendment as it is.

Mr. BUREAU: I remember trying to obtain incorporation of a railway exclusively within a certain province, but the Government said: "No, we do not want to incorporate a road like this." If a road is incorporated by the legislature, I admit that for the purpose of better operation it is all right to place it under Federal control while it is operated as part and parcel of another system which is under Federal control. But when the lease has expired why should you force the owners of that line to remain in that position? Why should they not return to the original jurisdiction under which they were incorporated?

Mr. J. D. REID: As far as this case is concerned, it would not make any difference, for the reason that it is a nine hundred and ninety-nine year lease. But at the same time, is it not almost certain that when a lease is taken of a road it is taken for a long term? You very seldom hear of a lease of a railway for only a few years.

Mr. BUREAU: But you are legislating for all railways.

Mr. J. D. REID: I admit that.

Mr. BUREAU: If this is going to be legislation for the Quebec Central, let us so state. If it is going to be for all railways, we should not force any railway which may be leased for a term to a larger system to remain under Federal jurisdiction after the lease expires or when the reason for its having been taken under Federal jurisdiction ceases to exist.

Mr. NESBITT: Suppose you lived on a short line which could not get along unless it had connection with a through line; and suppose the short line charged you more for carrying freight ten miles than the through line, under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board, charged for a thousand miles—what would you say then?

Mr. BUREAU: I would go before the Railway Board and have the rates cut down. I do not think we are so wise that we ought to legislate for these people who have organized companies and put up their money, and tell them that they are making a mistake; and that if they connect for a certain length of time with another line that has a Federal charter, they must stay there forever. I do not believe in that. After the expiration of their agreement with the larger line, they should be enabled to revert to the conditions which existed before they entered into the agreement.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member is overlooking something that will rather upset his argument when it occurs to his mind. The men who work on the main line railways are anxious that any subsidiary lines that are taken over shall have the same appliances, equipment and safety devices and the same general regulations for the safety of the operatives that exist on the large trunk lines. I am informed that many accidents have been brought about by lack of uniformity as between the smaller line and the larger one in the matter of the equipment of brakes and other connecting devices. If at the end of, say, a ten-year lease a local road ceases to be subject to the regulations of the Railway Board and may put on such local equipment and devices as it thinks fit, we shall be right up against the trouble that this section is intended to obviate, namely, lack of uniformity of devices, contrivances and apparatus for the safety of the operatives of the road. If for no other reason than that, I should say that once under the Railway Board, a system should always remain there.

Mr. BUREAU: I assume that the Provincial Legislature are just as wise as we are, and that they are able to make laws and regulations for the safety of their citizens just as well as the Federal Government is. If a provincially incorporated company chooses to make an agreement with a larger company which is under Federal jurisdiction, it is right that during the life of the agreement it should be under Federal supervision in such matters as these. But why should we prevent men from following their own inclination and their own wishes in the matter after the agreement has expired? If the only safety exists in the Railway Board or in Federal legislation, then away with the right of the provinces to enact railway legislation—that is what the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy) comes down to.

Mr. MORPHY: There is quite a difference between a local road with limited jurisdiction and a Dominion or Federal

road with an overshadowing jurisdiction. The local road cannot compel uniformity as regards the Dominion road; consequently there should be some paramount power to enforce uniformity of appliances. A local Government may be the best Government in the world for the railway operatives, but it has no power over Federal roads. While the local Government might be as advanced in the matter of railway legislation as the Federal Government, still, it might choose different kinds of appliances from those used on the Federal road, and it would be like the tail wagging the dog; the smaller road would attempt to set up its standards of uniformity against the equally good but different standards of the main line. My idea is that uniformity is the crux of the situation and that some paramount power ought to rest in the Dominion through the medium of the Railway Commission.

Mr. McKENZIE: The point made by my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) is very clear to me. I assume that there is no intention on the part of this legislation to interfere in any way with provincial jurisdiction over provincial railways. If a privately-owned road passes over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance, there is no objection to its being under the jurisdiction of the Board while it is held by the Canadian Pacific. But the member for Three Rivers contends that when the lease terminates, we should not prevent the company from going back to its former status if it wishes to do so. We should so construct our legislation that when the instrument which creates the jurisdiction terminates, the locally owned company may go back to its former jurisdiction.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The point raised by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) is of paramount importance to railway employees throughout the country so far as it relates to safety appliances. Notwithstanding anything that may be said as to the efficiency of any measure that a Provincial Legislature may enact with regard to safety appliances, you cannot have uniformity where nine provinces are dealing with the same thing. It is essential that there be uniformity in appliances on freight and passenger cars, and in respect of equipment of all kinds. Let me illustrate by referring to one of the appliances in connection with freight equipment on railways in Canada and the United States that come under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Railway Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission. I refer to the hand-grips on box cars. It becomes second nature to a railway man in the dead of night, without stopping to look, to reach to a certain place to take hold of the hand-grip on a freight car; and if it is not there, he may get under the wheels. I repeat that you cannot get uniformity unless you have uniformity of control. Railway employees as a body have been working long and arduously to get this enactment into the railway law, so that the Railway Board will have jurisdiction and will know that the equipment is uniform. They do not want to interfere with the right of a province in its own railway, but they do want the large body to have jurisdiction over the smaller one.

Mr. BOYS: I endorse absolutely what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. G. B. Nicholson). The very matter that he has referred to is what gave rise to the amendment. In 1913 complaints were made to the board with regard to the operation of the Quebec Central railway, which was under a 999-year lease to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Application was made for the establisment of uniformity of devices, appliances and so on.

What has been done here is to pass a law so that where any provincial road is owned, controlled, leased, or operated by a company wholly or partly within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, the provincial company shall also be within the provisions of the Railway Act and subject to the jurisdiction of the Dominion Railway Board. In that way uniformity in devices will be obtained. If what is suggested by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) were adopted, and at the end of the lease the company went back to the regulations which obtained in any province they might be quite different, for instance, the devices on box cars, which have been referred to, and accidents would be almost certain to result. It is for that purpose that this clause is inserted. It is really for the protection of railway employees.

Mr. BUREAU: If you take the case of a smaller road which has operated for a number of years with a larger road, for instance if you take the case of the Quebec Central, you will find that its equipment is just the same as that of the Canadian Pacific. It could not couple its cars with those of the Canadian Pacific if it did not have the same coupling device. To have different equipment would restrict the trade of the company and make it an absolute failure. Business interests would compel it to have the same equipment. All these new devices

must be used, because it would be suicidal for such a company not to have them.

Mr. BOYS: We need not worry about the Quebec Central, because it is under lease to the Canadian Pacific for 999 years and will continue to be operated by that company.

Mr. BUREAU: I object to the principle that we should bind forever a company which is at present under a certain management. This control ought not to go beyond the time mentioned in the agreement. If a company is subject to provincial legislative powers, let it be so; but if it amalgamates with a federal company, I am willing that, for the time of the amalgamation, it should be subject to Federal jurisdiction, but when that agreement expires, why impose upon that company the necessity of remaining where perhaps, it would not like to be?

Mr. NESBITT: The company can come to the Parliament of the day and get relief.

Mr. BUREAU: Why force it to come to Parliament?

Mr. NESBITT: It might be better for it.

Mr. BUREAU: We are not here to do guess work for the welfare of other people who are supposed to look into the matter of their incorporation when they become incorporated. This is a question that affects future interests of people who are not bound by any agreement. When this agreement has expired by the lapse of time, you force them to remain in a condition to which they did not want to submit before they came to make this agreement and which was imposed upon them by the making of the agreement.

Mr. NESBITT: We did not force it upon them.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it impossible to use other language than the language used here? The objectionable part is the clause "for the general advantage of Canada." No matter how small a property may be, if it is entirely within a province, when you declare it to be for the general advantage of Canada, it will be very awkward to be obliged some day to come back to Parliament for legislation declaring that it is not for the general advantage of Canada, and that is the only way to get back to the former status. It would be a very peculiar piece of legislation to put through this House, to declare that a certain piece of property was not for the general advantage of Canada. If the language was used that this road while so operated shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the board, then when the owner got the property back, he would be no longer subject to the jurisdiction of the board. In that way, you would have the same effect, but the property would not be forever declared to be property within Dominion jurisdiction.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I would ask the permission of the Committee to draw attention to a matter which properly would come under clause 8. Before I really understood the procedure of the Committee, I had allowed this clause to slip by. It has been carried, and I have to ask the permission of the Committee to speak to it.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is satisfactory.

On motion of Mr. H. A. Mackie, the Committee reverted to the consideration of clause 8.

On clause 8.—provincial railways connecting with or crossing Dominion railways:

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Under this clause the question of crossings arises, and a case may very will be imagined, indeed, a case has occurred where some difficulty has been apprehended in the matter of crossings and the meaning and definition of "crossings", where, for instance, a railway company operating or about to operate under a provincial charter has a certain location route and another company operating under a Dominion charter had virtually the same route and they came into conflict. A case has arisen in Alberta between the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific. The Canadian Northern had a provincial charter and the Canadian Pacific a Dominion charter. The lines of the two railways as shown by their respective location plans—though at different levels—both cross each other and also join each other so as to run along much the same right-of-way at several places, in what the plaintiff's counsel designates the "confliction area." The case was tried and decided by a single judge, which decision is not by any means binding, and it might be profitable for the Committee to have a better definition of what is meant by the word "crossing," so as to cover a case where roads are not in operation. The learned judge in that case said:

In my opinion, that section has no application to the case in hand. It seems to me that the evidence establishes a case substantially of both companies claiming a right to build upon the same right-of-way and that at different levels; that one railway "joining" another means joining on the same level so as to enable cars to be transferred from the tracks of one road to the tracks of another; and that "crossing" means the passing of the tracks of one railway on, over or under the tracks of another by meeting at any angle, continuing at the same angle to the opposite side of the track crossed and immediately leaving the track crossed.

The question taken before the court was this: "Is there any question of crossing any track or level inasmuch as neither railway company has thought of construction or operation?" The judge comes to the conclusion that it is merely a question of the right of a Dominion Parliament charter having precedence over a charter of the province. He says:

To be concrete, the Dominion Parliament has exclusive legislative authority with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway Co., the defendant company; and the Legislature of the province of Alberta exclusive legislature authority with respect to the Canadian Northern Western Railway Co., the plaintiff company. These legislative bodies, while each exercising its apparently exclusive jurisdiction, have conferred, each upon its own creature, powers apparently equal and a conflict has arisen.

The decision of the court was that where, as in this case, there is a conflict of rights granted by two different authorities, the authority granted by the Dominion Parliament is supreme. I submit that some amendment ought to be made to make it clear that where railways have secured authority from different sources and a conflict arises, the right granted by the Dominion Parliament shall have precedence over the rights granted by any other legislative authority.

Mr. MORPHY: I think the section already provides that.

Mr. NESBITT: That is what we intended to provide.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: It may be that it does, but I cannot see it, and I shall be very glad if one of the members of the Railway Committee will point out where this provision is.

Mr. MORPHY: I think paragraph (a) of section 8 covers the point raised by my hon. friend, and if it is in any way deficient I should like him to point it out.

Progress reported.

PRINCE OF WALES TO VISIT CANADA.

WILL OPEN NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I have the honour to announce the text of a message from His Majesty the King to His Excellency the Governor General, as follows:

I am very glad to tell you that with my entire approval the Prince of Wales will visit Canada this year leaving England in August. He will open the new Parliament Buildings in Ottawa.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

The House resumed at eight o'clock and again went into Committee on Bill No. 19, to consolidate and amend the Railway Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The hon. member for North Perth says that section 8 covers the point under discussion. The section says:

Every railway, the construction or operation of which is authorized by special Act of the legislature of any province, and which connects with or crosses or may hereafter connect with or cross any railway within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, shall—

—and so on. Under this section it is assumed that the railway is in operation or has been constructed or partly constructed. It does not contemplate railways on which no work has been done. The case I was dealing with is this. A railway company gets a charter from the province under the Provincial Railway Act and does everything necessary preparatory to the construction of its road. Another company is incorporated under the Dominion Railway Act, and it also complies with the requirements preparatory to the construction of its road. One company begins construction, and in doing so encroaches upon some territory or route that the other company, which we may call the plaintiff company, purposes to operate under the provincial charter. There is a conflict between the two. The routes cross and re-cross and at some point the defendant company constructs exactly on the same route that the plaintiff company had in view. The plaintiff company in this case seeks an injunction to restrain the defendant from constructing over a certain portion of its proposed route, because the

plaintiff, by provincial charter, claims exclusive jurisdiction. The defendant company claims that it has a perfect right to construct wherever it sees fit because it holds authority from the Dominion Parliament. The defendant says: "You have done nothing; you are not operating and have not even constructed; we have begun first and are entitled to priority, notwithstanding the conflict of rights between us. Take the case brought before the courts of Alberta, in which the Canadian Northern Railway seeks an injunction against the Canadian Pacific. Under Section 227 of the old Act it is provided:—

The railway lines or tracks of any company shall not cross or join, or be crossed or joined by or with any railway lines or tracks other than those of such company whether otherwise within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada or not until leave therefore has been obtained from the board as hereinafter provided.

The judgment in the case says:—

In my opinion, that section has no application to the case in hand. It seems to me that the evidence establishes a case substantially of both companies claiming a right to build upon the same right-of-way and that at different levels.

"Joining" means joining on the same level, and "crossing" the passing of tracks of one railway over or under the tracks of another by meeting at any angle, continuing at the same angle to the opposite side of the track crossed, and immediately leaving the track crossed. The judgment proceeds:—

The proper conclusion is, I think, that to this extent at least and speaking generally, Dominion railway legislation prima facie predominates over provincial railway legislation, that Parliament in legislating in relation to Dominion railways may as far as may be reasonably necessary to effect the object of its legislation impose obligations upon a provincial railway, that where Parliament has legislated with relation to a Dominion railway—as it has by the Railway Act and the defendent company's charter—what it has enacted cannot be derogated from by provincial legislature, and consequently had I thought it necessary for the decision of the questions involved in this action to have expressed an opinion upon S. 227 of The (Dominion) Railway Act with regard to crossings and junctions, I should have held both that it was within the power of the Dominion Parliament and also that it purported to and did apply to a provincial railway.

I have said that it seems to me, speaking generally, a Dominion railway will have predominating rights over a provincial railway, prima facie: what I mean to imply is that all other things being equal the predominance is not to be doubted but that the subsequent history of either railway may perhaps give the provincial railway a status which can be interfered with only, if at all, to a restricted extent.

[Mr. H. A. Mackie.]

Idington, J., in one of his judgments, says:—

The Dominion Parliament having by virtue of its exclusive powers over the enumerated subjects in sec. 91 of the B.N.A. Act created a corporate power and thereby conferred on one or more persons the power to construct or cause to be constructed a railway, that railway cannot be crossed by any other railway company which, with its work, is only the product of the somewhat analogous powers given by section 92 to provincial legislatures over "local works and undertakings."

I am with great respect, quite unable to understand how any express and exclusive dominating power such as given by the Act to the Dominion Parliament despite the so-called exclusive authority subject thereto given to the province is ever in any case to be minimized, much less deleted from the Act, because of some apparently inconsistent power given to the provinces. If need be to discard either, it is the subsequent and subordinate power that must be deleted as it were, in order to give the precedent and paramount power its full effective operation.

in conclusion, the judgment says:

I am of opinion, therefore, that the plaintiff company, in its present condition at least of being an unconstructed railway, can in no way interfere with the construction of the defendant company's railway.

There seems to be the same difficulty in the way when both railways are unconstructed. That is the decision of an Alberta judge. This does not make the matter final. Rather than have any repetition of lawsuits on this very point, I ask Parliament to make it clear, under this or any other section, that where there is a conflict between the provincial and Dominion legislatures in the granting of powers to railway companies which have not constructed and not operated, the authority given by the Dominion Parliament shall predominate over the power given by the legislature. That is the whole point at issue and one that has already caused some litigation. It is easy to understand how a company having a Dominion charter, if it is necessary to obtain even the consent of the board to cross a certain route or line to be constructed, receives that consent and the Dominion Government has no knowledge that a provincial legislature has given the same authority to another company over the same ground. Why not do away with conflict in a case of that sort? Section 8, or any other section which may be subordinated to it, only deals with railways when in operation or constructed, or which at least have done something towards construction or operation, I believe that answers the objection of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) and I hope I have made my point clear.

Mr. MORPHY: I am still in the dark, and I hope to convince my hon. friend that this Bill gives a complete answer to his contention. Without re-quoting section 8, I will just read the first two words: "Every railway". The Bill does not say "every constructed railway". To get the meaning of the term "railway" I refer to the interpretation clause of section 2, subsection 21, which defines the meaning of the word "railway".

"Railway" means any railway which the company has authority to construct or operate—

Not "has constructed" or "has operated", as my hon. friend has argued, not that has been partly constructed or operated, but any railway which may thereafter be constructed.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Under this Act?

Mr. MORPHY: Yes, under this Act.

—and includes all branches, extensions, sidings, depots, wharves—

etc. Section 8 provides that the Dominion jurisdiction is paramount to the provincial. Section 8 operates generally and applies to all railways under a provincial or federal charter whether they are constructed or unconstructed. It seems to be so clear that I cannot conceive of any court having any difficulty in the reading of the section.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Has the definition of "railway" been altered as compared with the definition in the last Act?

Mr. MORPHY: If any judge on this reading gave the decision which the hon. gentleman says was given, I think he must have given that decision without having looked at the interpretation clause as it is in the Act. No judge could give such a decision if this wording were there.

On section 10—Chief Commissioner and Assistant Chief Commissioner:

Mr. J. D. REID: I move:

That section 10, subsection 2, lines 1 and 2, be amended by striking out the words "or assistant chief commissioner" and inserting a new subsection between sections 2 and 3 as subsection 2 (a):

"(2a) Any person may be appointed Assistant Chief Commissioner who is or has been a judge of a superior court of Canada or of any province of Canada, or who is a barrister of at least ten years' standing at the bar of any such province, or who is a barrister or advocate of any such province and has held office as a Commissioner of the Board for a period of at least ten years."

The object of the change is merely to say that if it is thought advisable a person who has been a commissioner for ten years, although not a barrister for ten years, may be promoted to be assistant chief commissioner. It really means that Mr. McLean may be appointed to fill the position of assistant chief commissioner.

Mr. McMASTER: I note that in the tenth line you say "who is a barrister or advocate" while in the ninth line, you merely use the word "barrister." I think it would be well to say "barrister or advocate" in both cases.

Mr. J. D. REID: There is no objection to adding the word "advocate" in the ninth line.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the necessity of putting in "advocate." Is there any difference between a barrister and an advocate? There is not in our province.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not see any great necessity at all.

Mr. McMASTER: You have used the word "advocate" in one case and you say "barrister or advocate" in the other. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). "Barrister" and "advocate" mean the same thing in the province of Quebec. I would suggest that you either strike out the word "advocate" or insert it in both cases?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think it would be better to strike out "or advocate" in the tenth line. I would therefore move:

That the words "or advocate" be stricken out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not quite understand the effect of the last two lines.

"or who is a barrister of any such province and has held office as a commissioner of the Board for a period of at least ten years.

If you stop at "province" is that not all you require?

Mr. J. D. REID: I believe that has been added because Mr. McLean is not a barrister of ten years standing. Therefore, you could not appoint him to be an assistant commissioner, but if you say "who is a barrister" and who has served for ten years as a commissioner that would qualify him in case he might be appointed as assistant commissioner. He has been a barrister for probably four or five years.

Mr. McKENZIE: I know nothing about Mr. McLean, but I am opposed to the Parliament of Canada passing legislation to suit any particular person. I think the in-

tention was that any occupant of that position ought to have the standing of a barrister of ten years or be a judge of the Superior Court.

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. McLean was one of the commissioners reappointed. He has had ten years' experience as a commissioner. But as the Act now stands the very fact of his being a barrister of three or four years' standing would not qualify him; he would have to be a barrister of over ten years' standing before he could be appointed chief commissioner. It strikes me that if he has had ten years' experience on the Commission in addition to being a barrister of four or five years' standing, his qualifications would probably be equal to those of a man of ten years' standing as a barrister without the ten years' experience as a commissioner.

Mr. McKENZIE: You might very soon have cases where men would be claiming the rights which are being created under this section and which it was never intended they should have. If a man has practised law for ten years he has had a fairly good training. We are departing from the requirements that were originally thought necessary for the occupant of this office and saying that a man who was not a barrister until yesterday may get the same position as a judge of the Supreme Court or a barrister of ten years' standing.

Mr. J. D. REID: I must admit that it is to qualify Mr. McLean for the position of assistant chief commissioner. But after all he must be a barrister. He has been a barrister for a number of years and has served ten years on the Commission, and the information I have from the Chief Commissioner and others connected with the Commission is that Mr. McLean is really one of the best commissioners ever appointed. I am in the hands of the Committee, but I would like to see the clause go through for the reasons I have stated. While acting as a commissioner Mr. McLean has been practically discharging the functions of a judge, and the requirements we are specifying here constitute in my opinion qualifications sufficient to justify appointing him to the position of assistant chief commissioner. However, if the Committee think differently I shall drop the clause.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have nothing further to say about it. I object to special legislation to make a position for any person unless justified by the greatest possible necessity.

Mr. MORPHY: I think if the hon. leader of the Opposition knew Mr. McLean his objection would not be put forward. I had occasion while the late Judge Mabee was chief commissioner to have his opinion of Mr. McLean, and, in short, it was that he did not know any one in the whole North American continent who was his equal as an expert on railway rates. Judge Mabee said he was a perfect encyclopedia on the subject and without him the board would have great difficulty in getting along. So that while the general principle advanced by the hon. leader of the Opposition is a sound one, here is a special case of a man whose outstanding abilities are recognized by his superiors and who has had many years' experience upon the board. The legislation that is proposed now to apply to Mr. McLean will probably never be required again; and even if it is, the appointment has to be made by the Government, and it does not necessarily follow that a man gets it just because he is a barrister of ten years' standing. Having some knowledge of Mr. McLean's work I am of opinion he is much more valuable than if he had been a barrister of ten years without any experience as a commissioner.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not saying anything against Mr. McLean. I would not know him if I saw him on the street, and I never heard of him before. I would be very sorry to block his way to promotion or to deprive the country of his services. But it is the principle I object to; we should not specially legislate any man into a position of this kind. No matter how good he is, there are plenty of other men equally as good to take his place.

Mr. CANNON: The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) suggested an amendment to sub-paragraph 2 (a). It seems to me that if his suggestion is accepted it will lead to a misunderstanding as regards our province. According to the diplomas that we receive from our universities we are called "avocats" in French and "advocates" in English; we are not called "barristers."

Mr. J. D. REID: It was at the request of the hon. member for Brome that the clause was amended. It was considered in Committee and for the very reason the hon. member states the word advocate was inserted.

Mr. CANNON: I do not blame the hon. minister at all; I say I do not concur with what the hon. member for Brome suggested. I think the clause ought to remain

as drafted, and it might be improved by adding the word "avocat" where missing,

Mr. FIELDING: I am sorry the hon. member for Brome is not in his place. In one place the words "barrister or advocate" occur, and in the other place it is simply "barrister." The argument of the member for Brome was that to be consistent you should put the word "advocate" in both places.

Mr. J. D. REID: I move that the word "advocate" be added in both places.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 26—commissioners:

Mr. J. D. REID: Subsection 2 as it came from the Senate is now subsection 3. It read:

The secretary shall be paid an annual salary to be fixed by the Governor in Council not exceeding four thousand dollars.

That has been changed to read:

Such annual salary as may from time to time be fixed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. Cartwright has been secretary of the commission since the board was organized, but his present salary, $4,000, cannot be increased unless the Act is changed. It was stated to the Committee that the Government would like to increase his salary to $5,000 per annum, and the change has been made for this reason. We could not change the amount in the subsection to $5,000, because if we did we should have to bring in a resolution.

Mr. SHEARD: Are the appointees of the board governed in any way by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. J. D. REID: No. A good many of the officials are experts. A portion of the staff, consisting of clerks and stenographers, are really in the same position as others who come under the Civil Service Commission, but in this Bill we have not specially made them come under that commission.

Mr. SHEARD: When the matter of the appointment of experts in the new Department of Health was discussed, it was contended that such officials must come under the Civil Service Commission. It seems to me that the departments are not all in harmony in the matter of their coming under the Civil Service Commission, and this is one of the cases in point.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 40—approval of certain works after construction:

The CHAIRMAN: This section was amended in the committee by adding at the end thereof the following words:

Provided that where the doing of such work affects the safety of the public or the employees, no such approval shall be given without due notice and hearing.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there anything in the Act to define what "due notice" shall be?

Mr. J. D. REID: The commission may make regulations at any time that are satisfactory to the employees. At present, fifteen days' notice is required in the West and ten days in the East.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 155—insolvent companies:

Mr. J. D. REID: The leader of the Opposition asked how the Bankruptcy Act would affect this section. Section 2, subsection (k), of that Act says:

"Corporation" includes any company incorporated or authorized to carry on business by or under an Act of the Parliament of Canada or of any of the provinces of Canada, and any incorporated company, wheresoever incorporated, which has an office in or carries on business within Canada, but does not include building societies having a capital stock, nor incorporated banks, savings banks, insurance companies, trust companies, loan companies or railway companies;

So that railway companies are not excepted.

Section agreed to.

On section 179—unauthorized changes forbidden:

Mr. J. D. REID: This clause is intended to compel railway companies to pay their employees for any loss that may result from a change in the location of a divisional point. The clause has been made stronger by the amendments that we are now including in it. The Railway Brotherhood thought that the wording as regards the partial removal of a divisional point was not quite sufficient, and I should think the clause as improved would be quite satisfactory.

Section agreed to.

On section 210—prior contracts:

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I move to amend clause 210 by adding after the word "agreement" in the fifth line thereof the words "or notice thereof by way of caveat or otherwise," because in Alberta as in the other western provinces, the only way in which registration may be obtained is by register-

ing a caveat. This is merely to meet the requirements of registration in the western provinces.

Mr. J. D. REID: Would not the words "or caveat duly registered" be sufficient?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The registration is done both ways. A notice may be registered with caveat attached, or it may be registered by itself, so that I would prefer the amendment I have moved.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am not a lawyer and do not know whether this would make any difference in the clause, but as a layman I cannot see why it should make any difference. What does not appear to me to read right is the phrase "or notice thereof." The hon. member, of course, knows what that means in Alberta. What I had in mind was "if such contract or agreement—"

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Or notice thereof by caveat.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not see any objection.

Mr. MORPHY: Is there not a provision in the Railway Act for notice by caveat as stated by the hon. gentleman? If there is, the wording suggested would be unfortunate. The clause seems very plain and comprehensive in itself.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: This is the Alberta law: An agreement for sale, mortgage or any agreement of whatever nature it may be, with the exception of an absolute transfer, cannot be registered except by caveat. That caveat is drawn up and a notice something like this is filed in the Registrar's office:

Take notice that so-and-so declares that he has a claim against a certain property under an agreement for sale, or under a mortgage or under any other documentary evidence. That notice is filed and that is the only means we have of registering the interest that a man may have. Under the clause as it stands we have no way of getting notice to anybody, unless provision is made for notice by way of caveat. I do not know why the matter should be doubted, because this is the Alberta law, the Saskatchewan law and the Manitoba law.

Mr. NESBITT: The clause says: "If such contract or agreement." Would it not follow that the agreement would have to be drawn up in whatever form is required by the province, without that form being specified?

[Mr. H. A. Mackie.]

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: No. No matter what sort of an agreement a man has, it cannot find its way into the hands of the registrar of the province. The man may give it to the registrar if he likes, but the registrar will not record it. The only way in which he will record it is, according to the law of the province, namely, by a notice of caveat, which says: Take notice that I claim an interest in—describe the property—by reason of an agreement of sale dated a certain date made between so-and-so and so-and-so, and govern yourself accordingly. The registrar will accept that notice and he will stamp it upon the record which contains a description of the land in question, and nobody can deal with that land until the registrar removes that notice of caveat. In Alberta that is the only way in which a man who has an interest less than an absolute interest in a piece of land can protect his interest.

Mr. MORPHY: If that is the only way in which an agreement can be registered in the registrar's office, then what is the matter with the clause which merely uses the words "if such contract or agreement is duly registered?" If the notice of caveat being filed in the registrar's office constitutes due registration, then this clause covers the point, because it refers to an agreement duly registered.

Mr. J. D. REID: Perhaps we might let the clause stand in the meantime.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I have no objection to letting the law clerk consider the amendment, and I have no doubt he will find that the law is as I have stated.

Section stands.

On sections 215 and 217—expropriation proceedings:

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: These sections were allowed to stand at my request. My reason for asking that was merely because I wished to argue from them in relation to subsection (13) of section 2. The committee did not adopt my suggestions in regard to subsection (13) of section 2, so I have no reason now for asking that these sections be allowed to stand.

Sections 215 and 217 agreed to.

On section 232—appeal from award:

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: What I was endeavouring to point out under subsection (13) of section 2 was that a judge appointed as arbitrator who granted an order or gave a direction in any proceedings taken under the arbitration was acting as a person desig-

nated, and not as a judge of the court, and that if an appeal were taken from this interlocutory measure, if I may so call it, a legal question of very great difficulty would arise. I was unable this afternoon to convince the Committee by my own exposition of the case, and I shall now endeavour to convince it by a judgment of the court. In the case of Marsan vs. the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, reported in the Alberta Law Reports 1909, volume 2, the judge says—(page 43):

Quære—Whether or not the judgment of a judge who is persona designata is appealable in view of the decision in C.P.R. vs. Little Seminary of Ste. Therese, since the enactment of s. 220 of the Railway Act.

Quære—Whether or not a dissatisfied litigant who has the right to appeal must appeal and is not at liberty to bring the same matter before the Court in a different way.

Held, that where the right of appeal was doubtful and the plaintiff had given notice of appeal, and at the same time brought an action for injunction, in which action the validity of the order appealed from would have to be inquired into, the matter was properly before the Court.

Secondly, from the same judgment I read:

Where there is a failure to comply with the Act the jurisdiction of the judge is wanting, and the company may be restrained from acting under a warrant granted. The warrants in question—

These are warrants for possession of land.

—if these appeals were granted by Mr. Justice Beck under and in pursuance of the power given in section 217 and 218 of the Railway Act and the learned judge in granting such warrants acted persona designata and there can be no appeal from his decision: C.P.R. vs. Little Seminary of Ste. Therese, and particularly the language of Mr. Justice Patterson, p. 618.

Mr. Justice Stuart says:

With respect to the appeal from the order of Mr. Justice Beck directing the warrant of possession to issue, the preliminary objection was taken by council for the respondent company, that Mr. Justice Beck was acting as persona designata in making the order, and that, therefore, in accordance with the decision in The Canadian Pacific Railway Company vs. The Little Seminary of Ste. Therese, there is no right of appeal. There may be some doubt as to whether this case is now binding upon us in view of the subsequent insertion of section 220 into the Railway Act, but inasmuch as the plaintiff has in fact appealed from the order granting the warrants, and has brought his actions for injunctions as well, it is clear that the whole matter is now properly before us, either in the one form or the other.

The point I have been endeavouring to make is this: Some company may want possession of land, as in the case I have cited. They go to a judge and say; "Give us a warrant for possession." The respondent company says: "You have no right to the possession of this land because you have not fulfilled all the requirements of the Railway Act." An injunction is sought, and notice of appeal is given from the judgment granting the warrant. Then when action is taken on the basis of the warrant granted you have a double remedy before the courts: First, the notice of appeal that you have given, and, secondly, an action for damages for trespass, whether nominal or actual. One of the litigants will tell you at once: "You cannot seek damages by way of injunction because you have given notice of appeal." The other litigant says: "When the judge gave you this warrant he was acting as persona designata and you cannot appeal from his decision." That was the case I put before the Committee this afternoon, and I ask that subsection 13 of section 2 be amended to make it clear that when a judge gives such an order as giving a warrant for possession or directs notice to be served these orders are orders of the court, and not merely the orders of a man who stands in the position of an arbitrator.

To further convince the Committee of the ambiguity of the law, let me cite another case, Saunders vs. the Edmonton and Dunvegan Railway, and we may see how other judges look at this question. In the case I cited a moment ago I was dealing both with a single judge and the Appellant Division, but in this case you have other judges of the Appellant Division sitting, and observe how they disagree with the judgment given in the Marsan case:—

By virtue of section 220, the Railway Act, ch. 37, R.S.C., a judge in granting a warrant of possession under sec. 217 to a railway company is acting as a judge.

A full court in Marsan vs. the Grand Trunk Pacific held that the judge was acting as an arbitrator, was persona designata. In this case the full court, but not the same personnel, holds that he is acting as a judge.

The report says:

By virtue of sec. 220, the Railway Act, ch. 37, R.S.C., a judge in granting a warrant of possession under sec. 217, to a railway company is acting as a Judge of the Court and not as a persona designata; Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. vs. The Little Seminary of Ste. Therese, 16, S.C.R., 606, distinguished. The grant of such a warrant is, therefore, subject to appeal.

A warrant of possession granted under sec. 217, the Railway Act, ch. 37, R.S.C., by a judge of general jurisdiction is effective for the purposes intended until set aside in the regular way, and the fact that there has been a failure to comply with some of the statutory provisions does not render the warrant void, but merely irregular.

The Chief Justice in delivering his portion of the judgment in the case says:

> The plaintiff by his statement of claim alleges that he was in August, 1912, the owner in possession of certain lands and that at that time the defendants "wrongfully and unlawfully entered upon the said lands" and did certain damage. He claims (1) Damages for the wrongful acts complained of; (2) An injunction; (3) In the alternative if the railway is authorized to be constructed through the lands, damages for the land taken and to the remaining land.
>
> The defendants deny the plaintiff's allegations and set up that they went upon the land in pursuance of a warrant of possession duly obtained from a judge of the Supreme Court. Plaintiff joins issue . . . . .
>
> Even if it is open to the plaintiff under the pleadings to test the validity of the warrant of possession, which is doubtful, I am of opinion that he has failed in his attack upon it. He contends that the judge in making it is acting as a persona designata and that any failure to comply with the express provisions of the Act would result in rendering his act a mere nullity.

I do not need to take time to read the contradictory opinions of judges in this matter. Assuming for the sake of argument that the legal talent of this House say that the decisions I have read provide that you may take action and bring before the courts of your province the very subject matter of the order about which you would take an appeal, and that consequently whether you have the right of appeal or not you are still at liberty to take an action for nominal trespass, why should a man on a legal question be obliged to take a double remedy—first to file a notice of appeal from a decision of a single judge arbitrator, who in one case is not a judge and in another case is admitted to be a judge? Why should he be put to all the trouble of taking action to maintain the very point he could maintain if he had a proper case for appeal? I hope that I have made it clear that section 232 deals only with the appeal from an award, and does not provide any machinery by which you can appeal in cases such as I have cited. In conjunction with this matter I may call attention to section 243 which says:

> —and where there are different interests in the same lands all shall as far as possible be dealt with in one proceeding.

These sections should be taken jointly, because often a judge, if acting in that capacity, could settle by an order of the court the claims of any one of the litigants, whereas now, no matter what may be the attitude of the litigants, it must all be decided in the one proceeding as far as possible. It is of the greatest importance, I contend, in view of the contradictory decisions that have been given in our province in this matter, that the law should be made clear whether a judge is acting simply as an arbitrator or as a judge of court. This brings me back to section 2, paragraph (13). Even if you amended section 232, the courts would immediately turn to the interpretation clause, and if they held under it that "judge" meant a judge arbitrator and not a judge of the court, all that you might say in section 232 would be of no use. So that if an amendment is to be made in section 232 there must also be an amendment in paragraph (13) in section 2.

Mr. J. D. REID: We had quite a discussion in connection with section 232, and I think perhaps it is better to leave it as it is. There is an appeal in a case of award for compensation where the amount is over $600. In other cases where it is necessary for a railway company to take possession of lands they apply to the judge for authority to enter, and the judge granting such authority is acting as an arbitrator. In such a case there is no appeal. The judge can issue an order giving the railway company power to enter and take possession of lands, and that order is final. But after possession is taken, if the party from whom the land is taken is not satisfied with the amount of the award he can appeal to a higher court, if the amount exceeds $600. If a railway company wishing to start construction work could not begin until their right to take possession had been considered by various courts they would be greatly disadvantaged. From the decision of the judge who gave authority to take possession there might be an appeal from one court to another and the railway would never get posession of the lands or be able to build its railway. This clause empowers the judge, who may be an arbitrator, to give authority to enter and take possession, and as regards compensation the owner can appeal. The judge decides the question of possession, and the compensation is disposed of afterwards.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The angle from which the minister views the matter is altogether different from my viewpoint. It is true that under the Railway Act which is now before Parliament if a judge grants an order for possession and he is wrong you may move at once that the party who got the warrant of possession shall deposit in the court a certain amount of security. That is provided for in the Railway Act.

There is no harm done in so far as the ultimate result of the case is concerned, but in so far as the man who is to receive the money is concerned there is, because the court can order the issue of a warrant of possession and also issue an order for security, but this entails unnecessary costs. But the point I have made is that if something is irregularly done or without jurisdiction by a judge, I have no appeal under the law as it is interpreted by the court at the present time. That it has been on the Statute Book from time immemorial is no reason why it should remain on the Statute Book. It is only creating trouble in the carrying out of the Act. I am not merely raising a legal point but my object is to avoid litigation. Apparently the policy of the Government is to foster litigation. I am a barrister and I would like to have a lot of work but where difficulties arise, such as have arisen, and when judges hold contradictory opinions, why not settle it at once? It is just a question whether a judge is acting as a judge of a court or is acting as an arbitrator. If he is acting as an arbitrator I have no redress except to take an action at law, and as the basis of my action I must allege trespass which will mean a nominal fifty cents and costs. Why should my client be put to all that trouble? I should simply have to file notice of appeal to the full court and the case is decided on the merits, or on legal questions, before the court, and if there are any costs incurred it would be the costs of appeal and any court is in a position to deal with costs and to decide as to whether a warrant of possession may properly be given or not. I am not dealing at all with the question from the angle of the minister that no harm can ensue from this section, because if a warrant of possession is given a man has his recourse and he can get his money. A man who has got irregularly a warrant of possession may be forced to give security in the courts. Why should a company be permitted to go before any judge in the country and get a warrant of possession on affidavits which are not correct? Why should it be that under such circumstances I should have no relief except to take a straight action at law and put my clients to all sorts of trouble? Why should a company be allowed to take advantage of such irregularity for the purpose of proceeding with the construction of a line? Our purpose is to see that the Railway Act is lived up to. I had a conversation with a minister yesterday and he said that he would see that the laws of the country were obeyed. I told him that I would do the same thing. I am asking that the laws of the country be obeyed and that no railway company be allowed to start the operation or construction of any railway on the strength of a warrant of possession obtained from a judge on affidavits which are not correct. I have no remedy except to tell my client that he must take a straight action and claim trespass, the result of which may secure him $1 and costs. That is a condition of things that I have proven here, not only by my own exposition, which is not very clear, but rather by quoting from the judgments of the courts. Now is the time to make the law right, and there is no reason why this Committee cannot go back to subsection (13) of section 2 and say that when we speak of a judge, we speak of a judge having the power of a court. If we do that, it would settle the whole situation.

Mr. MOWAT: I think the clause should remain as it is. We must take it for granted that the judges are men of common sense—they are as a rule—and that they are not going to issue these warrants without fully considering the case. It is to the advantage of the country that there should be as few appeals as possible. The minister has put the business side of it in a very clear manner, and I do not think that is a different angle from that from which it has been viewed by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Mackie). The section says that a company should not be held up, but that the ultimate result will be to do justice as between the land owner and the company. My hon. friend does not suggest an amendment here, but he wants the law made so clear that there can be no appeal. I venture to say that we cannot so frame the law that there will be no appeal.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: What time have I had to prepare an amendment when the motion is made to-night that we go into Committee at once and no notice is given that we are going into Committee?

Mr. MOWAT: If my hon. friend even had time to prepare an amendment I do not think he could prepare one which could resist the ingenuity of the bar of Alberta to get by the statute. My hon. friend has proved to us apparently that even the courts of his own province differ as to whether the word "judge" means qua judge or a judge as persona designata. Apparently the Superior Court of Alberta has held that he is sitting as a judge. It is stated in sub-

section (13) of section 2 that "judge" is a judge of the Superior or county court.

It would be far better to leave it at that and have the law construed under the ordinary canons of interpretation that he is a judge. If any particular case should arise of that kind, which I doubt now in view of the decision of the appellate division of Alberta, or if a judge should be held not to have power, which is very doubtful, let that case take care of itself. Anybody who has studied the railway law and the cases in Canada knows that it is a case of the most extraordinary rarity that any dispute has been had as to the warrant of a judge ordering possession. We would be going out of our way if we tried to make an amendment to cover the extremely rare case that the hon. gentleman has cited here. It would probably result in an increase in ligitation on the part of ingenious litigants or their counsel and we would be no better off than before. I think the clause should be left as it is.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: May I claim the indulgence of the Committee for another moment? The hon. member (Mr. Mowat) seems to think that we are so isolated in Alberta that our judges are limited in their knowledge of the cases. In connection with the case I have cited to this Committee, it was not my desire to detail all the law on the subject but if you will permit me I will entertain you for the balance of the evening. For the benefit of my hon. friend let me quote some Ontario cases on this point showing that the Ontario people have not had smooth sailing in so far as that point is concerned. We have, amongst the English cases, Law Reports 12, Appeal Cases 602, 56 Law Journals' Privy Council Decisions 66; 57 Law Times, page 602; 26 Ontario Reports, 667; affirmed 27, Ontario Reports 46; 16 Supreme Court Reports 606.

Mr. MORPHY: What did that 26 Ontario Reports decide? Just read from it please.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I am not reading these but I am just referring to the Ontario decisions.

Mr. MORPHY: What does it say?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I will get the report and read it if you wish me to.

Mr. MORPHY: That will be more satisfactory.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: What is given here as a tabulation of the cases on which the judges reached the decision which I read. They have not detailed in extenso the decisions which they have referred to. But they have merely given at the bottom of their own judgment a list of the cases to which they have referred. Amongst these cases is 26 Ontario Reports and I am prepared to give that decision if my hon. friend wishes it. But you have the decision of the case that I read to the Committee, you have these references and you can go back and look up these cases for yourselves. I could go on and give more cases to show that this point has been at issue in other provinces.

You have the English decisions, the Ontario decisions, and our Supreme Court decisions, on this matter; and the Alberta courts after having discussed all these cases are divided in their opinion. Surely it is not for the Committee to ignore this thing.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 240—Warrant for immediate possession in certain cases:

Mr. J. D. REID: The reason the words in line five, "to carry on" were struck out and the words "for the construction or maintenance of" substituted, was because of a question raised as to whether it included maintenance.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 243—to be continued in court where commenced. Different interests:

Mr. J. D. REID: There is no change there. That was held over on account of the other clause.

Section agreed to.

On section 250, subsection (3)—space above rail:

Mr. J. D. REID: When this subsection left the House before, it read " rail level," and the Senate changed it to " base of rail." It was to decide where you would measure the height of a bridge from. The railway employees appeared before the Committee and stated that they preferred the subsection in its original form. The term "rail level" they say is better understood by the railway authorities than the term " base of rail." So we are just reinstating the old term.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is the top of rail ?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes; whether you measure from the top of rail in determining the height of a bridge or from the base of the rail where it touches the ties. It makes a difference of about five inches in the height.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 255, subsection (1)—Railway on highway. Leave. Compensation. Consent of municipality:

Mr. J. D. REID: The words inserted in line 7 and in line 19 " in so far as such sections are applicable," were to make the meaning plainer as to what sections would be applicable.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the restriction for? Is that to exempt Government railways? There must be a reason for it.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is not to exempt the Government railways.

Mr. BUREAU: There must be a remedy for every wrong.

Mr. J. D. REID: It has not anything to do with the Government railways. It is to make it plainer that where we take land for a railway, if the conditions justify, this Act will apply.

Mr. BUREAU: It does apply. If the board orders the taking of land certainly the owner is entitled to compensation, and the compensation must be established by the provisions of this Act.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am informed that when we do not take a man's land, for instance, where the railway is running along a highway, the Act would not be applicable without this provision.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not understand it. Supposing the railway follows the highway, there is no land to be taken; that is public property. Your own railway does that in some parts of the county of Chambly where there is nothing between the roadbed and the main highway. What compensation do you want to give—for the noise or the frightening of horses?

Mr. J. D. REID: A railway may run alongside a highway without taking any land, but it may injuriously affect a man's land in the vicinity, and in the absence of this clause there would be no power to award compensation.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a new principle. You do not award compensation for any nuisance created by a railway without touching any man's land.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is not a new principle; I am informed by the solicitor for the Railway Commission that legislation to that effect was passed in 1911. I should think, if a railway were running close to a man's house, it might cause a nuisance which would entitle him to compensation.

Mr. BUREAU: He has his right of action at common law.

Mr. McKENZIE: There would have to be a question of severance in any case.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 262—Crossings.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I should like to have the last two lines of subsection (5) amended to read as follows, in order to meet the case of Alberta:

"Municipality" means an incorporated city, town, village or rural municipality.

Mr. J. D. REID: What are the divisions of land in Alberta?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: There are three—local improvement district, municipality, and rural municipality.

Mr. J. D. REID: Just add the words " or rural municipality " after the word " parish ".

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Subsection (5) says:

"Crossing" means any steam railway crossing of a highway, or highway crossing of a steam railway, at rail level, and every manner of construction of the railway or of the highway by the elevation or the depression of the one above or below the other.

The member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) said that the definition of " railway " covered the point that I had raised. Section 262 defines " crossing "—the very thing with regard to which I was arguing and citing cases a few minutes ago. Suppose you have a railway company operating under a provincial charter and a railway company operating or about to operate under Dominion charter, and there is a conflict between the two with regard to the route that they are to cover, which is to have priority?

Mr. J. D. REID: The definition of the word " crossing " relates to this particular section, and so far as provincial roads are concerned, would apply only to those which have not been declared for the general advantage of Canada. Even if two railways are side by side, if they are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, the board may order them to build one or more subways or overhead bridges. Of course, this act would not apply to a railway incorporated under provincial law, over which the board has no jurisdiction.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: This definition makes " crossing " apply to every manner of construction of a railway or a highway by the elevation or depression of the one above or below the other, and deals also with rail levels. Section 8, under which I made my observations a few moments ago, says:

Every railway the construction or operation of which is authorized by special act of the Legislature of any province and which connects with or crosses or may hereafter connect with or cross any railway within the legislation or authority of the Parliament of Canada, shall, although not declared by Parliament to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, be subject to the provisions of this Act relating to,—

(a) the connection or crossing of one railway with or by another, so far as concerns the aforesaid connection or crossing.

Suppose two railway companies are building simultaneously on the same route and one encroaches upon another, which is to have priority?

Mr. NESBITT: According to my memorandum, we did not strike out the whole of subsection (1) of this clause; we simply changed the word " nine " in the third line to " nineteen ". According to the list of amendments, we struck out the whole of subsection (1).

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection 1 is entirely struck out, according to the official copy.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Parliamentary Counsel, in the memorandum he gave me, stated that subsection (1) shoud be stricken out and that the Act that we passed a short time ago would fit in.

Mr. NESBITT: If that Act is inserted here, that will be all right, but that is not the way the Committee passed the clause.

Mr. J. D. REID: I admit that, but I am moving now to strike out subsection (1) in accordance with the advice of Mr. Gisborne, the Parliamentary counsel. The hon. member will remember that we passed an Act which, of course, is now law, and that Act takes the place of subsection (1) in this Bill.

Mr. STEVENS: At the time that we were discussing this clause, that Act was in process of passing through this House.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 282—packing in spaces:

The CHAIRMAN: Section 282 is amended by adding to subsection (4) the following proviso:

Provided that if there is at any time any method of packing which, in the opinion of the Board, is an improvement over the present requirements, the Board, after hearing on notice, may authorise or direct the use of such improved method.

Mr. J. D. REID: This was put in at the request of the Board of Railway Commissioners after they had consulted with the railway brotherhoods.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 285—notice to Board of accidents:

The CHAIRMAN: Section 285 has been amended by striking out from lines 9, 10 and 11, the words "Any conductors or other employees making a report to the company of the occurrence of any such accident," and substituting therefor the words "The conductor or other employee in charge of the train, place or structure in connection with which such accident occurred."

Mr. J. D. REID: This amendment was made at the request of the brotherhoods representing the railway employees.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 323—tariffs of tolls:

The CHAIRMAN: Section 323 has been amended by striking out from lines 3 and 4 the words "in which his name in full and title are stated."

Mr. BUREAU: Why is that struck out?

Mr. J. D. REID: Because, if these words were left in, every time there was a change in the directorate, for instance, if a director or an official of the company resigned, his name and title would have to be taken off the printed time-tables.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 346—Members of Parliament and Board, etc., free:

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Why are not judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, and of the superior courts, county courts and district courts for the several provinces included in this clause?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Railway Act has never provided for judges being given free transportation. There is no particular reason why they should travel free. On the contrary, judges must go on circuit and their travelling expenses while on circuit are paid by the province. If we were to give the judges free passes it would mean that the provinces would be getting the benefit except, of course when judges were travelling for private reasons. I cannot see why the railways should be deprived of this source of revenue.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In Canada, but in no other part of the British Empire, the judges are treated as magnified civil servants, and are underpaid. While they get their travelling expenses on circuit refunded, they are not free to travel to and fro throughout the Dominion as they should be permitted to do, in order that they might have an opportunity of learning how the different provinces conduct their law courts. I think the judges should be given an annual pass over all the railways.

Mr. J. D. REID: I quite agree that the judges are not receiving sufficiently high salaries, but the only way to remedy that is for Parliament to vote them a higher salary. I cannot see why we should expect the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways to help pay the salaries of our judges by giving them free passes. We should be big enough to pay them adequate salaries ourselves. Although the judges are not receiving adequate salaries, I might say that ever since I have been a member of the Government I have never found any difficulty in getting a man to accept a judgeship when one became vacant. We should appoint to the Bench the very best men we can get, and we cannot get the very best men at the salaries we are paying to-day. I believe that in some cases the result is that people probably do not get the judgments they would if we were able to appoint the very best judges. But I do not think we should discuss the salaries of judges on this Bill.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I will give a reason why they should be granted travelling passes. Historically and traditionally the judges should stand between the legislative body and the people. If there are a number of men chasing after judgeships it is because of the way in which the appointments are made. In the province of Alberta to-day there are three judgeships vacant, and twelve politicians looking for judgeships. So long as judgeships are granted principally for political services rendered, rather than upon a man's record at the Bar, just so long you will not be able to get the best men in the country to sit on the Bench.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I understand that the Government is considering the question of increasing the salaries of the judges. I think the reason advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton for granting passes to judges is a fallacious one. If judges should be allowed to travel on the railways free to see how court business is conducted in other portions of the Dominion, you should extend the same privilege to school teachers, for instance. The whole principle is wrong.

Section agreed to.

On section 371—municipal and other systems, connection with stations, etc.:

The CHAIRMAN: This section is amended by inserting in subsection (1), line 1, after "any" the word "province" and on line 7 after "such" the word "province". Subsection (2) is struck out and the following is substituted therefor:

(2) The Board may also upon the application of any interested party authorize any telephone company operated by any province, municipality or incorporated company to install at its own expense telephone connection with any station of the company, the annual charge, if any, to be paid by the company for such service and all other terms or conditions connected therewith to be such as the Board may determine having regard to all local conditions, but in no case is such charge to exceed the customary local rate.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is the telephone clause. All the different parties interested were heard before the Committee, and I think the section as now drafted is satisfactory to all.

Mr. BUREAU: It is a compromise clause?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 373, paragraph (b)—Height of wires:

Mr. J. D. REID: We took this matter up with the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the maximum height mentioned in this clause was agreed upon. Twenty-two feet was considered high enough in cities, towns and incorporated villages; 18 feet in the rural districts, and 17 feet at crossings.

Mr. BUREAU: What is a police village?

Mr. J. D. REID: In Ontario the Government gives power to a small number of people, probably 100 or 150, to form themselves into what is called a police village. They can assess themselves to put down sidewalks and make different local improvements.

Mr. NESBITT: They are separate from the township?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 374—Power companies:

Mr. J. D. REID: This section stands.

Mr. CAHILL: Why?

Mr. J. D. REID: This is the section that relates to Toronto. There will be quite a discussion on it and it will be necessary to take it up another day. Some members who are not here now would like to discuss it.

Mr. SHEARD: Will the minister fix a special day for the discussion of section 374?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. SHEARD: And will he announce the day in time?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the minister any idea when it will be?

Mr. J. D. REID: It will not be taken up again this week, but some day next week, probably on Tuesday, unless the Acting Prime Minister has something special for that day.

Mr. BUREAU: Can it not come up before Tuesday?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, not before Tuesday or Wednesday.

On section 376, subsection (7)—Connections with other systems, power of board to order:

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Why were the words "including compensation if any", in subsection (7), in line 29, not struck out?

Mr. J. D. REID: We are now on section 376. We made no changes in it.

Mr. WALLACE: I move to amend subsection (7), of section 376 by striking out the words "including compensation if any" in line 29, and adding thereto the following:

> Provided however that the charge to such first-mentioned company, province, municipality or corporation for any long distance conversation or message transmitted over a line owned, controlled or operated by the company shall not be more than the established long distance rate of the company.

Mr. J. D. REID: We had a considerable discussion in the Committee in regard to this and went into the matter thoroughly, and the Committee decided that the clause as it is now and as it has been in the Bill should remain.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is this amendment made at the request or suggestion of the Bell Telephone Company or any other company?

Mr. J. D. REID: We are not moving the amendment; it is moved by the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace). I do not know at whose instance it is moved.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps the hon. member might explain the amendment. Those present at the discussion in the Committee will understand it, but to many hon. members the striking out of a few words will not convey any clear meaning.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it for the purpose of restricting the jurisdiction of the Board and determining the terms upon which connections shall be made?

Mr. WALLACE: It is to provide that the Bell or any other telephone company shall not have power over independent telephones.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that when a small company want to connect with a larger system, if they cannot agree upon the terms they shall go before the Board, who shall determine the terms and conditions upon which they shall connect, and determine conmpensation, if any. What is the object of striking out the words "including compensation if any"? Is it to eliminate compensation, even if there is a right to it?

Mr. STEVENS: This was very fully discussed in the Committee. Certain persons desired to eliminate these words, "including compensation if any," because they claimed that no compensation should be allowed. The majority of the Committee decided that it would be better to leave it to the board to decide if compensation should be allowed.

Mr. BUREAU: That is what the clause does now?

Mr. STEVENS: Exactly. It was argued by the majority of the committee that if these words were eliminated the board would not have power to allow any compensation, no matter what the conditions were or how deserving the case. Therefore, the committee decided to leave these words in.

Mr. BUREAU: After discussing the matter?

Mr. STEVENS: After an exhaustive discussion for days.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the object of the amendment? If you strike out the words "including compensation if any" you limit

the powers of the board. Supposing there is any damage done we prevent the board from assessing the damages. Is that the object?

Mr. MOWAT: I think I understand what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) means. There is a strong feeling which he represents here, I understand, that users of the Bell telephone should have the same right to use their long distance lines as if they were subscribers, although they are subscribers to a private line. The way the law is now, and with the words "including compensation if any," there is an addition to the rates of the Bell Telephone company. It amounts to $600 in some cases where there are over 400 subscribers to a local line. It was thought that was too much of a burden to put on the users of the local telephone lines, and that all local telephone users should have the right to connect up with the Bell without paying that extra compensation.

Mr. BUREAU: We decide, without hearing the merits of the case, that whether or not any company is entitled to compensation they shall not have compensation?

An hon. MEMBER: That is what it means.

Mr. BUREAU: I think that is rather arbitrary, and I would not like to vote for anything of that kind. I think it would be better to leave it to the decision of the board after hearing the evidence. Unless there is some further explanation given I cannot see my way clear to support the amendment.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not see why the words "including compensation if any" should be in at all. "Upon such terms, as the board shall direct" ought to be sufficient. The inclusion of the words "such compensation if any" lends colour to the argument that compensation was intended. We had a case before the committee. I think it was the case of the Ingersoll Telephone company. This company had a large number of phones and sent about six times as much business to the Bell company as they got from it. It was a great advantage to the company. Many other companies would also do that. There are many small companies, some of them struggling to get along, sending business to the Bell company which is much more valuable to the Bell than the short distance connection is to themselves and to put in this section, "including compensation" and then after it the words "if any" carries with it the implication that compensation may be asked for. Compensation for what? For handing over revenues that the Bell would not otherwise get if they were not connected with the local company? I think the words "compensation if any" should be left out and that the section should read "upon such terms as the board deems just and expedient." That would be a fair clause. The question of compensation is not directly placed before the board to be dealt with.

Mr. BUREAU: Do you mean that it is a suggestion to the board that might influence them?

Mr. MORPHY: Yes. I think in a way it might possibly be so. It certainly would not suggest anything by way of compensation if the words were not there. Why put them in when you have the words "such terms and conditions as to the board may seem just and expedient?"

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member (Mr. Morphy) was a member of the committee and recalls the discussion we had about the very point he has raised.

Mr. MORPHY: Yes, I took the same ground there.

Mr. J. D. REID: My hon. friend took the same ground there. We went into the question very thoroughly and the majority of the committee decided that we should have these words in the clause. I think the clause should pass as it is here because this matter is left entirely in the hands of the board and they can take up each case and do justice to all parties concerned.

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to explain this clause a little bit because I have been very much mixed up with this question the last few years. When the House of Commons passed this clause in 1917 they sent it to the Senate after striking out the words "including compensation." In the old Railway Act the words "including compensation" appeared. The Senate inserted the words "including compensation if any." They added the two little words "if any" to the words "including compensation" which had appeared in the old Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: They continued the language of the old Act?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes, and added the words "if any" so as to make it clear that it was not necessary to give compensation unless it was thought to be justified. Lawyers argued before the Committee that under the old Act containing the words "including compensation" the board necessarily had to give compensation because those

words implied that compensation was to be allowed, but, that the addition of the words "if any" removed the obligation to give compensation. The Bell company did not charge compensation to those rural companies who were not competitors in cities, towns and villages but they did charge compensation where rural companies were competitors, for the reason, as they say, that the rural company takes away a certain number of their subscribers. Therefore they claim they should have compensation. I moved in 1917 that the words "including compensation" be struck out. That was carried in the Commons Committee at that time but the Senate put the words in again and added "if any" so as to leave it to the board, which made it better than it was before in my judgment. You have to bear in mind that the Bell company impose on the rural companies a charge over and above the regular rates and that is what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is trying to get at by his amendment. They make a charge generally of about ten cents over and above the regular rates against the rural company connecting with them. That surcharge is generally divided half and half, but in some cases it is not so. At Ingersoll the Bell company get 7 cents and the Ingersoll company 3 cents, but they charge the Ingersoll company compensation to the extent of $300 because that company competes with them in the town of Ingersoll.

That is why at that time I moved that that be struck out, because, speaking offhand, they derived from the Ingersoll company about $1,100 one year and about $1,300 another year, while the Ingersoll company only got about $189 one year and less than that the next year. For that reason the rural companies—and they were here by the flock before the Committee—claimed that compensation should not be allowed to the Bell company, a good many of them also claimed that they should not be charged a surcharge. That was not listened to very favourably by the Committee, I confess, because they thought the Bell company should have something for the additional expense.

An hon. MEMBER: Some of them.

Mr. NESBITT: But as it passed the Committee I have nothing further to say about the matter. I moved at the time that that be struck out, I was defeated, and I am willing to take my defeat and abide by the decision of the majority. So far as Ingersoll is concerned, in 1917 the total earnings on surcharges were $1,632.09, of which the Bell company got $1,443 and the Ingersoll company $189, the latter company being charged $300 for the compensation.

Mr. MORPHY: For the privilege of giving a big revenue to the Bell company.

Mr. NESBITT: I have explained as nearly as I can the position that was taken throughout on this clause, and I repeat, having been defeated by the Committee I am willing to abide by my defeat.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I think the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is right: There should be no compensation, there should be reciprocity in a matter of this kind. The member speaks of the Bell company feeling aggrieved because some of their business was taken away. That would not have happened had they been reasonable with those who wished to use the telephone. The Bell company virtually made it impossible for the rural population to take their telephone service. Now that company comes along and wants compensation to the extent of thousands of dollars throughout the province. It is one of the greatest monopolies and I think the Committee would be quite justified in striking this clause out. The Bell company ought to be satisfied with what it gets and encourage reciprocity with outside telephone companies.

Mr. SEXSMITH: We had a similar fight when this Bill went through the House before, and after discussing it until two o'clock in the morning, the Committee struck the clause out. Of course, the hon. Senate saw fit to reinstate the words. I think the Bell Company have already a sufficient monopoly without allowing them to extort this compensation. I know municipal systems with hundreds of subscribers in country districts which the Bell Company refused accommodation, and if any subscriber on those systems required to use long distance, the Bell Company insisted on payment of the regular long distance charge and ten cents extra. Why should a man outside the city of Ottawa, if he happens to be on a municipal or privately-owned system, have to pay the Bell Company ten cents more than the Bell subscriber in the city of Ottawa, or a fereigner, if you like, coming in from another country? I think it is a prepostterous position. In the meantime those municipal and privately-owned rural systems are bringing in thousands of dollars

to the Bell Company, and yet that company wants to penalize these systems.

Mr. J. D. REID: "Upon such terms, including compensation, if any, as the board deems just and expedient, and may order and direct how, when, where, by whom and upon what terms and conditions such use, connection or communication shall be had, constructed, installed, operated and maintained." If a rural line makes application to the Bell Company for a connection, and they cannot agree on terms, they have a right to appeal to the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the board has absolute power to compel the Bell Company to make that connection on this clause as it stands. I do not think that is where the complaint is; it is more as to compensation. I do not think that the question of compensation would arise in very many instances, but in any event a clause such as this protects all concerned, and we all have confidence in the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. SEXSMITH: What have the courts said?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not know what the courts may have said in the past. But I understand that this clause gives the Board the final decision, with the reservation, of course, that in all cases there is a right of appeal from the Board to the Governor in Council. The Board can order that connection free of charge if it sees fit to do so, and of course the Act is framed entirely on the understanding that we have confidence in the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will the minister explain why there should be any compensation at all?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not say there should be compensation if, for instance, it is merely a connection with a rural line. But, if I remember rightly, in the discussion before the Committee, cases were brought to our attention where there might be compensation. For instance, the Bell Company have connections all through the city of Ottawa; another company might bring in an independent line at a small cost and take away a lot of the Bell subscribers if they could get connection free of charge. In the opinion of the sub-committee there might be a question of compensation in some cases, and for that reason the words were left in by the Senate. In any case, that is the way the Bill came from the Senate, and the Committee thought it wise to leave it as it was.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was not on the Committee which dealt with this matter, and I am not as familiar with what took place as members of the Committee are. But I have a recollection of the debate that took place on this section a year ago, when the words "without compensation," were struck out of the Bill. These words, which were inserted by the Senate in the Bill this year, are evidently designed to enable the Bell Telephone Company to penalize any company that dares to compete with them. For many years the Bell Telephone Company, to which the people granted a very valuable franchise, neglected to extend its lines into rural districts; consequently, over six hundred telephone companies have been established in various parts of the country. I am familiar with the operation of the Ingersoll Telephone Company, which has been mentioned to-night. I believe it was singled out by the Bell Telephone Company as a company that dared enter into competition with the great Bell Company, in the town of Ingersoll; therefore a clause must be put in this Act to exact compensation from them.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is meant by "compensation" in this case?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The Bell Telephone Company levies a tax of $300 a year upon outside companies for the privilege of connecting with the Bell lines. Besides, for every long distance call originating on the Ingersoll or on any other local line, ten cents additional has to be paid, of which the Bell Company takes seven cents and the local company three cents. Ten thousand calls must originate with the Ingersoll Company before they can get a cent of revenue out of this part of the service, because they have to pay $300 for the privilege of connecting with the Bell Telephone Company's line. As a matter of fact, these outside companies are of great service to the Bell Telephone Company; they enable it to reach the people in the rural districts. The number of long-distance calls originating on the Ingersoll line last year was 7,284; and 11,947 calls which originated on the Bell lines went over the Ingersoll lines. It seems to me that this charge of seven cents a call is ample compensation to the Bell Company. In justice to the local companies, an equal division should be made of that ten cents; the local company should get five cents and the Bell company five cents. That would be only fair, because the local company is of as much service to the Bell company as

the Bell company is to the local company. For the life of me I cannot see why this provision should be in the Act. In a case which came before the Railway Board some years ago and was submitted to the courts, one of the judges decided that as Parliament had not defined the matter clearly, but had put these words in the Act, they must have intended that compensation should be paid in some instances. Those instances only occur where a company is in competition with the Bell company. If you are going to encourage monopoly, if you are going to strangle initiative and enterprise on the part of weaker or smaller companies, then, I say, leave these words in. But if you are going to see that justice is done to all, regardless of whether they are weak or strong, these words should be struck out of the Bill.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I was a member of the special committee that dealt with this Bill, and listened to most of the discussion. I voted against the section as it now stands in the Bill, so that I feel free to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace). The objection I have to mentioning compensation is that by doing so we imply that there are cases in which compensation ought to be given. I cannot make up my mind that there are any cases in which a tax of three, four or five hundred dollars should be imposed on a local company. The Bell Telephone company is looking for business; the greater the number of long distance messages brought to that company the more money they will make. It is an advantage to them to have the rural connection, and they get the lion's share of the ten cents extra that is paid by the sender of the message. This compensation is really used for the purpose of keeping down competition. The member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) told us that the Bell Telephone company did not insist upon exacting compensation in all cases; they asked for it only where there was competition. If, therefore, you give them the right to a compensation they will always ask for it for the purpose of keeping down competition. Why should Parliament assist the Bell Telephone company to keep down competition? The rates of the local lines, as well as those of the main line, are under the jurisdiction of the board, and if the local lines show a tendency to cut rates unduly the board will see that nothing unfair is done in that regard. There is no reason why compensation should be given when there is competition, but not when there is no competition. The objection is that the right to compensation is used for an ulterior purpose, and is not in the public interest. The matter is not important so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, but I understand that eight or nine hundred lines in Ontario which connect with the Bell Telephone company will be affected by our decision in this case. I intend to vote for my hon. friend's amendment.

Mr. STEVENS: This is a general Act controlling railways, telephones, telegraphs, etc., and it is administered very creditably by the Railway Commission. This clause refers not only to any one particular telephone company, but to the telephone companies of Canada generally; it applies just as much to the British Columbia Telephone Company as to the Bell Telephone Company in Ontario. Whenever a company or province, municipality or corporation desires to make a connection and cannot agree with the telephone company with respect to obtaining such use, connection or communication, such first mentioned company or province, municipality or corporation may apply to the Board for relief. What I want to impress upon the Committee is this. This clause is not, as many hon. members have intimated, some protection for the Bell Telephone Company, but really a restriction on such companies as the Bell Telephone Company. It provides that other companies not having the advantage of these larger concerns may apply to the Board for the terms of their connections, and the convenience of the public is undoubtedly considered by the Board as of primary importance. The clause continues:

> And the Board may order the company to provide for such use, connection or communication, upon such terms, including compensation if any.

The argument here is a question of fact. All those who are opposing the words now in the clause do so on the ground that there should be no compensation, but we are not in a position to decide that no case will arise anywhere in Canada where compensation may be desired. This works both ways. It does not affect only the Bell Telephone Company, although that company has been brought up as a sample case, and if we strike out these words, we are preventing the Board of Railway Commissioners from giving compensation where cases are clearly made out. The point I wish to make plain is this. This court has been set up for the purpose of trying these cases on their merits; this Committee and the special committee cannot possibly expect to decide these cases on their merits,

and, therefore, we should give the Board the widest possible powers. I consider that those local companies, quoted so frequently here, are safe in the hands of the Board. I think we must all admit that. If the Railway Commission is not competent to administer this Act, then our first duty would be to make that court a competent court, but I submit that that court has, by its record, proved beyond all question that the public interest and the interests of various companies are quite safe in its charge. I feel it would be a serious mistake to restrict the powers of that Board to administer this clause or other clauses of a similar character in the Bill.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I quite agree with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair). This is not a matter of want of confidence in the Railway Board at all; it is a matter for the Committee to decide. While I am not familiar with the telephone company of British Columbia, I am fairly familiar with the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, and if this Committee does not wish to say that the Bell Telephone Company, which is the great telephone company of this country, has a right to a monopoly and the right to make any other private or municipal company which wishes to use its long distance lines, pay the regular rate and to charge those people an extra ten cents, why should we not strike out those words?

Mr. J. D. REID: As I understand the hon. member, he wants the clause framed so that the Bell Telephone Company cannot charge that ten cent rate for a local connection, but the striking out of the words "including compensation if any" would not do what he wants, because the clause still reads that the Board has power to order the connection on whatever terms it may deem just and fair.

Mr. SEXSMITH: The private companies would be perfectly satisfied if those words were struck out because, apparently, there has been in the past some decision on those very words. But apart from that altogether, I cannot bring myself to the conclusion that the Bell Telephone Company has a right to charge any other company an extra ten cents unless we of this Committee say: Yes, because you have a monopoly now, we shall let you keep it, and we shall permit you to penalize the other private or municipal companies, some two or three hundred in number throughout Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: This is not a question which affects only Ontario. As the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has said, it affects any telephone company. Why is the Bell Telephone Company brought into this argument? Simply to becloud the issue and to endeavour to arouse sympathy. We are legislating for the whole of Canada. The Bell Telephone Company are not operating in Manitoba, and I do not know if they are operating in British Columbia. Supposing the British Columbia Telephone Company have some connection to make with any private telephone company, why should they be deprived of getting compensation before the Railway Board because there is a grievance in one or two provinces against one particular telephone company?

Mr. STEVENS: In one province.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think that is fair. As the hon. member for Vancouver Centre has stated, we must either accept the Board of Railway Commissioners as a fair tribunal or not trust them. We may trust them to give justice, and what this Parliament seeks to do is to enact legislation that will give justice. If we do not trust them what is the use of having a Board of Railway Commissioners and of submitting to that board all differences which may arise under the Railway Act. If we strike out those words, we curtail the powers of the board; we give notice to that court: We are willing that you should go a certain distance, but we do not trust you to go past that distance. I do not believe in limiting the jurisdiction of any court to serve a specific purpose, when in this Bill we are legislating for the whole of Canada and for every citizen in Canada. The deeds of the board in the past are such as to justify the confidence I have in them, and I am willing to trust them to remedy wrongs which may be done to any individual or company. We do not want to becloud the issue the same as was done as regards another Bill when it was made to appear that because certain members did not agree to a clause in the Bill, they were against public ownership of railways. That was not the question, and that is not the question here. There is a tribunal to settle all these differences, and I think we can safely leave this matter to the board.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith), the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) were excellent arguments to

advance before the Board of Railway Commissioners, but they did not seem to me to be reasons why we should not allow the board to inquire into the question. If we were asked to decide now whether there shall or shall not be compensation, we might have some difficulty in determining and I think in the light of the excellent speeches I have just listened to I would vote against it, but all we are asked to determine now is: shall the board be permitted to inquire whether there is at any time a case for compensation? That surely is a question within their proper authority. The words " compensation, if any " which are in dispute may naturally give the company ground for making a claim. To that extent the words are worth something to them, but who will say that they will have any influence on the mind of the Board of Railway Commissioners? Surely they are not going to be influenced by these words. If the words encourage the Bell Telephone or any other company to base a claim upon them, why, it pleases them and does not hurt anybody, because the Board of Railway Commissioners is the tribunal, and surely we can permit them to inquire whether or not in any exceptional case there is a fair claim for compensation.

Mr. SEXSMITH: It is not simply a matter of the Bell Telephone company, but concerns every long-distance telephone company. The question for this committee to decide is whether the privately-owned and the municipally-owned telephone companies shall be compelled to pay the Bell Telephone Company, in addition to the regular rate, ten cents a message for long distance. I have confidence in the Board of Railway Commissioners, but is this committee going to say that every privately-owned and municipally-owned telephone company must apply to the Railway Board if it does not wish to pay that extra ten cents?

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). The people have found it necessary to build rural telephones for themselves because large corporations like the Bell Telephone have refused to do so. They had to invest money in these telephone companies, many of which I know have never paid one cent of interest. Then they have to pay for an expensive connection in order to get a long distance message over the 'phone. I claim that that is an injustice to the public. The telephone may be called a public utility, and its extension into the rural districts is going to be one of the great factors in keeping people on the land. We should encourage these small telephone companies instead of holding a club over them in the shape of a clause like this. I think it will be in the public interest to eliminate this clause altogether. Very few of these small companies pay more than operating expenses, while the Bell Telephone is one of the richest corporations in Canada to-day. The daily papers show that they are paying dividends of about 8 per cent, and now they are increasing their share issue and allotting them in the proportion of one to every four held, and a shareholder of the company will be able to get them for about 12 per cent less than the market value. I do not think this corporation needs any encouragement from this Parliament. I think we should pass legislation to protect the people, and especially the rural people, so that they will stay on the farm and produce, as they must produce if we are to pay off our national debt.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: These particular words with compensation have been in the Act now for a number of years, and we are in a position to judge of their effect. The argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) would be very convincing if this were new legislation, but it is not. We know from actual experience that those words are in there with a view to prevent competition with the Bell Telephone Company. I understand that that question was argued before the Special Committee. It was not a question of lines in Western Canada or British Columbia, but a question of the lines that were competing with the Bell Telephone Company. The Bell Telephone wants these companies penalized for encroaching upon their preserves. It has been mentioned here that the Ingersoll Company is one of the greatest offenders in that respect. It is a rather remarkable thing that the Ingersoll Telephone Company built their lines out into all the country surrounding Ingersoll, the Bell Telephone having refused to extend their lines outside the town. Ingersoll has a population of nearly 6,000 people, and many of the townspeople were anxious to connect up with the people in the rural districts, and in consequence the Ingersoll Telephone Company has about 600 subscribers in Ingersoll, and is therefore in competition with the Bell Telephone in that town. On 10,000 calls sent out over these rural lines the Ingersoll Company does not collect one cent of revenue, because the

Bell Telephone takes it as compensation. After 10,000, the Ingersoll Company gets three cents and the Bell seven cents on every call. That is the actual experience of this small company with the great Bell Telephone Company, and it is now looking to this Parliament, not to the Railway Commissioners, but to the men who have been sent here to represent the people, to pass legislation that will protect them against injustice of this kind. In fairness to them, we should not leave this matter in doubt for one moment. Parliament should put itself on record as disapproving of any such conduct on the part of the Bell Telephone Company. I would go much further and say that the small companies should receive fifty per cent of the revenue derived from the long distance calls originating on their lines, instead of the ten cents being divided in the proportion of three and seven.

Mr. NESBITT: There are a good many companies that receive half on every call. I belong to two such companies myself.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: By making some private arrangement with the Bell Telephone Company. The hon. gentleman's argument goes to justify the striking out of these words.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: There is a point that seems to have been overlooked in connection with the word "compensation." I believe there is a decision of the court in which it is held that when Parliament inserted the word "compensation" it was a reasonable presumption that the board must grant compensation whether they deemed it to be just or not. We can accept the judgments of the Railway Commission as being just, and our confidence in the commission would be best expressed if we omitted the word "compensation," for we would thereby leave the whole question to them. The clause without the word "compensation" will read:

> the Board may order the company to provide for such use, connection or communication, upon such terms, including compensation—

Mr. FIELDING: If any.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Yes. The word was struck out by this Parliament in 1917 and reinserted by the Senate this year. The Senate reinserted the words "including compensation" and added "if any" afterwards. I am not a lawyer and do not presume to argue this question from the legal standpoint, but I think the majority of lawyers will agree with me that if we put in the words "including compensation if any" there is a reasonable presumption that we anticipate that there will be compensation, and that we are directing the Board of Railway Commissioners to find compensation. Without these words we leave the whole matter to them, the same as we would any question of rates for the carriage of freight or passengers, or any other matter that rests with them.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am in an awkward position in regard to the amendment. I can support the striking out of the words "including compensation if any" but not the rest of the amendment. I think the board should have an entirely free hand as regards rates. I understand that the Supreme Court of Ontario decided that they felt themselves bound by some meaning attaching to the word "compensation." I am in favour of leaving these words out but I would not support the rest of the amendment.

Mr. J. D. REID: That decision of the court, I believe, was in connection with the original Railway Act, which read: "Upon such terms as to compensation as the board deems just and expedient." In that case it was decided that there should be compensation according to that interpretation. The words "if any" have been added so that it is plain the board will have power to decide whether there shall be any compensation or not. If these words were struck out the Board of Railway Commissioners would not have power to allow compensation even if it were considered that compensation should be allowed. The very fact of Parliament having struck out the words would be interpreted as an intention on the part of Parliament that there should be no compensation, and the board would have no jurisdiction as regards compensation. If the rest of the clause is left in, they will, of course, have the right to arrange as regards rates and tolls.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the board will have every power they can possibly require, even after you have omitted these words on line 29. If they cannot give compensation they can increase the rates and even things up in that way. They need not call it compensation. We are giving them absolute power to deal with every phase of argument that can be presented by both sides. I have never had the pleasure of appearing before the board, who, I understand, are a very democratic court and will hear everything properly presented to them, and will make a decision covering the whole ground. It

is open to parties who go before them to argue as strongly as they can from both sides, and the board will reach its conclusions on the merits of the full facts. It is unnecessary to suggest to them that they have to consider the question of compensation. If it is decided to leave them a free hand without any encumbrance, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of Ontario, I am in favour of striking these words out and will vote accordingly; but if the hon. member insists upon the rest of his amendment, I cannot vote for it.

Mr. BALL: The words "including compensation" are entirely superfluous. Their elimination would not detract from the powers of the board one iota. The matter would be fully covered if the section read:

The Board may order the company to provide for such use, connection or communication upon such terms as the Board deems just and expedient.

The word "compensation" is unnecessary, misleading and suggestive, and the board would have full power without them. The words "including compensation if any" are objected to by those who have experienced the effect of this clause. I have had communications from rural telephone companies in my riding and it is felt that these words should be eliminated.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would move that the words "including compensation if any" on line 29 be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: That is part of the amendment.

Mr. J. D. REID: If there were a connection with the Bell Telephone company in the East or the company in the West they would not get any of the extra charge which would go to the rural line. The clause would read:—

Provided however that the charge to such first-mentioned company, province, municipality or corporation for any long distance conversation or message transmitted over a line owned, controlled or operated by the company shall not be more than the established long distance rate of the company.

Therefore if connection is made with the Bell Telephone Company, or the British Columbia company, it will be made without any extra charge.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: It does seem to me that it is our duty as representatives of the people to protect them. In putting through a clause suggesting that the board may allow compensation if they see fit, we are giving an invitation to the board to make a charge against these companies. We all have confidence in the Board of Railway Commissioners and it is unfair that we should put in the Act a provision of this kind. If we are satisfied that the clause should not be there it is our duty to strike it out. Speaking for myself I am quite satisfied that it should not be there. I think there is no bigger monopoly in Canada than the Bell Telephone Company. They have made loads of money—so much money that they do not know what to do with it, and they had to create an insurance company in order to use it up. You are admitting here that they should have the privilege of charging for something for which they should not be allowed to charge. We have been neglecting our duty in the past in regard to this matter. Our duty to-night is to strike out these words. The ten-cent charge is an outrage and it should not be tolerated for a minute.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In view of the explanation that has been made, and the exception that has been taken, I think the difficulty can be overcome by moving as an amendment to the amendment that the section be made to read "upon such terms, excluding compensation, as the board may deem just." In view of the fact that the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for—

The CHAIRMAN: The ruling I gave a moment ago concerning the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) was that the ground covered by the sub-amendment was already dealt with in the amendment. If the amendment is adopted by the Committee there will be no reason for the hon. gentleman to move his proposed amendment but if the amendment is not adopted he will be in order in proposing a new amendment to strike out these words.

Mr. WALLACE: I will be very glad to agree to the cutting out of the words in the 29th line "including compensation if any."

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the hon. member wish to drop the rest of the amendment?

Mr. WALLACE: I just propose to cut out the words "including compensation if any." I therefore beg to move:

That sub-section 7 of section 376 be amended by striking out in line 25, the words "including compensation if any".

The Committee divided on the amendment (Mr. Wallace). Yeas 47, nays 9

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 380—statistics and returns:

Mr. J. D. REID: moved that the section be amended as follows:

Section 380, in the subtitle, strike out the words "To the Minister."

Subsection (1), line 4, strike out the words "and furnished", and on line 5, substitute the word "Board" for the word "Minister".

Subsection (2), line 7, strike out the word "Minister" and substitute therefor the word "Board."

Subsection (3), line 8, substitute the word "Board" for the word "Minister".

Subsection (4), line 3, substitute the words "Dominion Statistician" for the word "Minister," and on line 5, substitute the word "Board" for the word "Minister".

Subsection (5) struck out.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Would the minister explain why these clauses 380 to 384, were not struck out altogether as they already appear in the Statistics Act? I take it that these amendments are suggested to make these clauses conform more to the Statistics Act. I would also call the minister's attention to the fact that clause 385 seems to cover the same subject. Perhaps there is an explanation. I was not a member of the special committee and I do not know what discussion took place there.

Mr. J. D. REID: Statistics have in the past been collected by the Minister of Railways and Canals. The Board of Railway Commissioners are collecting certain statistics and they perhaps know better what statistics should be collected. It was thought advisable that the statistics should be sent to the Board of Railway Commissioners and the Dominion Statistician.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The Department of Railways and Canals will have nothing to do henceforth with gathering statistics?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, this duty is assumed by the Board of Railway Commissioners and the Dominion Statistician. It is they who print the statistics for the public. The Board of Railway Commissioners keep their copy on their file and use it for their own purposes.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Does not section 385 cover very much the same ground as the preceding clauses?

Mr. J. D. REID: When we get to section 385 we can deal with that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I understood that has already been settled.

Mr. J. D. REID: That has been passed.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 381—traffic returns:

Mr. J. D. REID: moved to amend the section as follows:

Section 381, subsection (1), line 3, substitute "Board" for 'Minister' and on line 3, substitute "monthly" for 'weekly,' and on line 4, substitute "close' for 'seventh,' and strike out all the words after 'inclusive' on line 5 to the end of the subsection.

Subsection (2), line 2, strike out the words 'and furnished,' and substitute "Board" for 'Minister.'

Subsection (3), line 4, substitute "Dominion Statistician" for 'Minister.'

Subsection (4), line 1, substitute "Board" for 'Minister.'

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 382—annual returns of accidents:

Mr. J. D. REID moved that the section be amended as follows:

Section 382, subsection (1), substitute "Board" for 'Minister' on lines 3 and 5.

Subsection (2), line 6, substitute "December" for 'June.'

Subsection (3), line 3, substitute "Dominion Statistician for 'Minister,' and on line 4, substitute "February" for 'August.'

Subsection (4), line 2, substitute "Board" for 'Minister.'

Subsection (5), line 1, substitute "Board" for 'Minister.'

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 383—further returns as to accidents:

Mr. J. D. REID moved that the section be amended as follows:

Section 383, substitute "Board" for 'Minister' on lines 1, 2, and 7, and on line 8, substitute "their" for 'his.'

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 385—board may require returns:

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member (Mr. Campbell) was asking about section 385.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would move that this section be reconsidered. I would like to have the minister's explanation regarding it.

Mr. J. D. REID: Clause 385 has been in the Act for some years, and the Committee thought it wise to leave it in. I understand that on this statistical matter, which includes this clause, the Dominion Statistician, Mr. Coats, and Sir Henry Drayton, the Chief Commissioner, got together and framed clauses 380, 381, 382 and 383, which we have just passed, and this clause 385, and the amendments as I have given them were handed to me by Mr. Coats. I did not go into this particular

clause with him, but took it for granted that it must be satisfactory to him and the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The clause seems to be superfluous. I suppose it will not do any particular harm, but I do not see why 385, which covers practically the same matters as 380 to 384, should be left in.

Mr. J. D. REID: It covers more than the others.

Mr. CAMPBELL: We are amending the Act and should amend it properly.

Mr. NESBITT: Clause 385 is the financial clause.

On section 392—limitation:

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The meaning of subsection (1) has for years been the subject of judicial disagreement and doubt, and it should be redrafted to clearly define these three distinctions: The time limit for personal actions, the time limit for actions as to land damages, and the time limit for any actions not otherwise covered.

Section agreed to.

On section 409—Walking on Track. Penalty:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am afraid the language is not right. After amendment the section will read:

Every person not connected with the railway or employed by the company who trespasses upon the yard or track of the company, except where the same is laid across or along a highway, is liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding ten dollars.

What does the word "same" refer to? If it refers to the track I can understand it; but if it refers to the yard I do not see how that can be laid along or across a highway.

Mr. BUREAU: There may be a street going through the yard. We have that in Three Rivers.

Mr. J. D. REID: We can pass it, and I will get it redrafted.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 436—Opening package with intent to steal contents:

Mr. J. D. REID: That is amended to make the section clearer.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 444—subsection (c)—fraudulently entering train:

Mr. BUREAU: Has there been any doubt expressed that a man who is under the orders of the section foreman is liable under this section?

Mr. J. D. REID: There is no reason why any person fraudulently entering a train with the intention of not paying his fare should not be punished, whether it be done with or without the knowledge of the company's employees. If with the knowledge and consent of an officer or servant of the company, he is guilty of a conspiracy to defraud, which clearly should be punishable.

Section as amended agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. J. D. Reid the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Wednesday, May 21, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. R. C. HENDERS (Macdonald): Presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization as follows:

Your committee reports for the information of the House, the following evidence taken during the current Session of Parliament.

The evidence of Dr. S. F. Tolmie, M.P., on "Control and eradication of Bovine Tuberculosis," and "How our live stock can best be improved and a solid and permanent industry built up." The evidence of Mr. H. S. Arkell, Live Stock Commissioner, on "Prospects and Markets for live stock in 1919." The evidence of Mr. J. A. Ruddick, Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner, on "Canada's transportation, refrigeration, and cold storage requirements, in connection with the possible and necessary development of live stock." An address by the Hon. Mr. Crerar, Minister of Agriculture, on "The general conditions and prospects for Agriculture in 1919," and a series of addresses by different speakers on "The Standardization of the various parts of vehicles, and agriculture machinery."

Your committee would recommend that 5,000 copies of the first five subjects be printed in blue book form under one cover for distribution, and also as an Appendix to the Journals of 1919.

INQUIRY INTO EFFICIENCY OF THE INSIDE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth) moved the adoption of the first report of the special committee appointed for the purpose of considering the possibility of reducing or re-arranging the staffs of the inside Civil Service with a view to securing the greatest efficiency with the minimum number of employees, and moved that it be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

MR. ARTHURS, M.P.

Mr. PEDLOW:

1. What is the total amount of money received by Colonel James Arthurs, M.P., Parry Sound, as pay and expenses from the Department of Militia and Defence, while on service both in Canada and overseas?
2. On what date did he sever his connection with the Department of Militia and Defence?
3. Since severing his connection has he received payment of any further sums from the Department of Militia and Defence?
4. If so, how much, and for what service?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1, 2, 3 and 4. The whole of this information is not available in Canada, but a cable has been sent overseas for the necessary information.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BUREAU:

How many Orders in Council have been passed under the War Measures Act?

Mr. CHISHOLM:

1. What amounts have been paid to Morrison's Limited, or D. A. Morrison, Amherst, Nova Scotia, for supplies for the military camps and the internment camp at that place during the years, 1915-16, 1916-17, 1917-18, and 1918-19?
2. What amounts have been paid Edgar Fillmore, Amherst, Nova Scotia, during the above-mentioned years?
3. From whom has coal been purchased for the Military Barracks, Armoury and Internment Camp at Amherst, Nova Scotia, during the above mentioned years?
4. What has been paid per ton for coal so supplied?

Mr. PREVOST:

1. How much was paid by the Government to all those persons who represented the Department of Militia and Defence before the Tribunals of Exemption, and Appeal, respectively, at Montreal, Quebec and Ottawa, during the period when the provisions of the Military Service Act were being enforced, either prior, or subsequent to, the 4th of February, 1918?
2. What are the names of such persons, and what amount was paid to each?

PROPRIETARY OR PATENT MEDICINE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order for the House to again go into Committee on Bill No. 53 (from the Senate) to amend the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue): This Bill was before Committee of the Whole some few days ago when very substantial amendments were proposed. In some respects the Bill is contentious, and requests have been made by many persons in regard to certain of its provisions. It is very desirable, I think, that these persons be heard, and the most convenient way of so doing is to refer the Bill to a special committee. I move, with the unanimous consent of the House:

That Order 21 be struck from the Order Paper and that Bill No. 53 be referred to a special committee consisting of Messrs. Beland, Copp, Cowan, Douglas (Cape Breton South and Richmond), Long, McMaster, Manion, Nesbitt, Pedlow, Sheard, Stevens and Sutherland, with power to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): At this late stage of the session it is very unlikely that the special committee which is now proposed will have time to sit, and hear evidence and report. I do not know what procedure could be suggested in lieu of what is now contemplated, but it is obvious there will not be time now for a special committee to consider this Bill in all its details and report, and then for opportunity to be afforded for a thorough consideration of the measure by the House.

I would suggest that we further consider the Bill in Committee of the Whole. No doubt the hon. minister has had a number of interviews since the Bill was considered in Committee, and he might be in a position to suggest some amendments. I believe that would be the proper course to adopt, otherwise it means that the law will remain as it is to-day.

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: I have had many requests from hon. gentlemen to appoint this Committee. I think if the Committee when properly constituted fixes one day for the hearing, that will be sufficient. There is no reason as far as I can see why the Committee should not report the Bill promptly.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I hope it will be a lesson to the Government to introduce Bills of this importance in the House of Commons instead of in the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be entertained by unanimous consent. Do I understand the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) to object?

Mr. BELAND: No, I do not object. I understand that the Committee will have power to summon witnesses before it to give evidence. That in itself will require more than one sitting.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Committee need not exercise that power. Motions of this kind invariably contain those words. The power is there in the event of the Committee desiring to call any one before it, but I do not think there will be any necessity to exercise the power.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): May we have the assurance of the hon. minister that the Bill will reappear this session?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I see no reason why it should not. I have every desire to expedite the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

PROHIBITION.

BILL TO CONFIRM ORDERS IN COUNCIL PROHIBITING IMPORTATION, MANUFACTURE AND TRANSPORTATION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 107 to confirm the Order in Council of the twenty-fourth day of February, 1919, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and transportation of intoxicating liquors, and the Order in Council of the twelfth day of April, 1919, in amendment thereof:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Will the Acting Prime Minister give us some information on the details of the Bill?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Upon consideration by the Committee of the resolution which preceded this Bill I made a full statement as to its nature and scope and I do not know that there is anything I can usefully add on this occasion. If in Committee further information is required in regard to any of the sections of the Bill, I shall, of course, be pleased to reply in as great detail as may be necessary.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1, subsection (1)—Orders in Council confirmed. Definition of "prohibited area" amended. Importation of permitted wine allowed. Manufacture of liquor that may be sold in any province to be permitted in such province. Transportation of liquor, the use of which is permitted, to be allowed. Sale of liquor which is in prohibited area allowed but not delivery in that area.

Mr. BUREAU: Could we have the regulation read now as amended before we proceed? To hear that a word is stricken off in the third line or added in the sixth line does not help us very much.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think my hon friend will have no difficulty in following it. He will find in the schedule the regulations referred to, and the amendments are of a comparatively simple character. I will send up to the Parliamentary counsel to see if he has a copy of the Bill in its amended form, but in the meantime I think we can make progress. For example, take the first section:

> The Orders in Council marked "A" and "B" in the Schedule to this Act are hereby declared to be valid and are ratified and confirmed, and declared to have the force of law according to their terms, subject to the following amendments to the said Order in Council marked "A."

That is to say, as I explained upon the resolution, the Government is asking the House to ratify and confirm the two Orders in Council, subject to such amendments as are necessary to enable effect to be given to any provincial legislation respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. Then take subsection (a) of section 1.

> Paragraph (c) of regulation one is amended by striking out all the words after the word "wine" in the last line thereof and inserting the following words in lieu thereof: "or other intoxicating liquors of limited alcoholic content are permitted."

Mr. BUREAU: That may be all right, but we had the same thing last night, if I may be permitted to inform the Acting Prime Minister. Somebody is charged with the duty of drafting amendments to a Bill, and the Bill is examined by a sub-committee. We have full confidence in the sub-committee, and we are satisfied that the Parliamentary counsel has seen that the drafting is proper. But we have not the law before us as amended, and I think it unfair to any member of this House to have a clause read to him full steam stating that in the first line all words are struck out after the word "wine," and certain words are added in the second line, and so on. That is not the proper way to pass legislation. I suggest that the regulations as amended should be submitted to the members in order that they may have a chance to make a comparison between the law as it exists and the law as it will be when amended.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand that some members of the Committee desire to speak generally on the question, and while an opportunity is being afforded them, I

shall endeavour to see if we can get the regulations in the form suggested by the hon. member.

Mr. CRONYN: Mr. Chairman, if I am now in order, I desire to make a few remarks on this clause and to suggest two amendments thereto. In the first place, when the resolution on which this Bill is founded came up for discussion, I suggested an amendment which was not approved by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), and which was dropped. Upon reading his remarks in Hansard, I take it that the basis upon which the Government is acting in this matter is set out in these words by the Acting Prime Minister on page 2440 of Hansard:

> The principle which should underlie the action of the Dominion with respect to legislation of this kind in recognition of the rights of the provinces to enact such legislation within their jurisdiction as they may deem proper.

And again, on page 2438, the Acting Prime Minister states:

> I should be prepared to consider an amendment to the resolution which would provide for the importation into a province of wine not exceeding the alcoholic standard authorized by the law of that province. Such an amendment might provide for importation from a country outside of Canada, or for transportation from another province in Canada, into any province where such a law as I have mentioned is in effect.

Following the reason of the Acting Prime Minister, I feel it will be necessary to drop my former suggestion. I note that his position, which is also that of the Cabinet, has been approved by a body called, I think, the Dominion Alliance, which is prepared to endorse the Government in accepting the provincial view on matters concerning prohibition. I, therefore, do not purpose making any general remarks on the Bill itself. It would be futile to mention the fact, and I understand it to be a fact, that a petition of 1,500 Trades Unions was presented to the Government last February asking for an increase in the strength of beer. The answer, in view of the attitude of the Government, would be logically this: You must go to your provincial legislature and request it to increase the strength of the beer, if that is your desire. It would be useless to discuss the fact that in various states of the Union and in a number of European countries, beers of a strength of from two to three per cent alcohol by weight are declared to be non-intoxicants and are advocated very strongly by temperance societies and other bodies in those countries. But I do question whether this new Bill follows the provincial law, and I hope to be able to submit to the Committee a statement, which, if the Committee reach the opinion which I have reached, may cause them to favour the amendments which I shall suggest.

I want to take the case of Ontario as an example. I have no familiarity with the laws of the other provinces, but I have before me a copy of the Ontario Temperance Act. It is necessary for the consideration of this subject that the Committee follow as closely as they may be able, the law of Ontario as, in my opinion, it stands to-day. Under section 40 of the Ontario Temperance Act passed in 1916, there is a sweeping clause prohibiting any person from selling any liquor,—which, under the interpretation clause, is defined to be any liquid having an alcoholic strength of more than 2½ per cent proof spirits. Section 41 is another sweeping clause and it provides, that no person by himself, his clerk, servant or agent shall have or keep or give liquor in any place wheresoever, other than in the private dwelling house in which he resides, without having first obtained a license under this Act authorizing him so to do. Then there follow three clauses to which I wish to draw the attention of the Committee, and which may be classed as clauses of exception. I do not desire to read all of each of these clauses as portions do not affect the question at issue, but I hope to read all the words which have any bearing on the subject. Section 43 provides, amongst other things—and this section was enacted first in 1916, and amended in 1917:—

> Nothing in section 41 contained shall prevent common carriers or other persons from carrying or conveying liquor from a place outside of Ontario to a place where the same may be lawfully received and lawfully kept in Ontario, or from a place where such liquor is lawfully kept and lawfully delivered within Ontario to a place outside Ontario, or from a place where such liquor may be lawfully kept and lawfully delivered in Ontario to another place in Ontario where the same may be lawfully kept, or through Ontario from a place outside of it to another place outside of it.

That clause, as will be seen, deals with common carriers or other persons interested in transportation. Then section 45 reads:

> Nothing herein contained shall prevent any brewer, distiller or other person duly licensed by the Government of Canada, for the manufacture of spirituous, fermented or other liquors, from keeping or having liquor manufactured by him in any building wherein such manufacture is carried on, provided such building does not contravene the provisions of section 39 hereof, or for selling liquor therefrom to a person in another province or in a foreign country—

I just want to emphasize that line, which is repeated in the next section.

—or for selling liquor therefrom to a person in another province or in a foreign country or to a licensee under this Act, or to the keeper of a liquor warehouse within the meaning of section 46.

Then this clause was amended at the last session of the legislature by repealing certain words and adding these:—

Nor shall it prevent a distiller selling alcohol to a wholesale druggist.

Then subsection (1) of section 46, which is very much along the same line as the last section I have read, reads:—

Nothing herein contained shall prevent any person from having liquor for export sale in his liquor warehouse, provided such liquor warehouse and the business carried on therein complies with the requirements in subsection 2 hereof mentioned, or from selling such liquor from such warehouse to persons in other provinces or in foreign countries.

Under these sections of the Act—and I do not think there are, in that very voluminous Act, others which materially affect the provisions of those sections—the law of Ontario is clear that while one could not sell liquor having a strength of more than 2½ per cent proof spirits in Ontario, it was possible to manufacture and export to places outside of Ontario liquor of a greater strength. Since that Act was passed, the Orders in Council, of which those now before us are a consolidation, came into effect, and in 1918 the Legislature of Ontario added section 154 to the Ontario Temperance Act, which reads:—

During the time any statute of the Parliament of Canada or any Order in Council passed thereunder is in force, the effect of which is to prohibit the transportation of liquor into or out of this province for any purpose, sections 43, 45, 46 and section 139 of the Ontario Temperance Act shall be deemed to be suspended to the extent necessary to conform to the provisions of such statute or order.

I would call the attention of the Committee particularly to the words "shall be deemed to be suspended." I submit that the real effect of the Bill before the Committee is not to implement the provincial law, but actually to supplant it. The provincial law, as I hope I have made clear, did allow the export of liquor of a greater strength than that mentioned, and the Order in Council actually prevents it. It is quite true it may be argued that the Ontario Legislature suspended the operation of the four sections I have mentioned during the continuance of the Orders in Council, but if we now confirm by this legislation those Orders in Council, are we not virtually legislating for Ontario? That is the effect, and if I cannot make that clear, I must confess to failure.

It may be argued that Ontario recognized the Orders in Council and was only too glad to lay the burden upon the shoulders of the Dominion—words to that effect were used in a former discussion. I rather take it that Ontario desired no clash of jurisdiction between the province and the Dominion and was quite willing to supplement the Dominion Order in Council by saying "While that Order in Council is in force we shall suspend the effect of our Act."

In order that the Committee may understand the effect of the amendment I shall propose, I will read subsection 1 of section 3 of the regulations, appearing on page 4 of the Bill, as amended by section 1 of the Bill:

No person shall make or manufacture intoxicating liquor or cause intoxicating liquor to be made or manufactured within the Dominion of Canada after the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen: Provided that in case the sale of intoxicating liquor of any class for beverage purposes is permitted in any province, this regulation shall not apply to the manufacture of such intoxicating liquor in such province.

Section 1 of the Bill strikes out all the words after "province" in subsection (1) of section 3, so that the subsection as amended will read as above. Now my amendment is that the last three words "in such province" shall be struck out. The proviso will then read as follows:

Provided that in case the sale of intoxicating liquor of any class for beverage purposes is permitted in any province, this regulation shall not apply to the manufacture of such intoxicating liquor.

In other words, as the law of Quebec allows beer of a strength of 2.96 per cent to be manufactured and sold in that province, the other provinces may lawfully manufacture beer of that strength.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It will be a case of Quebec ruling Canada.

Mr. CRONYN: Perhaps so. The amendment, of course, does not make the sale of that beer lawful in any province outside of Quebec. It would be just as unlawful for a brewer to sell beer of that strength in Ontario as to sell to the public the stronger beer which the brewers now manufacture and sell for medicinal purposes to licensed vendors.

Combined with the amendment I have proposed, I also suggest an amendment to subsection (3) of section 3 of the regulations, and in this case my amendment has to be

read into the amendment proposed by the Government. I will now read subsection 3 as it will read with the combined amendment:

No person after the first day of April 1918, shall send, take, transport into or deliver in any prohibited area any intoxicating liquor, or cause any intoxicating liquors to be sent, transported or delivered.

I leave out the proviso which then follows, because it has only a temporary effect and does not govern this case at all, and I will read the second proviso with the combined amendment:

Provided that this regulation shall not apply to the sending, taking, transporting or delivering any intoxicating liquor lawfully manufactured in any province to any place where such intoxicating liquor may lawfully be sold.

Hon. members will see that my amendment strikes out the words "in such province" from the amendment appearing in paragraph (d) of section 1 of the Bill. I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) that it is most difficult to follow the Bill in its present form. The net effect of the two amendments I have proposed is to allow the manufacture of beer of the strength permitted by the province of Quebec in any province of the Dominion. It does not permit the manufacture of any other liquor; it would, of course, permit the manufacture of wine up to the Quebec strength, but that is already provided for under a special proviso. It would also permit the export of that beer not only to the province of Quebec but to any foreign country where it can lawfully be sold. That is the total net effect of striking out the words "in such province" in the two subsections.

It restores to the breweries throughout Canada—because it affects only the breweries, as I read the Act—their right to export ale of only Quebec strength to any country where it may lawfully be sold.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is the present proposition?

Mr. CRONYN: That is the proposition as embodied in the amendment I have suggested. Under the Bill as brought down here, while you can import into Quebec wines of Quebec strength from anywhere in the world including Ontario, you cannot export from Ontario or any province beers of any strength greater than 2½ per cent proof spirit. That is the rule in Ontario, and, I understand, it is the same rule throughout the rest of Canada. The curious fact should be noted that if Ontario is so ill advised as to follow the example set by Quebec—some people may quarrel with my phraseology describing it as ill advised—and allow beer and wine of limited strength to be sold there, while Ontario could manufacture that beer it could not under this Act be sold outside of Ontario; and Quebec could not export her beer into Ontario, nor could any other province. As I said, I did not come prepared to discuss the general question, but I do not want this Committee to be under any misapprehension as to my view thereon. I am delighted to testify to the benefits derived from the abolition of the sale of ardent spirits under the Ontario Temperance Act, and I would be very sorry to see that Act repealed. But I am also of the opinion that the best measure of temperance to-day is that one, or something akin to it, adopted by the province of Quebec. I therefore move:

To amend clause 1 of the Bill by striking from sub-paragraph (d) of subsection one, the words "in such province" where they appear in the thirtieth line of the said bill and by adding as sub-paragraph (f) of subsection one, the following words:

"(f) Subsection one of regulation three is amended by striking out the words 'in such province' in the eighth line thereof."

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I want to understand what the hon. member is doing by his amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Some one is joking—

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Well, I hope my voice is at once circumventing the acoustics of the Chamber and penetrating the somewhat dull faculties of my interrupters. I want to know what my hon. friend exactly desires to accomplish by his amendment. Does he want Ontario to manufacture these liquors, where they are not drunk, and export them into Quebec for sale there?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. CRONYN: To manufacture what may be termed "lager," which is absolutely the Quebec standard and export it not only into Quebec, but into any country where it may lawfully be sold.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does the hon. member not think that that would be a most immoral proceeding—at least from the Ontario point of view?

Mr. CRONYN: Can my hon. friend justify the Ontario point of view which allows the manufacture and sale of native wine

having an alcoholic strength up to perhaps 20 per cent proof spirits?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That is not under discussion.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: The question is, do we or do we not want a "dry" Canada? The answer is; we do. Considerable effort has been made to prove that the working men are anxious to return to the old condition of things. Even Gompers has given his view on liquor drinking and is rather encouraging the use of strong drinks among working men. From my experience I will venture to say, notwithstanding the endeavours that are made to draw the workman into this issue, that the liquor interests are involved in the attempt to revert to the old condition of things; and before I conclude my remarks I think I shall be able to convince the Committee that the workingmen generally do not want that condition. It is untrue that the workingmen are asking for it. But there are certain interests that are making capital out of the question for their personal advantage and at the expense of the workingmen. Let us consider the question from some concrete standpoints. Do the railway companies, for instance, want to employ men who indulge in drinking either wine or beer? My experience is that any man who shows any indication of being addicted to the drink habit is turned down, and there is no use whatever for men of his type. Then take the manufacturers—and we have many of them in this Chamber. One such gentleman is sitting very close to me and no doubt he employs hundreds of men. I would like to ask him if he or any other manufacturer would employ to operate machinery men who showed signs of intoxication. I think not. And take the banks. I know of one instance in which a bank was wrecked through over-indulgence on the part of one of its principal men; and in another case of which I am aware, a man who had imbibed too freely lost one of the best positions in connection with the management of a bank. And in connection with the steam ship companies no man who is addicted to the drink habit even in the slightest degree will be employed, for we know that accidents have frequently happened and lives have been lost because men employed in occupations of this kind have given way to drink. I remember a few years ago that to be a school trustee or an alderman or a controller, a mayor or member of Parliament, one could not succeed unless he had been endorsed by the saloon-keeper or the hotel-keeper. This condition was rather embarrassing. If a respectable candidate wanted to offer himself for election, he would have to make terms with this class of people, and it meant that he had to go to every saloon in the riding and saturate the voters with booze so as to satisfy the saloon-keeper.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That was not in Toronto.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: It was in a large city in this province. I have seen this condition time and again, and I have experienced it when offering myself in opposition to that class. I have seen candidates go from saloon to saloon to debauch the voters with a view to getting their support, and I might mention a rather amusing incident. I know of a candidate who catered extensively to people of this type. He would call into the saloon perhaps about twenty or thirty men, and there would be in all some hundred men in the saloon. He would purchase drinks for all the "boys" who, as soon as they had quaffed their fill, made their escape. The candidate could not understand it, but when he got to the next corner the men were all there as dry as ever. He went the rounds for a couple of hours, and the crowd grew larger and larger at each saloon, until after a while there was no saloon large enough to accommodate the men who had been trying without success for hours to slake their thirst. That condition of things has passed away, and we do not want a return to it. We know the debauching effect drink has had on the people generally, even when supplied by candidates who wanted to ensure their elections and to be considered pretty good fellows into the bargain. In satisfying those who were ready to drink, they were only injuring men who would be better off without liquor. I wish to call the attention of the House to two or three statements which I shall quote as bearing upon this important question:

Prohibition Extending in Europe.

The trend of public opinion throughout Europe is all against the Liquor traffic. Legislation prohibiting certain classes of spirits had been adopted prior to the war, and, since the outbreak of hostilities this has been largely extended, both in belligerent and neutral countries, while beer and wine have been prohibited in some countries and greatly restricted in others.

Total prohibition has been enacted in Russia, Roumania, Finland, Iceland, Greenland, the Faroe Island, and among the North Sea Fisheries. Absinthe and similar spirits have been prohibited in France, absinthe in Switzerland,

Italy, Holland, and Belgium: branvin in parts of Norway and throughout the rural parts and in some of the cities of Sweden: the use of home grown corn and potatoes for the manufacture of intoxicating liquor is prohibited in Denmark and other countries: the manufacture of spirits for beverage purposes has ceased in Great Britain and its sale in parts of Scotland and on certain days throughout the United Kingdom is also prohibited. The beneficial results are so universal that prohibition is fast being recognized as the true remedy for the world's drink problem.

Mr. Stanley Washburn, the well-known British journalist, has stated in 1916:—"From Serbia to the Baltic there is not a public-house open, and, further, the Order is enforced to the letter: and greater even than that, it is accepted by the entire population."

Denmark:—An overwhelming majority of the people has declared for National Prohibition, and at the General Election in July, 1918, 69 per cent of the elected members of the various Liberal, Socialists, and other parties pledged themselves to enact a measure for taking a National Plebiscite on Prohibition.

In France, Switzerland, and some other European countries, the demand for Prohibition or more drastic restriction on the liquor traffic is growing louder and more persistent.

I heard one hon. member of this House make the remark a few days ago that the drinking of coffee for a certain time caused sickness and that it was necessary, in order to counteract the effect of the coffee, to take something stronger, or to indulge in another way. Well, if coffee has such an effect on the individual that it is necessary to resort to something stronger, I think I can prescribe a remedy that would be more effective than that if my hon. friend would accept my prescription. I would say to him that, instead of taking strong coffee to make him sick, and taking strong liquor to cure him, if he would take pure water all the year around, he would have none of these troubles at all. I read the following citation:

Civil War and Prohibition.

The first State to adopt Prohibition was Maine. From 1851 down to the present time, with the exception of a few months in the years 1856-57, prohibition has been the law of Maine. On March 29th, 1918, the Governor of this State, in an address delivered before the State Convention of the Republican Party, at Portland, Maine, said: "The honest efforts of all officials charged with the enforcement of the Prohibition law in Maine have brought about a condition so satisfactory that all discussion of the wisdom of the law has permanently ended." This is surely an effective answer to those who declare that "Prohibition does not Prohibit."

Clearing the Liquor from Government and Civil Positions.

In spite of the powerful influence of the liquor interest and its influential lobbying in Congress, year after year the Temperance Reformers have made inroads upon the various strongholds of liquordom. To protect the Indians, a Prohibition Zone has been established round every Indian Reservation. To protect the soldiers and sailors the sale of intoxicating liquors has been abolished from all Canteens, Army and Navy Training Camps and Naval Depots. Prohibition is also enforced in all Soldiers' and Sailors' Homes, Army Reservations, National Homes for Disabled Volunteers and Emigrant Stations, &c. To protect the workers a Prohibition zone has been established round shipyards and Government workshops. To protect young people, the evil effect of alcohol upon the human system is taught in all the public schools, colleges, and universities throughout the land. By an Order issued September, 1918, the selling of alcoholic liquors is now prohibited on trains and at Railway Stations. Railway Corporations and many of the great industrial concerns have, with the approval of the Trades Unions connected therewith, prohibited servants employed by them from drinking while on duty, and in some instances this is extended to drinking whilst off duty, or frequenting places where intoxicating liquors are sold. The great fraternal organizations, such as the Masonic, Trade and Thrift Societies, totalling a membership of over 12 millions, exclude liquor-sellers from membership, and many societies call upon their members to vote for Local No-License and State-wide Prohibition.

Surely, if that has been the experience in the past, we cannot be too careful at this moment in changing the present condition as to the restriction of the liquor traffic, especially when societies representing 12,000,000 people will not admit to membership any one engaged in selling liquor or who is associated with the traffic. I read:

Methodist Minister Arrested.

The arrest of the Rev. S. F. Newton, pastor of the East End Methodist Church, for distributing temperance literature on the streets without a permit was one of the incidents of the campaign on Wednesday. Mr. Newton stated that he had permission from the general manager of the Canadian Consolidated Rubber Company to distribute leaflets among his employees.

There is a case where a clergyman trying to do good, and innocently distributing certain kinds of literature, is arrested. We know, notwithstanding it was forbidden by this Government, that certain propagandists were distributing literature, that they were arrested, convicted and sentenced to two or three years' imprisonment, that their sentences were commuted and that they were set at liberty. When men had been convicted of doing things of this description this Government had no right to interfere with the law but the law should have been allowed to have taken its course. Yet, here is a man, a minister, who is doing harmless work and he is arrested and put in prison. It is not very creditable to those who undertook to bring about his arrest. I read:

Mr. Brewer: We are absolutely opposed to the restoration of the drinking bar. They propose to cleanse whisky drinking of its relations with crime and vice by changing its posture and ensconcing it behind tables. So universally are vice, crime, corruption, disease and misery associated with the bar, that both brewers and distillers are willing—nay anxious—that it should be banished—if only they can go on doing the mischief they have been doing by means of it. But no change of fittings or of posture is going to change the nature of the reptile or the fruits of its activities..

There are streets in Montreal whose reputation is so bad that their names have had to be changed over and over again. One which was named after a saint had to be unsanctified and was then called after a national hero, but he, in turn, had to be relieved of it; and it was again reduced to a more fitting godfather. It will be the same with the drink trade; its outward form will not change its unholy results.

Then, as to the saloon, we have the following declarations:

Death on the Saloon.

The Committee of Fifty, in their exhaustive study of the liquor traffic in the United States found that out of the unions investigated one out of every five is, by its constitution, directly opposed to the saloon, one out of every three is at least generally opposed to it, while only about 25 per cent of all unions seem to have no definite policy in relation to the liquor traffic;

Now come the opinions of labour leaders, men occupying responsible positions, and organizations of working men:

To inquiries, answers were received as follows:

Order of Railway Conductors: We are absolutely opposed to the saloon, and it is incorporated in our laws that a man cannot engage in the liquor traffic and remain a member of this organization.

Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen: We oppose the saloon to the extent that the Brotherhood will not tolerate a member being connected with the sale of liquor.

International Seamen's Union: We continually enjoin sobriety upon our members by refusing to publish advertisements of the saloon, etc., in the official organ of the union.

United Garment Workers: Our organization is decidedly opposed to the saloon.

The Journeymen Tailors: The officers of our organization are decidedly opposed to the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage and its general secretary adds: "I have not failed whenever the opportunity has presented itself, to declare myself upon this question."

The United Mine Workers of America: The officers of the United Mine Workers of America discourage in every respect saloon business.

The constitution of the Telegraphers reads: The use of alcoholic liquor as a beverage shall be sufficient cause for rejecting any petition for membership.

And to crown all, and to prove that the fight against the saloon is not of recent origin, in 1894 the International Typographical Union in its convention called for "the State and national destruction of the liquor traffic."

[Mr. Foster.]

The Blacksmith's Journal says the greatest curse to the labour movement has been the saloon, and it is high time that the labour leaders got together and forever divorced the trades union movement and the saloon influence.

It is a readjustment, a changed condition of society. Almost every disturbance in the ranks of organized labour can be traced back to some connection with the saloon.—John Mitchell, Vice-President A. F. L.

I have been criticised for my fight against the saloon, but I give notice here and now that I will fight the traffic as long as the saloon opposes the interests of the people. Too many men and women are going downstream to degradation for me to keep silent. To the trades unionist there is no redeeming feature in the saloon. Go anywhere where its influence is felt and you see the demoralization it brings. We are fighting for social well-being, civil benefits, and moral uplift. Never a foul plot is organized to injure public rights and social well-being but the saloon is used for the job.—John B. Lennon, Treasurer American Federation of Labour.

I know that I am right; I know that in refusing to even touch a drop of strong drink I was, and am, right. In refusing to treat another to that which I do not believe to be good for myself to drink, I know I am right. In refusing to associate with men who get drunk, I know I am right. In not allowing a rumseller to gain admittance into the Order of the Knights of Labour, I know that I was right. In advising our assemblies not to rent halls or meeting rooms over drinking places, I know I was right. I have done this from the day my voice was first heard in the council halls of our order.—Terrance V. Powderly, former General Master Workman of the Knights of Labour.

I will now give quotations showing what the position of President Wilson is:

President Wilson's Glass of Water.

The American press report that when President Wilson responded to the toast of the President of the French Republic in Paris, he raised a glass filled with water, President Wilson drank no wine at the luncheon. Explaining the President's action to the French, Dr. Grayson, his physician, said that Mr. Wilson never drank wine or alcoholic liquor of any kind.

Here is a further statement showing the attitude of labour towards the liquor traffic:

Slandering the Workingman.

Friends of decency and sobriety are getting exceedingly tired of the constant vilification of labour at the hands of the Liquor Traffic. Every time an attempt is made to pass some prohibitory legislation there is a protest in the name of labour. We must not shut down the saloon lest labour be angry and cease work. The curious fact is that every time the vile grogshops have been put out of business in any large numbers, labour, far from quitting or causing trouble, has immediately become more efficient.—Zion's Herald, Boston, Mass.

That goes to show the opinion of the workingman and the effect which prohibition has with respect to his efficiency. Now let me give the opinions of the Canadian provincial premiers in regard to the value

of prohibition. The International Record contains the folowing:

Prime Ministers and Prohibition.

During February, 1919, an extraordinary expression of opinion on the value of Prohibition was given by statesmen, professional and business men and others. We have only space for the following:—

Sir G. H. Murray, Prime Minister of Nova Scotia—"I regard Prohibition in Nova Scotia as very beneficial."

Hon. T. C. Norris, Prime Minister of Manitoba—"Results of Prohibition are certainly beneficial."

Hon. W. M. Martin, Prime Minister of Saskatchewan—"Money formerly spent on liquor now finds its way into more legitimate channels. Crime has greatly decreased, and one of our jails has been closed."

Hon. N. E. Foster, Prime Minister of New Brunswick—"Prohibition in New Brunswick since it became effective in May, 1913, has undoubtedly given satisfaction."

Sir W. H. Hearst, Prime Minister of Ontario—"All parts of the province indicate the success of Prohibition."

It is apparent, from the statements I have read containing expressions of opinion by labour leaders, that it is a libel upon workingmen generally to say that they are not sympathetic towards prohibition. I have also given you the opinions of the various provincial premiers throughout the Dominion, and I think it can be taken for granted that a similar opinion is held by the Premier and the Acting Premier of Canada. Such being the case, and the House having now to deal with a prohibition measure, every clause of the Bill should receive the greatest consideration, and should be put in such a form as to demonstrate that Parliament proposes to discourage rather than encourage the liquor traffic and the consumption of liquors of any description. Surely it will not be long until the day comes when throughout this Dominion there will be total prohibition. I think you will find that every province will eventually vote in favour of it.

I do not suppose there is an hon. member but has had more or less experience of the degradation, the suffering and the wasting of energy of men and women through overindulgence in the use of intoxicating liquors. The world knows by this time that liquor sold under high license, low license, or no license, in saloon, export warehouse, or government grog shop, by hotel keeper, dealer, or "factor," whether across a bar, on a table, or in a sealed package is the same liquor, and it is the liquor that does the damage. Let us not be confused or deceived in this matter. The foe we are fighting is alcohol.

Then I saw the mother shudder and tremble as if with dread,
As she heard on the rotten staircase the sound of a heavy tread,
And the children run to their mother, and cry in their deep despair,
Oh, hide us from our father, for we hear him coming there.
Then I see the door flung open and a form come staggering in,
The form of one God made as man, now a brute through the curse of gin.
Those hungry babes are his children, that fainting woman his wife,
And he was their proud protector till the liquor ruined his life.
Now the stone is rolled away,
Hail the glorious Temperance Day.

Mr. M. CLARK: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not interrupt my hon. friend; indeed, I admired the care with which he had prepared his speech, and it has always been considered an invidious action to interfere with a young member. But I submit to you, Sir, that we are embarking on a second reading debate after the House has gone into Committee; that is the point of order I desire to raise. If we are to have a second reading debate we ought to have it at the proper stage, and it is a bad precedent at a time when law and order ought to be supported everywhere that a coach-and-four should be driven through the rules of the House of Commons itself. I hope my hon. friend will not take any offence at my remarks.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Certain latitude was given by the Acting Prime Minister to cover any general views on this question.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order raised by the hon. member for Red Deer is well taken. The debate which is now being carried on is a second reading debate, discussing, not the Orders in Council at all, not the schedule to this Bill, not the clause under consideration, but the general principle of prohibition, which principle was adopted by this House when the Bill was read the second time. As long as the matter had not been brought to my attention by any hon. member I took it for granted that the debate was being carried on by the unanimous consent of the Committee; but now that it has been drawn to my attention I will have to ask hon. members to observe the rules and confine their remarks to the clause under consideration. Section 5 of rule 13 is well known to all hon. members. It is very short and has been read many times, but I will read it again:

Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE: Of course, the point is not open to discussion, but I might just remind the Chair that there is an amendment before the House which I think would let in the speech of the hon. member.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think it would.

Mr. HENDERS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) with regard to the turn taken by this discussion and I shall endeavour to confine my remarks to the matter in hand. As I understand it, this is an amendment that will continue the provinces in the right that they now have to deal with the use of intoxicants. I believe that when the Government dealt with the liquor question as a war measure and passed the Order in Council, they did one of the very wisest things possible under the circumstances, and there is no doubt that very great profit accrued to us as a people because of the advantages that followed that measure. The part that Canada played in the war would indicate that the action taken by the Government was along the right lines and brought splendid results. Now that the war is over and we are coming back to normal conditions, naturally the question comes up as to what should be the attitude of Canada on the temperance question. That brings us back to the point as to where the provinces stood on this question previous to the war, and there can be no doubt that their pronouncement was emphatic and conclusive along the line of prohibitory legislation, with the exception of one province, and that province through local option measures had in large measure in effect pronounced against the evils that flow from the effects of intoxicants used for beverage purposes.

I am glad that the Government has brought this matter up for consideration. In the main I agree with the Bill as now presented, which will leave the matter in the hands of the provinces to be dealt with as they see fit. I have always been a believer in provincial rights, and this regulation is placing the matter where the law previously enacted by the provinces placed it. In view of the fact, however, that the Order in Council gave practically Federal prohibition, and that we are enjoying that condition of affairs at the present time, it seemed to me that we might perhaps have left the Order in Council as it is, with the right reserved to each province, if it saw fit, to bring up the issue and vote on it, as to whether it would continue a prohibition province or not.

This would have practically removed the question of prohibition as a contentious matter out of the realm of Federal politics and would have left it entirely with the provinces, and the Federal powers would have concurred in the attitude taken by each of the provinces. As the Bill now stands, however, no serious loss can accrue and no serious damage can be done to any one. I am prepared to support the Bill because of the position taken by the constituency which I represent. I have received from my constituency a large number of petitions asking that the strongest possible support be given to the retention of the prohibitory legislation that has been secured. I have further the endorsation of one of the largest organizations in my province, an organization that has placed itself on record year after year for seven years as being in favour of prohibition. I think that organization represents very largely the sentiment of the province from which I come, and I believe I would be acting contrary to the pronounced view of that organization as well as of the constituency which I represent, did I not make my voice heard to-day in endorsation of this Bill.

Mr. EULER: It is not my purpose to discuss the merits or demerits of prohibition, although I would say in a general way that restrictive legislation of too drastic a nature, particularly at this time, is not in the interest of the country under the present unsettled conditions. The extremist in any movement is usually a greater hindrance to that movement than a help. I rise only for one purpose, and that is to point out what I consider was an inconsistency on the part of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) in the statement he made the other day when discussing the resolution that preceded this Bill. He laid down the principle that legislation on prohibition should primarily be the function of the provinces, such legislation to be enacted after the will of the people of the provinces had been ascertained. With that, I entirely agree. If the people of any province say that they desire prohibition in whatever degree they please, then this Parliament of Canada can consistently enact legislation that will ensure, so far as lies within the power of this Parliament, that the will of the people of that province shall be made effective. When the Acting Prime Minister made that statement, he also stated that when the Government of Ontario enacted prohibitory legisla-

tion, he took it that they represented in that legislation the will of the great majority of the people of that province. I do not know upon what he based that assumption. It may be, and perhaps it is, the wish of the people of Ontario that they should have prohibition in that province. but, so far as this Parliament knows, there is no indication that the people of Ontario desire prohibition. Indeed, the election of 1914 would show that prohibition was not favoured. For that reason my opinion is that this legislation is premature and anticipates what this Parliament believes to be the will of the people of Ontario. The proper method to follow would be this: First, obtain your mandate from the people of Ontario—and I refer now particularly to Ontario, because I know very little about the conditions in the other provinces—then, after that mandate has been obtained, this Parliament would be justified in making effective whatever wish is expressed by the people of that province. The Acting Prime Minister, when he stated that he took it that the people of Ontario endorsed the action of the Government of that province, could not have been in close communion with the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), because, as far as I know, the only recent expression of opinion that we have from the people of Ontario was that given in the provincial election of 1914. The President of the Council knows all about that, because he was the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario House at that time, and that election was fought on a question of much less stringent legislation. The question was the abolition of the bar, and, as every one knows, the people of Ontario voted overwhelmingly against the Opposition, led by the present President of the Council. From that, we must gather, if we can gather anything at all, that the people of Ontario were opposed to prohibition, and if later on it seemed that opinion had changed, perhaps because of the war, the proper method to follow, before this Parliament interferes with provincial rights, would surely be to obtain a new mandate from the Ontario people. It may be the case that the people of that province will vote in favour of prohibition, but my argument is entirely on this point, that, so far as we know, the people of that province are, from their view as expressed in the election of 1914, opposed to prohibitory legislation. This was war legislation in the first place, and now that the war is over, the logical thing to do would be to revert to the position as before the war so far as Dominion legislation is concerned. Then, when each province declares itself by referendum in favour of or against prohibition, as the case may be, it will become the duty of this Parliament to enact legislation to ensure the carrying out of that expressed view. The thought has just entered my mind whether the reason for this legislation is not that possibly some undertaking or promise was given to the effect that legislation of this character would be enacted. If any such promise was given at a certain time, perhaps a year or two ago at election time, we should be told to whom that promise was given and what the consideration was.

Mr. CHARTERS: I desire to say a word or two in support of this measure, because in the first place I believe the passage and enforcement of a prohibitory law would result in greater good to the people of Canada than any measure we have put upon the statute book in recent years, with the possible exception of that in regard to the conduct and the winning of the war.

The Government is to be congratulated upon the courage it displayed in passing the Order in Council, and I believe that the House will be commended by the people of this country for the readiness with which it is accepting the legislation validating the Order in Council. As we have recognized the right of self-determination by the provinces in this matter, we cannot have total prohibition at the present time, but this legislation approaches more nearly than any heretofore enacted to the objective at which the temperance people have been aiming for upwards of fifty years, and I believe that it will meet with the general approval of the temperance forces throughout the country. Many years ago Sir John A. Macdonald told a temperance deputation that they would get prohibition just as soon as they elected men to Parliament who would vote for prohibition. I think the action of Parliament to-day indicates that the advice of Sir John A. Macdonald is being followed by the people of this country.

Are we wise in passing this legislation? In the first place, it has been asked whether the people of the province of Ontario are behind this proposed legislation. Let me remind the House that the people of Ontario have voted three times directly on this question, when no other issue was before them. In 1894, in the first Ontario plebiscite, there was a majority of 82,000 in favour of prohibition. The second vote was taken in 1898, when the Dominion

plebiscite was held. At that time, although there was very great fear on the part of certain temperance workers that a vote in favour of prohibition would put the then Government in the hole, Ontario gave a majority of 39,000 in favour of prohibition. In 1902, when the third vote was taken, prohibition was carried by the province by a majority of 96,000. In 1916, a petition equal to upwards of eighty per cent of the total vote cast at the election two years before was presented to the legislature asking that prohibition be enacted, and following that, the present Ontario Temperance Act was passed. Surely that is sufficient evidence of the feeling of the people of the province of Ontario on this question, and because of that evidence I believe the Government is justified in introducing the legislation now before us.

Further evidence is found in the western provinces. In 1915, for instance, Alberta voted for the widest measure of prohibition within the jurisdiction of the province by a majority of upwards of 25,000; Saskatchewan, in 1916, by a majority of 71,000, and Manitoba in the same year, by a majority of more than 25,000. The same sentiment prevails in the eastern provinces. In view of this evidence of a strong sentiment in favour of the destruction, as far as possible, of the evils of the drink traffic, I think the Government is justified in seeking to validate this Order in Council, and I am convinced that the only serious complaint that will be made is that the legislation is to be enacted for one year only, instead of being made permanent. I am sure that if this Government or the local Government in Manitoba opened the saloons in Winnipeg at the present moment they would be regarded as fit only for the asylum, and the same is true with regard to Toronto or any other city, where similar conditions might prevail. For the reasons I given this legislation has my heartiest support.

Mr. M. CLARK: I am a victim of unfortunate circumstances. I am compelled to break the law against my own will—that is, so far as breaking the rules of this House is breaking the law. I would not have done so, and I shall do so very briefly, but that there are one or two circumstances I am bound to point out in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Charters). I have put to myself as carefully as I could the question "Do you think that you can honestly vote for giving greater facilities during the twelve months immediately ahead of us than exists at the present time for the drinking of intoxicating liquor, considering all the circumstances of the country and the serious time through which we are passing?" And I have concluded that my duty to the country compels me to answer that question in the negative. I do not think that I could honestly vote for giving any extra facilities for the use of intoxicating liquors during the first period of reconstruction; but when my hon. friend goes on to say that regret will be expressed that the Government have not gone further I take issue with him, and on very clear and distinct ground. He mentioned the province of Alberta. Now, in the province of Alberta the prohibition vote was as large as it was, very largely because of the constant use by prohibitionists of this kind of appeal—it was said to the people most distinctly: "You are voting on what is practically a measure for the abolition of the bar; you are voting to abolish the free sale of these liquors in public houses over the bar; there is no disposition to interfere with any one's right to use liquor within his own home." I know I am right about that, because that argument was used upon the platform and in private canvass, and it had a very large influence upon the vote that was given in the province of Alberta. I do not know about other provinces, and therefore I do not mention them. Now, Mr. Chairman, what position does that put the question in from the prohibitionist's point of view? Good faith would have required that we should again have taken the opinion of that province on the question of importation. The Government in my judgment were perfectly justified in doing what they did as a war measure, and it was put up to them as a war measure by those who held what I venture to call, without any desire to offend, extreme views on this question. So that under the law complete prohibition was arrived at in Alberta by influences brought to bear upon the Dominion Government—I won't say against the wishes of the province of Alberta, because the question has never been submitted by referendum to the people—but against what they voted for at the time they voted on this question for their own particular province.

For that reason I do not agree with my hon. friend that this question can remain as it is. I understood that what the extreme prohibitionists were advocating at this time was an extension by legislative enactment of the conditions established by the Order in Council, with the added view that the opinions of the entire Canadian people should be taken at the end of that time; and that would be the only fair thing

to my province, having regard to the way the vote was taken.

And, I have a shrewd suspicion that the same thing applies to other provinces. However, as I said at the outset of my remarks, which I am sorry are somewhat out of order, I am in favour of the Government's measure. I am quite sure they have approached this question with a great sense of responsibility, and I am glad to support them in speech, and if there were a vote on the question I would support them in that respect also. Having looked as carefully as I can into the question I for one should hesitate to take the responsibility of giving greater facilities, for the first twelve months after peace has been declared, for the sale of intoxicating liquors than there are at present.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I understand that the particular subject before the committee is the amendment of the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) by which he purposes to allow the manufacture in Ontario of liquor of such strength as is permitted in other provinces. Perhaps on a cursory consideration the proposal might seem reasonable, but a careful study of the question will not support such a view. If the province of Ontario says it is in favour of complete prohibition, that would imply that it is also in favour of abolishing the manufacture of liquor in that province, because it would be most inconsistent to say that you are not in favour of the sale of liquor, the consumption of which you think is not in the interests of the people, and at the same time that you are willing to have it manufactured to any strength permitted by other provinces. If the amendment of my hon. friend from London were accepted you would have breweries all over Ontario manufacturing beer to seven or eight different strengths. Perhaps British Columbia would permit 3 per cent, Alberta 5 per cent, Manitoba 6 per cent, and so on throughout the different provinces; and under the amendment beers of these varying strengths would be permitted to be manufactured in Ontario while the province itself had said that they did not think that the sale of liquor was in the public interest. I do not think that is consistent. If we in Ontario say that we want prohibition because we believe it is good for the people, how can we consistently be willing to manufacture it for sale in Quebec? On the other hand, if we pass a law permitting the sale of light wines of a certain strength—we may do that, I do not know—can we conscientiously manufacture light wines of a greater percentage of alcohol to ship elsewhere?

Sir SAM HUGHES: In temperance legislation why should we depart from the principle of equal rights and the same law for all, and special privileges for none? Why should there be a different law in Ontario in this matter from that in Quebec, and why should this Parliament legislate special laws for each province?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: This Parliament is not legislating special laws for any province. Each province may pass whatever law it chooses, and by the legislation proposed by the Government we ratify and enable such law to be put effectively into force.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not do the same with any other concern?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: We do not want to force laws upon any province which it does not wish, and as regards the liquor traffic I think the only just and equitable solution of the difficulty is to allow each province to say what it wants, and so soon as it had the courage to declare its conviction this Act would enable that province to carry its legislation effectively into force. I think the Bill as it is is the best solution of the difficulty. It is fair to the provinces and to the Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE: I said before that I was in favour of the law permitting each province to manufacture liquor for export to any other province. The Order in Council, taken on the whole, has been quite unnecessary. But as the Government gave a promise a year ago that it would be effective for a year after the war, we must endorse it under those circumstances. When we voted on prohibition in Manitoba the vote was two to one in favour of prohibition, but at that time we had the option, as every one knew, of sending to Ontario or Saskatchewan for liquor. That privilege has been cancelled by this Order in Council and has interfered greatly with the comfort of the people of Manitoba. I have heard it said dozens of times—in fact I do not recall having heard anything to the contrary in Manitoba—that if the vote were taken again under existing conditions, liquor not being allowed to be imported into Manitoba, the result would be vastly different and possibly prohibition would be defeated. We are not going to eradicate the liquor traffic suddenly by such legislation or by enforcing total pro-

hibition. Apparently, nothing has so many public enemies and at the time so many private friends as liquor, but very few of the old private friends are ready to say a word in its defence. Total prohibition can not be rapidly advanced successfully. The only member who has thoroughly understood this matter of temperance—and the question resolves itself into one of temperance versus prohibition—is the hon. President of the Privy Council. If he had had his way and were elected in Ontario he would have proceeded, as he said, to abolish the bar. That accomplished, the liquor stores would undoubtedly have been regulated and the business would have been put under Government control. This would have solved the whole difficulty slowly and gradually perhaps but effectively. The pendulum at present is swinging with terrific force and will come back again to probably the same condition that existed before the war. I remember an old Scotchman years ago having said that it was well to make haste slowly, and the same remark applies when dealing with an old established custom like this. Liquor has been drunk since the time of the flood, because we read that Noah was drunk after that great event. It is evident therefore that liquor must have been obtainable before that period. And we also read in the Scriptures that Christ converted water into wine. The Bible teaches temperance in all great things. And in any great reform such as free trade, it has not been achieved with one fell stroke and in the course of one short year. Total abstinence from liquor will not be effected with any great suddenness. What we want is a reasonable compromise. We might consider France and Italy, which have not yet tried prohibition, and benefit by the experience of other nations. England tried prohibition on a modified plan, providing shorter hours and weaker beer. But so much industrial unrest ensued that they had to resume the longer hours open and the selling of stronger beers. Would Russia not be better off to-day with Vodka galore as before the war than she is to-day tattered and torn and bleeding? I am satisfied that all this industrial unrest is the result of restraint that has been put upon the people by the war. Many men were compelled to serve, and many volunteered, and the war meant a great deal to some 55,000 homes. We had the race track abolished and that meant a great deal of pleasure to many people.

We have had fuel control, we have had food control and we have had, last but not least, prohibition, which was the straw that broke the camel's back and precipitated to a great extent the industrial unrest that we have to-day. No member of this House has had a better chance to see the workmen's homes than I have had in my experience as a practising physician in North Winnipeg. We cannot say that we have any slums but we have some homes which are by no means superb. I have watched these people at their meals in the days before prohibition came into effect. Many people who have come from European countries are fond of their beer and, as they have so little comfort in their homes, they receive a great deal of stimulus from a glass of beer at their meals and they are not so restless after their day's work. I am satisfied that the elimination of the soothing effect of alcohol suddenly has had a great deal to do with the unrest. If any member of this House, who has been an habitual smoker, has stopped it suddenly, for a week he does not feel as serene and happy as he formerly did about his home or amongst his friends. It has a soothing effect. In every country there seems to be something needed to soothe the nervous system. The soothing effect of liquor and of beer is something that will be missed if suddenly stopped. A friend of mine said: When you stop smoking, do it gradually. You have to stop it gradually just as we have to stop a morphine fiend gradually.

There has been too much fuss about this prohibition business. We all know that the liquor traffic will die a natural death. The older members of the House can remember the logging bees in Ontario to which nobody came unless there was a gallon or more of whisky guaranteed depending on the size of the bee. Thirty years ago at a medical banquet the best fellow was the one who was on top of the table when all the rest were under. That was only thirty years ago; the other instance, that of the logging bee, was probably forty years ago. We do not find anything of that kind at the threshing and logging bees amongst the farmers of Ontario at the present time. Twenty years ago we had the first dry banquet at Trinity Medical College. This is the result of the process of evolution, of gradual education, of the gradual discussion of this traffic. Yet, temperance people take to themselves all the credit for this process of evolution. Follow Darwin's theory of evolution if you wish. That is the process which has been going on.

I think it is unfortunate that the conditions as they existed in Alberta, Mani-

toba, and some of the other provinces, have been disturbed by this Order in Council which we backed up on the promise of the Government that at the end of the year it should be dropped. I think it would be well to drop it and let the provinces make the best they can of the Doherty Act, which meets all the requirements.

We have heard a lot about the harm done by alcohol. I am satisfied that tea and tobacco are doing more harm in the land to-day with regard to the mentality, the physique, and the working capacity of the people than liquor, because they are more generally used. Fifty million dollars annually is the estimate placed on the tea bill of this country at the present time. I have known people to drink as many as one hundred cups of tea in a day. In the Old Country an Englishman would never think of taking a cup of tea after a meat meal. In this country, prepare tea as carefully as you can—and in many homes it is prepared very badly—take a meat meal and pour that tea down with its tannic acid, and the food that you have taken must be tanned as brown as the hide is tanned for the leather that goes into your shoes. Why is it that in the Old Country you find that most of the people are full blooded, while in this country a great many are sallow and yellow? Because they drink beer at their meat meals and avoid tea. The greatest trouble that the doctor has in treating patients in this country is to keep up the standard of the blood. Because of the quantity of tea that is drunk, it is very hard to do that.

The Women's Christian Temperance Union and various organizations are talking loud and long against liquor, but I am sorry to say that a great many of the members of these organizations never had a drink of liquor and know nothing about it. Would I be justified in giving a lecture on digitalis, strychnine or morphine if I did not know anything about these things? Yet members of these organizations are lecturing people all over the country on the question of liquor. I am sure that I have had petitions from every Women's Christian Temperance Union in Manitoba, all drafted in the same way, from the same copy sent out from headquarters.

That brings me to a story that I heard about the master of the Rotunda hospital in Dublin. There was to be a temperance meeting in the early days of the temperance movement, and one of the gentlemen interested in it said to the master of the hospital: We want you to come on the platform. The master said: I cannot make a speech." "We do not want you to make a speech, but we want you to be there to show by your presence that you are favourable to the movement." Several of the speakers failed to respond and the chairman was forced to call on the master to make a speech. He said: "Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I quite agree that bad whisky is a very bad thing, but I am quite convinced that a little good whisky never did anybody any harm."

Prohibition, in so far as it applies to Manitoba, has brought forward an awful crop of bootleggers and stills and the people are getting bad whiskey, which, as I have said, is a very bad thing. We will admit that during the first year in which we had prohibition crime fell off eighty per cent. The police stations had to hire people to clean out the halls and so on; they were almost deserted. But to-day that condition of things is changed. Crime has increased all over the country. The excise department has stated that there are probably 500 illicit stills in Winnipeg. I think they have underestimated the number. In every large city in Canada we find the same state of things. They tried to stamp out potheen in Western Ireland for a century, but they have not accomplished very much yet. This illicit traffic, making criminals of people, is going on. I do not know what the outcome will be, but I am satisfied that if the people had liquor before the Order in Council came in they are going to have it still. There were few bootleggers until the Order in Council was brought into effect and since then there has been no end to them. The people need liquor and they are going to have it. During the influenza epidemic there was a lot of controversy as to whether whisky was beneficial in influenza or whether it was not. Those who had tasted it and knew of it were the ones who backed it up, while those who had never tasted it are most emphatic in their declarations that it was no good at all. They did not know anything about it. I might just explain how alcohol operates by saying that for many years in the treatment of tuberculosis we had given creosote in the hope of killing the germs by this means. Take a child with diphtheria, take two swabs from that child's throat, drop them into two tubes and in one of these tubes put in three or four drops of alcohol; in the tube containing the alcohol there will be no diphtheria germs in twenty-four hours, while in the other tube you will have the diphtheria germs develop.

During the influenza epidemic alcohol was the only poison with which we could flood the lungs in sufficient quantities to have any inhibitory effect upon the

growth and development of these germs. That ought to be sufficient proof that there is need for this remedy; and, although I am a temperance man, I would not want to practise medicine during such an epidemic as we had last winter without using whisky profusely upon any of my patients who were suffering from influenza. I am satisfied that the results of my treatment will compare with those of any other practitioner on this continent, and I used heaps of toxine and whisky. The people need alcohol for medicine. Last winter they had to go to a doctor for a prescription when they wanted whisky, and had to buy say Burke's Irish whisky from a drug store and pay as high as $7 a bottle. Talk about the high cost of living. Look at the hardship occasioned to the poor in Winnipeg by reason of the high charges made when they happened to need whisky for influenza. I do not want to be held responsible to say who of my patients shall have a bottle of whisky. It is unfair to the medical profession to expect them to do so, and it is unfair to the public that they should have to go to a medical man and pay one, two or three dollars, as some medical men charged, and then pay the prices charged for a bottle of whisky as was done in some drug stores. That is not the fault of the retail druggists; I know the wholesale druggists are responsible as well. In the drug business, as in all other occupations there are middlemen, and the effort was made to get more money for their work than the manufacturer received for the finished product.

We have already had a referendum in this Dominion on the question of prohibition, and as a boy I worked hard for that referendum. The vote was a very close one, but it did not do any good, and I am satisfied that no federal referendum will achieve any great benefit. I believe the situation in regard to prohibition should be left to each province to deal with. We have not had success with the law as it applied to Manitoba. I repeat that in the last influenza epidemic the wholesale druggist charged all sorts of prices, and the people were either held up by medical men for prescriptions, or else the doctors did not make any charge; it is distasteful to any conscientious member of the medical profession to be placed in such a situation as arose at that time. My suggestion, and my advice to Manitoba in a case like this, and I suppose the remedy might apply equally to other provinces, is to establish provincial liquor stores under Government control and sell the best liquor that can be procured at a reasonable price. License the head of each home, charge a nominal fee of one dollar per year for the license, and then permit the purchase of a bottle of whisky, or a case of beer per fortnight, or per month, as the provincial government may deem proper. In that way the traffic can be regulated, real temperance brought about, and the tendency to crime removed. Control of the traffic, to my mind, is the important thing. We cannot hope to bring about total prohibition because stills will go on, just as the production of wine has always taken place on this globe. My hope is that people will deal with this question sanely; that they will try and carefully control the liquor traffic and not endeavour to enforce total prohibition immediately.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I desire to ask the promoter of this measure—I do not know whether the Acting Prime Minister or the President of the Privy Council has it in charge—if native wine can be made in the province of Quebec up to the same percentage of strength as is made in Ontario under this Bill, and if the same thing can be done in British Columbia or any other province? The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) said this was not special legislation, but as I read the Bill it is special legislation with respect to province after province. What I want to know is whether wine can be manufactured in Quebec up to twelve per cent strength as in Ontario, and whether the same thing can be done in British Columbia, or vice versa?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, if the law of the province of British Columbia permits the sale of native wine for beverage purposes up to that strength. Ontario places its whole limitation upon the strength of the native wine which may be sold in the province for beverage purposes subject to the regulations that are in force.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The point I want to make is that we are legislating for one province on one line and for another province on another line, according to the whim of a particular province for the time being. My view is that we should have the same law for one province as for another; that there should be a universal statute applicable throughout the whole of Canada. This Parliament has no right to legislate according to the whim of any particular province. If you do that in the case of one

province why not do it in the case of another?

Mr. WHIDDEN (Brandon): I want to say a few words in favour of the amendments to the Order in Council embodied in this Bill as presented by the Government. In the first place I think the measure recognizes fully the rights of the respective provinces to deal with this matter. It recognizes the legislation of the provinces and also the implied sentiment and attitude of a province where full and final legislation has not been put into effect. I think that the argument raised in regard to the position of the province of Ontario is taken care of in that connection. If the people of that province change their view and express it in their ballots, the provisions contained in this Bill meets that supposed new situation. While the Bill, does not in the matter of the length of time it is to be in operation, go as far as I personally would like to see it go, I believe that in view of the strength of the position taken by the Government in relation to the situation likely to exist in the year that is before us, (as the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has already stated) we can safely allow this legislation to take care of the needs of our developing country, and then permit the people of the Dominion, either through their representatives directly, or through a provincial or Dominion referendum, to express their sentiments when the twelve months have expired. Further I think this Bill meets a situation which my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) argued for in the first part of his address, and then argued against in the last part, viz: the evolving sentiment and attitude of an intelligent people of our country with regard to a system which—I say it without any passion or prejudice but speaking historically—has grown out of barbaric instincts. Scientific authorities, not old-fashioned grandmotherly temperance agitators, or the narrow-gauge old time temperance agitator from Missouri, are responsible for that statement. I do not think it necessary for us to spend time in discussing the general principles of prohibition at the present moment. I believe that there has been placed before us a fair proposition designed to meet the situation which will exist in our country during the next year.

I would like, however, to notice one or two statements that have been made in this debate before I resume my seat. In the first place it has been asserted that the opinion of the majority of the people of Manitoba, expressed in various ways, is that prohibtion has proved to be a failure in that province.

I do not wish to deny any of the statements that my hon. friend the member for North Winnipeg makes, but I will simply cite a quotation with regard to an official claiming that there were at least five hundred stills in operation in the city of Winnipeg alone. He was asked how many stills there were, and he replied: "How many stills; how do I know; there may be two, there may be ten, there may be five hundred." That was the statement that official made. However, a false interpretation of his statement was given publicity, and it was afterwards denied by a reliable and broad-minded citizen of Winnipeg. The same line of argument, Mr. Chairman, would have disproved the validity of Great Britain's position in doing away with slavery; there was many a slave bought and many a slave sold after slavery was abolished. But we do not propose to turn back this evolutionary process in the onward movement of an increasingly intelligent humanity, because there are evidences that we all have instincts which at times claim satisfaction in ways that are not good for the majority.

I think that we do well to enact such legislation as is proposed in this Bill, bearing in mind the outspoken demand and request of a great many thoughtful people in all classes of society throughout our Dominion and in many other countries, that we march steadily forward, not interfering with personal rights, where those rights do not interfere with the development of the national life. In regard to the claim made for the use of alcohol in a medicinal way—although that is not the point before us—I think we would do well to remember that so far as the public consciousness at the present time is concerned, it is capable of changing this way or that. When we refer to other countries, let us not refer to those countries that have not yet developed such a consciousness as is capable of being developed; and when we refer to the dear Motherland, let us not forget that the Prime Minister of Great Britain—whom we delight to honour when the circumstances suit us individually—is responsible for that very, very strong, if not extreme statement of two or three years ago: That Great Britain had three enemies—Germany, Austria, and drink; and the greatest of these was drink.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Mr. Chairman, I look upon this measure as the most important that has been brought before this House, notwithstanding the vital importance of so many measures that we have dealt

with since it has been my privilege to be a member. In saying that, as a prohibitionist I feel that it is not necessary for prohibitionists to justify, or to attempt to justify, prohibition as a means of wiping out the evils of the liquor traffic. The time has come when it is difficult to find any man who would undertake even for a moment to justify the liquor traffic as we have understood it. There are, however, those who will make an effort, that can only be looked upon as the last dying kick of those who, to retain a portion of their privileges, have from time immemorial fastened their tentacles on humanity through the liquor traffic.

This measure deals purely with the matter of giving to each province that which each province by its expressed will desires. Ontario has been referred to as being, one would imagine, the only province that was effected, and that Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island have been overlooked entirely. The argument centered around the question in many respects would seem to lead to the conclusion that Quebec and Ontario were the whole Dominion of Canada. They are important parts of the Dominion beyond question, but there are also other parts of the Dominion. This legislation is for all the provinces and has no relation to one province as against the others, but is simply giving to each the right by its expressed will to have what it wishes.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would feel that it was unnecessary to go any further, because I rose chiefly to commend the Government for what they have done as a distinct step forward in bringing about what prohibitionists look to as the ultimate goal —the complete wiping out of the liquor traffic. But prohibitionists, who are at the same time sane men, do not wish this or any other Government to go faster than the people want them to, and if the people in any province desire a certain standard of liquor as a beverage I do not feel that I, living in another province, have a right to say to those people, "You must accept something that I feel I should have because I am not living in your province."

But in order that we may not be misunderstood I would like to refer to one or two things that have been said on this question, sometimes in this House and sometimes outside. I as a man who, I think, can presume to represent working men to some extent, having lived amongst them all my life, want to place the position of the working man in a proper light before this House and country. A consistent, determined effort has been made to represent the working men of Canada as being in favour of the liquor traffic. I have been, as I believe has every other member of this House, flooded with petitions, all designed to lead us to the conclusion that the working men were not satisfied with what the Government was doing along the lines of prohibition and the curtailment of the liquor traffic. I am not going to question for one moment the bona fides of those who were circulating these petitions nor am I going to question the bona fides of the statement made in so far as they were representing the views of the individuals who were making them. But I am going to question the right of these men to represent the working men of Canada. I repeat, I have lived my whole life among working men, and I think I know something of their sentiments. I am going to give the House an idea of the efforts made to line up our working men and put them in a false position before the country in relation to the liquor traffic.

In doing that, I will read to the House some of the things that were said to organized bodies of workingmen from one end of the country to the other in an effort to have them pass resolutions in their organizations in support of the attempt to induce the Government to continue the liquor traffic. Some organization—I am not going to give my opinion as to what organization it was—undertook a propaganda from one end of the country to the other amongst organized labour, and that propaganda must have cost at least more than $100,000. I do not think the workingmen provided the money, but that is aside from the question. This is the first letter that was sent out to every body of organized labour in Canada. I will read just one or two extracts because the correspondence is too long to weary the Committee with:

> So that you will have a complete record of the actual proceedings, we are enclosing a copy of the resolution referred to.
>
> Experience has taught that resolutions do not meet their full value unless active propaganda is systematically employed to enforce them.
>
> We are also enclosing a resolution and appeal, together with a stamped envelope, which we urgently request your Local to adopt at the very earliest possible moment. Kindly return to us at your earliest convenience after your next regular meeting this resolution with the signature of your secretary and the seal of the Local attached.

I want the Committee to notice particularly the next paragraph:

The purpose of this campaign is self-preservation. We desire above all things to keep our organization intact, and at the same time to lend our aid and assistance in fulfilling the expressed will of the workers as declared at the convention, who have asked for the privilege of enjoying a palatable and nutritious beverage which is non-intoxicating.

This statement was sent out by the organization behind this movement and it is the organization responsible for the resolutions which have been misused to represent the position of organized labour, that all that was being asked for was a non-intoxicating beverage. These resolutions were sent to every lodge or division of every one of the bodies of organized labour in the railway service in the Dominion of Canada. The first circular and first resolution sent out did not secure a single reply from any one of those organizations. That was followed up by another letter marked "confidential" and stating:

You have received communications in regard to our campaign for permitting the manufacture of a palatable, temperance beverage—

Take note of the word "temperance."

—to contain less alcohol than is permitted in the manufacture of beer in the prohibition state of Maine.

We fully realize that your constitution may not permit you to sign the resolution as such, and it is far from our purpose, therefore, to ask you to violate any of your rules and regulations. If your sympathies are with us, if you feel that we are working along conservative, safe and sane lines, we should be very glad indeed, and we would highly appreciate if you would return the resolution to us, merely writing on its face that your constitution will not permit you to sign it, but that you give us your moral support and good will.

And so on and so on. Again that letter was sent to every one of those bodies from one end of the country to the other and with identically the same result—not a single answer from any one of the organized bodies of railway workers in Canada. Not satisfied with the progress they were making, after the lapse of a month, they sent out another letter marked "private and confidential" and beginning "Dear Sir and Brother." This time they were getting affectionate in their appeals to the workingmen of Canada in order to get their support for the liquor traffic. This letter reads:

We have been hourly expecting the resolution which we forwarded to you for adoption by your local.

We realize that only very unlooked-for circumstances of some kind would interfere with your co-operation. We have been so successful in our campaign that our ambition now is to make this appeal practically unanimous. With a little assistance and energy from you, this can be accomplished.

Please do not entrust this important matter to the mails.

Just as soon as your Local has adopted this resolution, please wire it direct to us at our expense.

We are again enclosing you copy of the resolution which we desire you to use.

Again thanking you for any assistance that you might give us, we beg to remain, etc.

This third appeal, couched in the language that I have just read, met with the same result as the other two—not one response. I have stated in this House before to-day that there is nothing in my life that I am more proud of than my association with the railwaymen of this country. I never was so proud of them as I was when I learned the result of these insidious appeals to organized bodies of labour men in the railway service of this country, that result being that not a single "local" as these bodies are termed approved the effort that was being made to line up organized labour with the liquor traffic.

While dealing with that, I should like to refer to another matter in connection with it just in order that hon. members in contemplating the possibilities of future legislation regarding the liquor traffic in Canada may take it into their consideration. The statutory law of Canada makes it a criminal offence for a man in the train service of this country anywhere, not only to drink intoxicating liquor, but to be found spending his time in one of the places where this stuff is sold. These so-called beer and wine saloons, that are a possibility under some of the conditions that are contemplated in this House, are of such a nature that if a man in the train service of this country is found frequenting any one of them, he can be haled before the court and prosecuted criminally. That may be too drastic legislation, and perhaps it is, but I am going to give the Committee one or two things to think about before hon. members make up their minds that it is. The men in the train service of this country are not going to be discriminated against very much longer. They have been discriminated against in the enactment of these laws; they have been set apart as a special class. It has been said to them: You are not going to be permitted to enjoy the conditions that the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Blake) looks upon as so very necessary for the well-being of the workingman; we will separate you as a special class. When this question is finally put before the Canadian people to determine, the railwaymen are going to demand that they stand on the same ground as every other man in this country. I would ask the hon. member for

Winnipeg North or any other hon. member in this Committee how he would like to go to bed in a pullman car going out of the city of Ottawa to-night with the knowledge that the man standing on the right hand side of that locomotive peering out into the night as he handled the train across the continent, had sitting beside him a jar of this stuff that the hon. member seems to think is so very necessary in order that the workingmen may be in a position to do their work, that, as he says, they may be full-blooded, that they may have the energy necessary to do these things. Or, I would like to ask any hon. member how he would feel if he knew that the train despatcher, in the still hours of the morning between one and five o'clock, had sitting beside him, instead of a pail of tea (which the hon. member (Mr. Blake) condemns so vigorously) a pail of lager beer. Would he feel that that man's intellect was so very much clearer, as the result of the imbibing of that kind of a beverage to maintain his vitality as he performed the most arduous kind of work any man could be called upon to perform?

The very reason why we have these drastic laws in the train service of this country is because there is not a man in this House or out of it with an ounce of common sense who does not recognize that the lives of the travelling public would be at stake but for these very laws. The common sense of the men themselves, recognizing that truth, has made them say, in the constitution of every single organization of railway employees in this country, that a man cannot be a member of any one of those organizations if he indulges in the use of intoxicating liquors to any extent whatever. If the Canadian people, when this question is directly before them for the first time, should decide against prohibition, railroad men are going to insist upon standing on their present ground, because if one of their members happens to come under the influence of drink they do not want to be brought before the criminal courts of this country, as I have known railway men to be brought, on the charge of being under the influence.

Let me say one word—and this brings me to the amendment moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Cronyn)—with reference to the manufacturing within a province of something that the province itself says should not be sold within its borders. I can scarcely conceive of a more immoral proposition being put before a body of intelligent men and the people of this country than to suggest that the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, which say, "We do not believe there should be imported into or manufactured in our province a liquor above a certain strength, because we do not believe our people should drink it," should, for the sake of financial gain, declare, "We are going to manufacture the stuff that we say is not fit for our own people to drink, and sell it outside of the province, where it will be accepted." I can hardly conceive of a more immoral proposition from any source whatever, than that there should be manufactured within a province something that the province emphatically states is not fit for its own people to use, whether it is liquor or anything else.

Let me add a word or two with regard to the workingman, because after all it is the workingman who is used as the argument in the effort to continue the liquor traffic in this country. I know workingmen's homes, not one, but by the score, into which the light of heaven itself has come as the result of the measure of restriction we have had in this country already. I can count workingmen by the thousand who were kept down by liquor when the liquor traffic held sway who so long as their money lasted were good fellows, but as soon as their money was gone were kicked out on the street like so many dogs. That is how the liquor traffic treats the workingman.

I should like to give the House just one instance. In 1912 I had in my employ a man from a town many miles from Ottawa, and the only reason he was back in the lumber woods of Northern Ontario was because he could not trust himself in places where liquor was sold. On a certain morning I received a telegram that this man's wife was dangerously ill. I immediately despatched a man to the camp in which he was working, to get him out as quickly as possible. He got out to the town in which I lived, and in which there were two open bar-rooms, about two hours before the train left for his home town. He had sufficient money to take him home and look after his anticipated needs there, and left my office one hour and forty minutes before his train left. The following morning I got a wire asking that the man come quickly as his wife was dying. I wired that he had gone the day before and should be at home by that time. The next morning I got another wire, "Where is so and so? His wife has only a few hours to live." I put the case in the hands of the provincial police to locate the man. They traced up and down the line, but could find no sign of him. The very next morning I got

a wire that his wife was dead, and on the following day a policeman found the man in the snakeroom of one of the hotels in the little town of Chapleau where I live. The climax came in June 1916, when that man staggered out of a bar-room in the city of Hull at ten o'clock at night, and the next morning his body was found against a boom of logs near Booth's mills. That is what the liquor traffic has done for the workingman, and that is why the workingman turns a deaf ear to the appeals of the liquor traffic, that he should get behind it and give it his support. Never was I so proud of my association with the railway men of this country when I learned that notwithstanding these three appeals not one single "local," as they are called, in Canada gave them their support.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON: I should not like to remain silent while this Bill is passing through the Committee. If the case which the hon. member for East Algoma has just recited were the only one, I believe it would be a sufficient justification for the wiping out of the liquor traffic the world over; but the history of Canada, the history of the continent, nay, the history of the whole world affords hundreds of thousands of if not millions of such instances. History is weighted down with tragic stories of that kind. However, I do not wish to deal with the question from that standpoint.

The province of Manitoba passed its present Temperance Act about three years ago and it came into effect on the first of June, 1916. As a newspaperman of forty years 'experience, and as a public man, I want to bear testimony on this great issue, and as a Winnipeg editor, I want to tell of the success of the temperance legislation in that province. The almost complete extinction of the liquor traffic in Manitoba has, in my judgment, been perhaps the most profound blessing that has ever been conferred upon the people of that province. I want to dissent from the position and the views enunciated by my hon. friends from North and Centre Winnipeg. As they are both my personal friends, I differ from them in all kindness and with all moderation. I have talked this matter over with all classes of people. I have often discussed it with many old topers in the city of Winnipeg who were tottering to the grave as a result of drink. These unfortunates voted against prohibition when it was submitted to the people of the province of Manitoba, and invariably they have borne testimony to the view that while they voted against prohibition they believed it was a godsend to the country and that so far as they were personally concerned prohibition was the best thing that had ever happened. I never found one dissentient voice on this question. Could I bring stronger evidence to bear of the value of prohibition in Manitoba than to tell the Committee that crime in that province was reduced to the extent of 80 per cent by virtue of the adoption of prohibition? We had six jails in Manitoba, and after prohibition there was a time when it looked as if the entire six would have to be closed. Three of them have been closed altogether, and the other three have scarcely sufficient inmates to warrant their being kept open. Is that not as strong testimony as could be submitted in favour of prohibition? I believe the people of Manitoba are overwhelmingly in favour of prohibition, and I think that their view generally is that they would like to see total prohibition for the Dominion of Canada. And when the speech from the Throne announced, as I think it did, that a plebiscite would be taken for the entire Dominion — the Acting Prime Minister shakes his head, and I accept the correction. The impression I had was that a plebiscite would be taken, but it appears to be erroneous. However, it is my opinion that it would be a good thing if we could have Dominion-wide prohibition. I suppose the federal authority is limited by the constitution, and the Dominion Parliament can only go as far as the British North America Act constitutionally enables it to go. That being the position, I am satisfied that the Order in Council was a good thing. After our Prohibition Act was passed in 1916, as we could not prohibit the manufacture and import of liquor, the result was that a string of liquor houses at such places as Kenora, Keewatin and Fort Frances, were established. On the other hand there were fifty-nine liquor houses established in Manitoba for the purpose of supplying liquor to Saskatchewan and Alberta. While they could not sell it in Manitoba they could export it to these provinces. Of these houses about thirty-nine were run by men of alien origin. I think that is creditable, at least to the Anglo-Saxon. In my judgment the bar should never again be allowed to get a footing in this country. As a newspaper man, and as one who has seen a great deal of life in the city of Winnipeg, almost since its incorporation as a city, I have watched the growth of these

numerous and well patronized bars and have seen their extending influence as the years went by. Little bars ten feet long extended to fifteen, twenty, and thirty and forty feet, until finally, before this Act was passed, we had a large number of circular bars taking up all available space possible in the saloons. I have taken many a visitor from the East to witness the spectacle in these bars at five or six o'clock in the afternoon as workers were on their way from work. We saw hundreds, sometimes many hundreds, at one bar alone, almost five deep, clamouring for liquor and pouring their coins over the counter. As a result of the passing of the prohibition measure in Manitoba the money that went over the counters of the bars by incalculable sums every year immediately began to filter over the counters of the retail merchants' stores, and the sale of boots and shoes and women's and children's clothing enormously increased. I am perfectly sure that if any independent man went into Winnipeg to find out for himself what the benefits of prohibition have been he could not find one independent man or woman—and the women have a great interest in this matter, because they are deeply interested in the liquor traffic—who would not bear eloquent and fervent testimony to the substantial advantage of prohibition. It always seemed to me that when the vote was extended to women the question of prohibition was solved. In Manitoba the men carried the plebiscite by a vast majority of two or three to one, and when we had the accession, as we have had since, of women to the ranks of those who exercise the franchise, those of us who believe in prohibition as a godsend to the people, felt that the question was permanently settled so far as Manitoba at least was concerned. The franchise is being extended to women in all the provinces, and we now have this great army of women, who, I think, are almost unanimously in favour of prohibition. And well might the women be in favour of it, for after all they are among the chief sufferers. It is they and their children who are subjected to the brutalities of drunken husbands, and who are deprived of the necessaries of life, because the money which should go to support and make them happy has been thrown over the bars. We know how rich and affluent the saloon keepers and hotel keepers as a class generally became in past years as a result of the liquor traffic. It is generally the saloon keeper who has been able to drive about with a span of fast horses, wearing diamonds and fur coats, and living on the fat of the land. It is no wonder that they desire to get the thin end of the wedge in again.

I want to say a word in regard to the administration of the law in Manitoba. It is true my good friend the hon. member for North Winnipeg criticised it, and said that since its enactment we have had boot-legging and illicit stills and all that sort of thing. Would the hon. member suggest that if we abolished the law against murder we would have fewer murders, because that is the logical sequence of his argument? Certainly not. The fact that crime has been reduced by eighty per cent in Manitoba absolutely proves the value of prohibition. The Liquor Act in Manitoba has been and is being well enforced. At the head of the License Department is a gentleman of splendid character, of known and tried integrity, and the staff of officials who second his efforts have done thir level best to stamp out the evil. Here and there an illicit still may be found, but that will always exist. In Ireland, although it is contrary to law, they have had illicit stills for centuries. I suppose the same is true of Scotland, and I have no doubt that similar conditions exist all over the country. You cannot absolutely wipe that out, but if the law is as well enforced as it can be—and I can bear testimony to the fact that it is in Manitoba—we have reached an almost ideal condition of affairs with regard to the enforcement of prohibitory liquor law. Speaking, as I believe, for the vast majority of the people of Manitoba, we commend every movement that this Federal Government may take to enable us to continue, and if possible strengthen, prohibition in that province. Under this proposed Act I take it that the importation and manufacture of liquor can be prohibited in Manitoba. Is that correct? Yes; the Acting Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council nod their heads. That being the fact, so far as Manitoba is concerned, we may assume so long as the populace itself is sound on the issue that we are safe in that regard. I have no desire to refer to the amendment of the hon. member for London. It has been criticised and it will be unnecessary for me to say anything on that point. But as the representative of a Manitoba constituency, I want to reiterate the statement that the people of that province look to this Government to assist in every way to make prohibition effective, and would be profoundly disappointed if every available measure were not taken by the Government to secure

that enforcement. If I could be assured that any legislation that might be passed here, or any additional position which the Government could take would make prohibition more effective in Manitoba than it will be under this proposed law, then I am prepared to advocate it. I am one of those who, from long experience and close observation of this traffic, firmly believes that alcohol has been the greatest curse that has ever fallen upon humanity.

Mr. EULER: Was the Manitoba legislation enacted after a plebiscite had been taken or was there a plebiscite taken at all?

Mr. RICHARDSON: It was after a plebiscite. Perhaps the President of the Privy Council could answer that.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) has answered it. It was enacted after a vote of the people.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, after a plebiscite had been taken. It was carried by two or three to one.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL: I think the Committee will pardon me for saying that I listened with a good deal of satisfaction this afternoon to the expressions of appreciation and approval of the policy of the abolition of the bar uttered on both sides of the House. I mention this because it indicates the rapid growth of sentiment in all sections of Canada on the important question now under consideration. Not only have there been expressions in the House and elsewhere, but I notice that in a statement issued by the distillers of Canada and circulated among members of the House they set out:

> It was felt that the public bar with its ever-ready invitation to enter, its customs of "treating," its pernicious record of political activity, and in too many cases its dubious management, could only be dealt with by extinction.

The distillers go further and put themselves on record as being absolutely opposed to any legislation which has for its object, directly or indirectly, the restoration of the public drinking bar. When I recall the attitude, so recently as 1914, of the gentlemen who are responsible for the publication and distribution of that pamphlet, and their very active and energetic hostility to the proposal to abolish the bar, I feel justified in accepting this change of attitude as an indication of the growth of public sentiment on this question. The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) has intimated that he thinks that the closing of the public bar is the right policy, and that in this proposed legislation we should not go further. I judge that the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) shares the same view, and that he thinks that in the Order in Council which we are seeking to ratify we are going beyond what should be considered in the public interest.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think the hon. member for North Waterloo expressed his opinion one way or the other on the prohibition question from my recollection of what he said.

Mr. ROWELL: He very carefully avoided committing himself, but I think the statement I have made is a fair inference from what he did say. But while that policy may have been a sound and wise policy in 1914, I venture to think that the war radically changed the situation in all the provinces of Canada, and public sentiment throughout Canada demanded more advanced action than the abolition of the bar. That has been shown by the action which the various provinces have taken in legislating on this question. Wherever it has been submitted to a vote of the people, the vote has been overwhelmingly in support of a proposal which went much further than simply the abolition of the bar. As I recall the matter, the province of Saskatchewan passed legislation for abolishing the bar and putting the sale of intoxicating liquor in shops under government control. That continued for one year. Then the Government submitted to the electors of the province the question of whether the sale in shops should continue, or whether it should be abolished. The result was a decisive vote of the people in favour of abolishing the sale in shops also. The question was submitted in Alberta, as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has stated, and the vote included the prohibition of the sale both over the bar and in shops, as the terms of the Alberta Act indicates. That was also the case in the province of British Columbia, in the province of Manitoba, in the province of New Brunswick, and in the province of Quebec in the legislation passed there a year ago. Nova Scotia was dry before the war, except the city of Halifax, and legislation was introduced to make the city of Halifax dry also. Prince Edward Island was likewise dry before the war. That was the general situation. Now

the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) has suggested that there is really no evidence that the province of Ontario is in favour of legislation as advanced as that now in force in Ontario and that we should not proceed with this legislation at the present time, but should defer action until an expression of the people is taken in Ontario this fall. May I say that I entirely dissent from the hon. gentleman's conclusion that the people of Ontario have not evidenced a desire in favour of the legislation in force in that province at the present time. The hon. member from Peel (Mr. Charters) has already pointed out the attitude of Ontario on this question as expressed in the votes which have been given in the province from time to time when the matter was submitted to a vote of the whole people. When the legislation was introduced by the Government of Ontario in 1916 I was a member of the legislature and have an intimate knowledge of all the discussions that took place upon it. But while I concede there was some differences of opinion in the House on the question, some members not being wholly in favour of the legislation, yet the Bill passed the House without one dissenting vote. I do not think there could be legislation as important and radical as that introduced into Ontario in 1916, and no vote against it unless public sentiment strongly supported the legislation.

Mr. EULER: How would the minister interpret the vote given by the people in the province of Ontario on the issue that was raised by the hon. gentleman himself in the election of 1914?

Mr. ROWELL: I think the best interpretation to put upon it is the one I put upon it at the time.

Mr. EULER: What was that?

Mr. ROWELL: That was that I would continue to advocate the policy until the cause triumphed.

Mr. EULER: That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. ROWELL: The interpretation I put upon the vote at the time was this: The total vote given in the province of Ontario—I am speaking now from recollection—was fifty-two and a half per cent in favour of the Government or the Government candidates. The vote in favour of the Opposition or in opposition to Government candidates was forty-seven and a half per cent. The popular vote was not fully reflected in the membership in the House, as the popular vote seldom is on any occasion, and there were other factors entering into the contest, as there is in every political contest. You cannot in an election between political parties have any issue decided wholly on its merits. In the vote referred to other questions entered in; all I can say is that to me it was not discouraging. The night after the election I announced that the policy would be continued; and I may be pardoned for saying I am gratified to-day that the policy has been accepted in all the provinces of Canada by men of both political parties. In reference to the situation in Ontario I have one further remark to make, and I make this upon the basis of a statement by the Prime Minister of the province. Speaking at the last session of the Legislature on the matter—Sir William Hearst stated that if the men opposed to the legislation, the men engaged in the trade, had desired a vote in the year 1916, he would have given it. I know that to be the case: If the men opposed to the legislation which was introduced by Sir William Hearst in the Legislature of Ontario in 1916 had desired that it should be submitted to a vote of the electors before it came into force on the 1st of September of that year, he would have been quite prepared to have had the question submitted. But those who were opposed to the legislation recognized that it would simply be absolutely hopeless for them to successfully oppose it before the people. The sentiment of Ontario was so unanimously in favour of the proposal of Sir William Hearst, that those opposed to the legislation would not challenge a vote upon it; and one of the grounds of complaint, and I think quite just complaint, on the part of Sir William Hearst, was that after he had refrained from giving a vote because these people did not want it, he should have been criticised for putting the legislation into force without a vote. Now since that time a vote has been given to the women of the province. There is not an hon. member coming from Ontario, if he considers the question of the women's vote in that province, who will not frankly admit that if you take a vote of the men, plus the vote of the women, there would be a most overwhelming preponderance of opinion in favour of this legislation. Others may not think the vote will be so overwhelming, but there will be an opportunity of ascertaining that when the vote takes place next fall. There is no use hazarding a prediction on the point; but I am persuaded myself that

the vote in Ontario on all the questions submitted will be decisively in the one direction; the people of Ontario will answer all the questions submitted to them in the negative. The position therefore when the Dominion Order in Council prohibiting the manufacture of intoxicating liquor and interprovincial trade in it was passed, was this: All the provinces of Canada had enacted legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor within their own boundaries, and the law had gone into force in all the provinces save Quebec, where it was to become effective on the 1st of May of the present year. When the Order in Council was passed the Government believed that it had the power to pass the necessary legislation to continue during the war and for the period of one year thereafter. Orders in Council passed by the Imperial Government, under somewhat similar legislation, were made to continue during the war and for certain periods after the war. The great majority of the Orders in Council passed by the Government of this country under the War Measures Act were made to continue during the war and for a certain period thereafter. But more recently the advice of the law officers of the Crown in Great Britain, and of the committee of lawyers of the British House of Commons appointed to look into the matter, has been to the effect that the legislation would end when the war came to an end—that is when peace was officially proclaimed. The Department of Justice concurs in this opinion and this legislation has therefore become necessary.

The object of the present legislation is simply to give effect to the intention and policy of the Government, as embodied in the Order in Council, to implement what they thought at the time they had the power to do, but which appears now to be doubtful; that is, to continue this legislation for the period of one year after the war.

The Order in Council as it stands prohibits the importation, manufacture and interprovincial transportation of intoxicating liquors throughout the whole Dominion for the remainder of the period of the war and for one year thereafter. Intoxicating liquor is defined in the Order in Council as any liquor or beverage containing more than two and one-half per cent proof spirits. It is quite true, as was stated by the hon. member for London, that deputations waited upon the Government urging that a change should be made in the definition of the alcoholic content, and that instead of two and one-half per cent proof spirits it should be two and one-half per cent alcohol. The Government was not able to see its way clear to grant that request. The Government did not itself fix two and one-half per cent proof spirits as the definition of what constituted intoxicating liquor; it found that definition already embodied in the legislation of almost all the provinces. It was the definition of intoxicating liquor in Quebec, in Ontario, and, I think, in nearly all the western provinces. Two provinces had a definition covering even a lower alcoholic content, one, I think, being two per cent proof spirits and the other something less; but no province had higher than two and one-half per cent proof spirits as the definition of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. McMASTER: As the minister is an authority on these matters, will he explain the exact difference between proof spirits and alcoholic weight?

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend had been in the House the other afternoon when this was very carefully and fully explained he would have had the information, and I must refer him to the Hansard statement on the difference, which is fully set forth there. Practically proof spirit is about one-half the alcoholic content.

Mr. McMASTER: The alcoholic content by weight?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. In other words, 2½ per cent alcoholic content would be approximately 5 per cent proof spirits. If the Government had undertaken to change the definition of the alcoholic content as was requested at one time, and had undertaken to say that liquor containing that alcoholic content might be sold in any part of Canada, it would have been over-riding provincial legislation. For while the Federal Parliament has power to deal with the sale of intoxicating liquors, if we undertook to do so the Federal legislation would supersede the provincial legislation. Therefore the Government in its legislation has carefully guarded against interfering in any way with the provincial legislation on the question of sale; we have dealt with importation, manufacture and interprovincial trade and transportation.

Before passing to a discussion of the amendment of my hon. friend, may I say a word or two more with reference to the action of the Federal Government in the matter? My hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and one or two other

members of the House have intimated that they believe the action of the Government taken as a war measure was in the public interest and met with public approval. I want to assure hon. members, and I say this after consulting with the Prime Minister's office, that on no piece of legislation introduced by the Prime Minister has he received so many expressions of public approval, from all sections of the country, as he received in connection with this Order in Council.

As to the attitude of the provinces in connection with this question, my hon. friend from London—and he presented the view very clearly, very concisely, and very effectively from his standpoint—intimated that our legislation was not supplementary to, but was superseding the provincial legislation. He quoted various sections of the Ontario Act, under which he pointed out that import and export and manufacture, under certain conditions, and interprovincial shipment were expressly permitted, and therefore he argued the Order in Council supersedes rather than supplements the provincial legislation. I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee and of my hon. friend from London to this important consideration. The various provincial statutes dealing with the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor within the province are almost all founded upon the Macdonald Act of Manitoba; there may be a few exceptions, but that is the basis of the provincial legislation dealing with the suppression of the sale of intoxicating liquor in most of the provinces. When that Act was passed many years ago the question of the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament and the jurisdiction of the provincial parliaments on this important matter was not clearly defined. There was grave doubt as to just how far the jurisdiction of the provinces went. When the Macdonald Act was passed special provisions were inserted in it to guard against its being held that the Act was unconstitutional in that it entrenched on the power of the Federal Parliament. So that provision was expressly made in the Macdonald Act that it should not interfere with the export, import, interprovincial trade and similar matters to which my hon. friend referred. That Act ran the gauntlet of all the courts and was declared by the Privy Council to be constitutional. Because it had been so declared to be constitutional, and because thereafter no question could be raised in the courts as to its validity, the majority of the provinces, when they came to frame legislation dealing with the matter, followed the Macdonald Act. I recall the discussion in the Ontario Legislature when this Bill was up in 1916 and these very clauses were under consideration. It was urged by some hon. members that Ontario, in view of more recent decisions of the Privy Council, had power to go further; that they could further limit the traffic in intoxicating liquors than they had done under the provisions of the Macdonald Act. I also well remember the answer made by the Hon. Mr. Hanna, who was in charge of the Bill, that it was much better to be on safe ground than on doubtful ground, and the Government considered it wiser in the public interest to keep within the limits of an Act which had already been declared by the Privy Council to be constitutional, even although it did not go so far as some might like to see it, than to run the risk of the Act being declared invalid by going beyond those limits. That is the reason why those provisions appear in the Ontario Act and in nearly all the other Acts passed by the other provincial governments. The reason is the desire of the province to make sure of the validity of its legislation by expressly providing that its legislation shall not interfere with matters which were considered to be within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, namely, matters relating to export, import, interprovincial trade, interprovincial transportation.

What conditions developed under the operation of the provincial Acts? Exactly the condition described by the hon. member for Springfield. Liquor stores could not be established in Winnipeg to sell liquor to the people of Manitoba, but a large number of liquor stores were established at Kenora to sell liquor to the people of Manitoba. Liquor stores were established at Montreal to sell liquor to the people of Ontario, and liquor stores were established in Winnipeg to sell liquor to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Fifty-one stores.

Mr. ROWELL: Representations were made to the Government that this was not in the public interest; that it was militating against the efficiency of existing legislation and preventing it from having the full effect which was desired. I am quite prepared to concede that many arguments were made by many people in favour of provincial enactments along the line of what the hon. member for Red Deer stated, and I thought his statement of the general position was very reasonable. The Government, having decided that this legislation was in the public interest and was needed to supplement the legislation of the provincial gov-

ernments, passed this Order in Council, and among the expressions of public opinion on the matter, I think none is more worthy of the serious attention of hon. members and of the country than the statements of the premiers of many of the provinces who expressed themselves on the subject, either in communications to the Prime Minister or in the form of interviews given to the press at the time. The Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), when he moved the resolution, read to the House a copy of a telegram from Sir William Hearst, Premier of Ontario, to Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, in reference to the matter. Let me give the Committee a statement made by the Premier of Manitoba in reference to the question:

In reference to the recent order passed by the Dominion Government concerning the control of the liquor traffic, it is regarded as very satisfactory to the Provincial Government rendering more effective the Manitoba Temperance Act. It applies the missing link, and will, I believe, be acceptable to the great majority of the people of the province.

I point that out as indicating that the provincial government recognized that our legislation was not supplanting theirs, but supplementing theirs, was providing the missing link, which they themselves had not the power, as they understood the situation, to provide. What was the view of the Premier of Saskatchewan on this matter, as stated at that time?

The announcement that the Dominion Government, by Order in Council under the War Measures Act, has determined that Canada on April first next will be under a complete prohibitory law has been received with general approval by the people of Saskatchewan. Almost all the provinces of Canada have now in force prohibitory laws which go as far as their constitutions will permit, but it was necessary for the Dominion to supplement the legislation by prohibiting the importation into Canada and by stopping trade in liquor between the provinces. The beneficial effects of our local prohibition law have been of such a character as to lead to the conclusion that Dominion wide prohibition will better economic conditions, and will also decrease waste, and will so increase the efficiency of the nation that we will be assured of still greater efforts being put forth to see that Canada performs her full duty in the world's great crisis.

I desire to call the attention of the committee particularly to this sentence:

It was necessary for the Dominion to supplement the legislation by prohibiting the importation into Canada and by stopping trade in liquor between the provinces.

Then the Premier of Alberta made this statement:

Aside from the national approval of any measure tending towards the conservation of all food products for strictly war purposes, the Dominion Order in Council prohibiting the transportation of liquor into any part of Canada wherein the sale is now illegal is the legal complement to the enforcing of the will of the people of this province as exemplified by the overwhelming majority given on the Alberta referendum.

Mr. M. CLARK: What is the date of that?

Mr. ROWELL: Shortly after the Order in Council was passed. I have not the exact date, and I am not sure whether that was an interview given to the press, or a telegram sent to the Prime Minister of Canada, but it was published, I think, in January, 1918, or the last week of December, 1917. I am not sure which.

Mr. M. CLARK: I am sure the minister does not want to mislead the Committee and is not doing so as to the opinion in Alberta, but is he aware that the Attorney General of Alberta stated in the Legislative Assembly quite recently that at this time eighty per cent of the people of the province are law-breakers? They are not breaking the law of the province as they are not drinking over the bar because they cannot do that, but, according to the statement of the Attorney General, they are law-breakers as far as the Order in Council is concerned. Does the minister know the opinion of the Alberta Government as to the matter now?

Mr. ROWELL: I have had no conversation with the Premier of Alberta on this matter since July or August of 1918, when I understood him to be wholly favourable to it. The situation may be quite as my hon. friend has stated, although I was not aware that the Attorney General of Alberta had made such a statement in the legislature.

Mr. M. CLARK: I do not want to misrepresent my province; indeed, I have no means of doing so. I think there is a very strong sentiment in the province still, but the minister will admit that that was a strong statement also by the Attorney General of the province who has in charge the liquor business within the province.

Mr. ROWELL: It certainly is a strong statement upon which I am not in a position to express an opinion as I have no personal knowledge of the matter. The then Premier of British Columbia, Mr. Brewster, made this statement:

Apart from sentimental temperance considerations, I regard the prohibition order as wisest possible enactment for war period and entirely in conformity with pledges of Union

Government to introduce all possible measures affecting the economic situation. The direct and indirect saving will enable the Dominion to better bear war burdens and, at the same time, materially conserve the country's manpower.

I might go on showing the general trend of public sentiment throughout Canada at the time by reading similar expressions of opinions from other influential persons and religious bodies. I shall not do so. I have quoted these particularly to show that the legislation we are proposing does not supplant, but, in the language of the premiers themselves, supplements their legislation of the provinces and gives effect to it in a way that at the time at least, they thought very desirable.

My hon. friend from London also referred to the large petition which had been sent to members of the House from various labour organizations in reference to changing the alcoholic content which should be deemed intoxicating. My hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) has already dealt with one aspect of that matter, and it is not my intention to go into it. I would say, however, that one of these deputations, representing the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, indicated that they would be satisfied if the Government left it to the provinces to settle the question of the alcoholic content, just as is being done by the amendment to the Order in Council. So that, even if there are sections of labour that do not agree with the Order in Council as originally framed, I believe that the Order in Council as now framed, meets their views. Even as the Order in Council was originally framed, it met with the approval of that very large and influential body of labour, the organizations of railway employees, who waited upon the Government to present their recommendations against any change and in support of the Order in Council as it then stood. My recollection is that the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council, the Alberta Federation of Labour, and I think the British Columbia Federation of Labour, voted against the proposal to change the alcoholic content. A very serious strike took place in Winnipeg last year, and the strike committee made a public statement in reference to prohibition which was cabled to New Zealand for use in labour organizations there, in view of the vote which was being taken in New Zealand on prohibition. I refer to this statement because it has a very direct bearing on the present situation. They stated that one of the most important and satisfactory features in connection with the strike was the maintenance of law and order in the city of Winnipeg during the whole period of the strike. And that this would not have been possible if the bars had been open.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What would have been the situation in Winnipeg to-day if the bars had been open?

Mr. ROWELL: I ask hon. members to stop and think what would be the situation in Winnipeg to-day, with 30,000 men on strike, and feeling running high as it naturally does when the situation is so critical, if the open sale of liquor were permitted in that city? I ask further, what would be the situation in Winnipeg to-day if large quantities of liquor were stored there and could be broken into? I venture to think that if this measure was important during the period of the war, it is vastly more important during the year that lies immediately ahead of us. We must recognize that we are passing through a very critical time, that there is a widespread feeling of unrest, that men must keep their heads level and their minds clear. We must recognize that the use of intoxicating liquor under existing conditions, or the granting of facilities for the securing of it, might have very disastrous results where large companies of men are on strike and feeling is running high in consequence.

The present Bill validates the existing Order in Council subject to certain exceptions which I shall mention. The existing Order in Council is to continue in force for the duration of the war and for one year thereafter. It has been modified, and modified only—as the Acting Prime Minister has pointed out,—to give effect to the change in the situation that has developed since the Order in Council was passed, and indeed, since the speech from the Throne was delivered. In the speech from the Throne the Government promised to introduce legislation to validate the Order in Council. At that time all the provinces had legislation prohibiting the sale of liquor. Since then the province of Quebec, by a vote of the people, has decided to permit the sale of beer containing 2·51 alcoholic content, and light wines. The province of Ontario has also passed legislation to take a vote on the same question, and it has been suggested—I do not know whether the suggestion has been carried out or not—that some other provinces are preparing to take a similar vote.

The effect of the amendment is simply this: That if any province decided by a vote of its people to permit the sale within that

province of any class of alcoholic liquors, then automatically the manufacture and transportation of such liquor is permitted in that province. Quebec has already decided to permit the sale under certain conditions. Automatically, under this legislation, those liquors may be manufactured within that province. If Ontario, when the time comes, should vote to permit the sale of beers of a limited alcoholic content, then the manufacture of those beers in Ontario may commence the moment the sale commences. Automatically, the Order in Council applies. It is not a question of discriminating between the provinces, because exactly the same principle applies with reference to every province of the Dominion.

The amendment of my hon. friend from London is to this effect: That although the province of Ontario does not permit the sale of beer of a higher alcoholic content that two and a half per cent proof spirits, if we should permit the manufacture in Ontario of beer containing a higher alcoholic content, namely, whatever alcoholic content might be sold in any other province it would mean, if his amendment prevailed, the manufacture of such beer might immediately commence in Ontario for shipment to the province of Quebec or for export.

Mr. MORPHY: How does the minister explain what appears to me to be an inconsistency of permitting Ontario to ship to Quebec or any other province native wines that may be fifty per cent proof spirits, but not beer that may be only five per cent proof spirits?

Mr. ROWELL: Ontario cannot ship to Quebec any wine of an alcoholic content in excess of that which may be sold in the province of Quebec.

Mr. MORPHY: Ontario could, if Quebec voted that way. The question is à propos just the same.

Mr. ROWELL: The Order in Council permits the manufacture in any province of any liquor of which the province permits the sale.

Mr. MORPHY: Ontario permits the manufacture of wine to any percentage.

Mr. ROWELL: Native wine.

Mr. MORPHY: That may be shipped out.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: Beer of 6 per cent can neither be made nor shipped out?

Mr. ROWELL: It cannot be made because Ontario does not permit the sale.

Mr. MORPHY: But this Order in Council permits the export to any other province.

Mr. ROWELL: It permits the shipment from Ontario of anything that may be lawfully manufactured and sold in Ontario. The only intoxicating liquor that may be manufactured and sold in Ontario for beverage purposes is native wine, which may be manufactured and sold under the conditions provided in the Ontario Temperance Act.

Mr. MORPHY: But your Order in Council, as I understand it, does not refer to the export of beer of any strength. You absolutely prohibit the export of beer abroad by this Order in Council.

Mr. ROWELL: No, the manufacture is prohibited.

Mr. MORPHY: You allow the manufacture and export of wine to the extent of 50 per cent proof spirits?

Mr. ROWELL: We permit the manufacture of wine because the province permits the sale. I do not think I can make myself clearer. The whole basis of the legislation is the recognition of the right of a province to govern the question of sale. We permit the manufacture of anything that the province decides may be sold.

Mr. CROTHERS: Does the Order in Council provide for the absolute prohibition of transportation from one province to another, or is the prohibition applicable only to a "dry" province? Does it absolutely prevent the transportation whether the province is "dry" or "wet?"

Mr. ROWELL: It prohibits the transportation of intoxicating liquors into any place that is "dry." It may be transported into any place where it may be lawfully sold.

Mr. CROTHERS: Is that native wine, or does that provision apply to beer? I understand that Quebec is not what is generally called "dry" since the vote taken recently, and under the proposed Bill would Ontario be in a position to send to that province not only wine but beer?

Mr. ROWELL: No. The provision is this:

> Provided that this regulation shall not apply to the sending, taking, transporting or delivering of native wines in the province of Ontario, or to sending, taking, transporting or delivering any intoxicating liquor lawfully manufactured in any province to any place in such province where such intoxicating liquor may lawfully be sold, or to sending, taking, trans-

porting, or delivering any wine lawfully manufactured in any province to any place where such liquor may lawfully be sold.

It does not permit a brewery in Ontario to manufacture liquor containing a higher percentage of alcohol than the province of Ontario authorizes to be sold. What cannot be sold cannot be manufactured.

Mr. MICHAUD: What is the percentage of alcohol in the native wine manufactured?

Mr. ROWELL: There is no fixed percentage.

Mr. MICHAUD: What is the minimum?

Mr. ROWELL: There is no minimum named.

Mr. McMASTER: What is the usual percentage of alcohol in the native wine in Ontario?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know. My recollection is that it is a higher percentage than that authorized for sale in Quebec. Therefore I think that the question of shipping it into Quebec is largely an academic one. At the suggestion of my hon. friend from Beauce the other day the Acting Prime Minister said he was prepared to amend the Act so as to provide for its shipment if it may be sold.

Mr. EDWARDS: Suppose the province of Ontario permitted the sale of 15 per cent wine and the province of Quebec limited the strength of wine sold in that province to ten per cent. Am I right in supposing that Ontario could not export into Quebec any wines stronger than 10 per cent?

Mr. ROWELL: That is correct.

Mr. MICHAUD: What amount of wine has the province of Ontario on hand at present?

Mr. ROWELL: The Ontario Government has not any wine.

Mr. MICHAUD: The province of Ontario?

Mr. ROWELL: The Government of Ontario has no wines on hand at all.

Mr. MICHAUD: But the province?

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot give that information because I do not know; but my recollection is that it is not a very large quantity. On one occasion when representations were being made to the Government by the grape growers of Ontario we asked for the information and I was surprised to find how limited the quantity was, and how small was the volume of business in native wines in Ontario. Relatively, it was an insignificant trade; there were only a very limited number of gallons. My hon. friend from North Winnipeg seemed to think that there was an objection to this Order in Council because of the necessity for liquor in the case of influenza. I am not going to discuss the medicinal or scientific aspect of that question, but I would point out that no legislation in any province interferes with the use of intoxicating liquor for medicinal purposes. My hon. friend also mentioned that the price was excessive and it was urged that there should be some control. I quite agree with that. Quebec and Ontario have both taken steps to curtail excessive prices in the future. Quebec in its recent legislation provides for withdrawing the license from the vendor if he charges an excessive price. In Ontario the Government is taking over the sale, and will carry the business through the License Board. Two or three hon. members have urged that the legislation be made permanent. The hon. member for Springfield regretted that we did not make it permanent and Dominion-wide, subject to a vote of the people, and other hon. gentlemen spoke of the legislation being province-wide, that is being continued subject to repeal at the request of any province so far as it relates to that province. While these views do represent the opinion of very many people in this country, the Government is carrying out the promise it made in the speech from the Throne by validating this war-time measure for the period during which according to its terms it should continue in force. In the meantime a vote is to be taken in Ontario where there will be an expression of public opinion on the question. Votes may also be taken in other parts of the country. The soldiers will have returned before another session of the House and the whole matter can be reviewed at the next session in the light of all the relevant facts with a view to taking such action as the public interests may demand. The Government felt in introducing this legislation, modified only to the extent I have mentioned, that it was carrying out its pledge in the speech from the Throne and giving, as I believe, expression to the real public opinion of this country.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I do not wish to take up much time in dealing with the subject in any general way. I do not think that I would have risen had it not been for some remarks that we have heard from some hon. members who appear to think that any legislation that is brought forward now by people who are generally termed

temperance organizations, such as the Women's Christian Temperance Union, which has been so much complained of, and kindred bodies, is liable to increase the consumption of intoxicating liquors. They are opposed to such institutions, and to the friends of temperance, although if their desires were carried out there would be less liquor consumed. The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) has given the Committee some medical views in regard to the question. The hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) has replied to a portion of the hon. member's address and has shown that this legislation is not intended to interfere with the use of intoxicating liquors for medical purposes. In regard to any other views that he may have expressed, as to the good effects of intoxicating liquors, or as to the absence of any bad effects, let me remind the hon. gentleman that there are others who are quite as capable of expressing opinions on this question as he is and who have expressed exactly the opposite opinion. In the issue of the Ottawa Journal for to-day, I find that one of the reporters of that paper has had an interview with Dr. Saleeby, whom the paper describes as the leading recognized expert on the effect of alcoholism on the future of the race. I will read an extract or two from what he says:

> We and you want to see the Dominions populated with British people. But if those people do not exist where are you going to get them? This is one of the factors of imperial importance that must be faced.
>
> The decreasing birth rate in Britain means ultimately that there will be no surplus for the Dominions, and then what? The future of this great Canada is bound up in this question of the birth rate of Britain. To go back to the factors in the reduction of the British birth rate, I said that the war was the chief factor, but the war did not cause the steady decline that had been going on for years before.
>
> Belongs to Racial Poisons.
>
> Alcohol, which I hold belongs to a group of racial poisons, is one of the chief factors in this condition, whether a war is being fought or not. Alcohol, it has been proved, has had the most deleterious effect, not only on the consumer in excess, but on his ability to be the father of healthy children; to be the father of children at all. Babies dead and babies incapable of living we have in immense numbers, due solely to alcoholism. Think of the effect on the future of the race. I am not so much concerned with the drunken man. I am, of course, deeply sensible of the fact that he is ruining himself and abusing his wife. But with the children of that drunken man I am vitally concerned. The racial effect of his indulgence is a matter that concerns not himself alone, but the nation to which he belongs.
>
> In my opinion there is no better stock in existence than the Scottish. For centuries the Scottish race has been the fruitful source of the best of our Dominion's population. My friend Professor Arthur Keith, curator of the museum of the Royal College of Surgeons in London, reckoned that in the war one Dominion soldier in every three was either Scottish or of Scottish descent.
>
> Scotch whisky in Scotland to-day is arresting the continuance of that splendid breed. The time has come for the Empire to choose which is the more valuable: Scotch whisky or Scotch men.
>
> Empty of Population.
>
> Our Dominions are practically empty of population and with this war we have made ourselves responsible for immense further tracts of the earth surface. We must have men for them. If we are going on with social practices that ruin the race whence will we get the men? It was not worth going on with the war if it is not worth going on with the race. This war has of course had its terrible effect on the fathers of the future but we must not lose sight of the other war against them that is continually going on. Incidentally this need of saving the future fathers of the race led me to devise the helmet which the British Government honoured me by accepting as the standard for its troops and the American Government added to that honour by adopting it for the United States troops. That, however, is beside the point of the evil of alcoholism. Research, data, statistics of every description, conditions as you may see them each day prove the evil effects of alcoholism on the human race.

I put that up in opposition to my hon. friend from North Winnipeg.

Mr. FRASER: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if what he has just read about the Scotch race represents his own views?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I think I will pass it over to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) to answer.

Mr. FRASER: If the view expressed in that statement represents the views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Levi Thomson) I protest against it. The Scotch race proved themselves to be a race of heroes in this war, and to say that alcohol has depleted that people is a libel against which I protest. It is well known that in the State of Maine, which has had prohibition for the last forty years, the birth rate is the lowest in the United States.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I do not know that what my hon. friend has said has any bearing whatever on the authority that I have quoted and I quote the statement of this gentleman as being as good an authority as my hon. friend (Mr. Blake). I have listened to the objections to the work of so-called temperance people and the assertion that their work has had the effect of increasing the consumption of intoxicants rather than decreasing it, and that their opponents are the true temperance people.

We have been told that very often. Those who oppose these organizations pose as the real friends of temperance. I have been watching temperance work for half a century and I have become rather accustomed to the statement. In this connection I am reminded of the saying that there is nothing new under the sun. When I was a boy I sometimes had occasion to travail over the Guelph-Erin gravel road for a distance of twelve miles. Along that road, according to the best of my recollection, there were twelve licensed hotels. A great many people in those times thought there was no necessity for so many. They earnestly preached the doctrine that some of these licenses should be cut off, the way temperance cranks do. A strong campaign was made along that line but the liquor interests and their friends held that if the suggestion of the temperance workers was carried out it would cause an increase in the consumption of intoxicating liquor. That was the main argument used against the cutting down of the licenses. It was suggested that the congregating of people in fewer houses would result in more drinking. That was one of the first effective reforms that was undertaken along temperance lines in that part of the country. Another early reform was the cutting down of the hours in which intoxicating liquors could be sold. The same argument was used against that—it would increase the consumption of intoxicating liquors. Not a single thing endeavoured to be done for the last fifty years in the hope of decreasing the consumption of intoxicating liquors but the organized liquor traffic and their friends insisted determinedly would have the opposite effect. We were told the same thing in regard to the Dunkin Act, that its adoption would cause an increase in the consumption of intoxicating liquor. The same thing was said in regard to the Scott Act and local option. People who opposed local option said: "Anything in the world but local option; we are prepared to support you in anything at all that will do away with the use of intoxicating liquor, even total prohibition, but don't say local option whatever you do. It will ruin the communities in which it is passed, and will cause an increased consumption of intoxicating liquors." Every man who has been through those campaigns knows that these were the arguments always advanced. The same arguments were put forward when a campaign was started in favour of banishing the bar. We were told that if we banished the bar it would cause intoxicating liquor to be taken into the people's homes, that more of it would be consumed, and the young people in those homes would be taught to use it. Doubtless that doctrine was preached in Ontario and all over the country. I know it was preached in Saskatchewan, because before we actually did banish the bar in that province there had been considerable agitation going on on the part of the so-called temperance cranks and marked advance had been made everywhere along temperance lines by reason of that agitation. The same thing is true with regard to every single piece of legislation that has ever been passed with a view to decreasing the consumption of intoxicating liquors; and I think we may say such objections will always be raised. I think the present legislation is along sensible lines. The President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) has dealt so very fully with the subject that little has been left for me to say, except this: The duty devolves upon us under the British North America Act, in view of the decisions which have been given with respect to temperance legislation, to pass such laws as will make provincial enactments effective. The provinces, as we all know, have no power to prohibit the importation, the manufacture or interprovincial trade in intoxicating liquors. Therefore, the only authority that can make the provincial legislation as effective as it should be is this Parliament. The only complaint I have to make with regard to the Bill now before us is perhaps that it is merely temporary and not permanent. However, it is legislation along the right line; we will take what we can get and look for more.

Mr. EDWARDS: The debate has taken a somewhat wide range, and while I do not propose to speak at any great length I may be obliged to follow the course taken by others instead of confining myself directly to the Bill.

I suppose we can all accept the principle that the aim of legislation should be to make it as easy as possible for men to live right, and as difficult as possible for them to live wrong. We will find considerable more difficulty when we undertake to define what is right and what is wrong. No doubt it is a serious matter to interfere with the personal liberty of the individual citizen; but it is also a serious matter that the physical, intellectual and moral status of the next generation may depend upon the quantity of intoxicating liquor consumed by the head of the house. That is also a

serious matter and something that we have a right to take into consideration. The State, I take it, is justified in introducing legislation of this kind interfering with the liberty of the subject, when the subject in the exercise of that liberty interferes with the general welfare of the State and with the undoubted right of other individuals to enjoy a measure of happiness in this world.

The amendment which is before the Committee is in the right direction because its general object is to make effective whatever legislation the provinces see fit to pass. I do not blieve the House should go beyond such legislation as the provinces are prepared to adopt, but, in my opinion, it is perfectly logical and right for us to go as far as each of the provinces wishes to go and to pass legislation here which will make effective the expressed will of the people of those provinces. Such, I understand, is the general intention of the present legislation. I am not one of those who feel very enthusiastic about the Dominion Alliance, nor am I disposed to throw many bouquets at that organization. I think the Dominion Alliance has on a great many occasions taken a course which could not be regarded as a straight course. From 1878 down to 1896, the Dominion Alliance hounded the life fairly out of the Conservative Government at Ottawa by its demands for prohibitory legislation, and from 1896 down to 1911 was practically silent in regard to prohibitory legislation so far as it could be enacted by the Dominion Parliament. The Alliance became active again, especially active, immediately after 1911. I do not agree with some gentlemen who seem to think that the argument in regard to prohibition is all on one side. I think I could produce figures here to show that that is not true in the prohibition States on the other side of the line, bearing in mind what is disclosed by the years 1888 and 1893. It may be said that that is ancient history, but those are the years for which I have figures concerning the prohibition States of Maine, Kansas and Iowa. Comparing those States with the non-prohibition States of Michigan, Nebraska and Minnesota, there were more arrests per thousand of the population for all offences against the law in the prohibition States referred to than there were in the non-prohibition States. There were also more arrests for drunkenness in the prohibition States than in the non-prohibition States, and a greater degree of pauperism in the former States than in the latter. I do not think we would be justified in taking that data as an argument against prohibition. The figures cannot be regarded as an argument against prohibition because they did not really have prohibition in the so-called prohibition States. Prohibition has never had a fair trial in any of those States. The Royal Commission appointed by the Canadian Government in 1893 to inquire into the liquor traffic examined one hundred and eighty-four witnesses from the states of Maine, Kansas and Iowa. Twenty-four of them stated that the prohibition law was enforced; one hundred and fifty-four that it was not enforced; and six of them expressed no opinion on that point. The report of the Canadian Commission contains this sentence:

> The whole trend of the evidence only proves this much, that prohibition prohibits where no one wants intoxicating liquors, but nowhere else.

That was the summing up of that commission in regard to the way in which prohibition was working out on the other side of the line. But notwithstanding that summing up there is undoubted evidence that not only in the United States but in the countries of Europe wherever prohibition has been tried it has been an unquestioned success in the rural districts.

I was very much interested in reading a work compiled by two English gentlemen appointed by the Imperial Government for the express purpose of inquiring into this whole business, Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell, who have probably written the most comprehensive and logical book that was ever attempted on the temperance question. They spent several years on the work and visited the different countries of Europe, the United States and Canada, and their facts and deductions are well worthy of consideration. Referring to the Gothenburg system in Sweden, they state that in 1900 the consumption of spirits per head of the population was not over one-third as much as fifty years before. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Swedish government enacted a law which gave the right of distillation to any person who owned or cultivated land. The result was the establishment of 173,000 distilleries, or one for every seventeen of the population, and the drunken degeneracy of the people. Drunkenness was carried to such an excess that, I presume, it disgusted public opinion and led to the adoption of the Gothenburg system. An attempt was made through that system to lessen drunkenness, and by 1895 the number of distilleries had decreased to only 132. The Gothenburg system has

been a very great success if viewed from the standpoint of the amount of liquor consumed per head of the population, but its weakness lies in the fact that while the sale of liquor is under the control of the State, the money received by the State from the sale is used as a means of increasing the local revenue, and consequently the people have an interest in retaining the liquor traffic because the revenue derived from it lessens their burden of taxation.

Now, Sir, I want to name what I consider to be the three principal causes of intemperance, and then to suggest what I think, if not a complete remedy, is something which commends itself to me as more likely to be effective than anything I have heard suggested. First, in regard to the cause of intemperance. What are they? The first is the element of private gain. General Neil Dow, who took such an active part in the prohibition movement in the state of Maine, made use of these words:

> The liquor traffic can never be put down so long as there is any profit remaining in it.

That is to say, his idea of the first requisite was to eliminate private profit from the sale of liquor. I believe that that is logical and sound. So long as any persons are making money out of the sale of liquor, there will always be some who will actively work for the continuance of the traffic. Another cause of intemperance is the monotony and dullness and, too often, the actual misery of many lives. I know there are some who are of opinion that drink is the cause of poverty. No doubt drink is responsible for a measure of poverty, but I think I am right in saying that if it were possible to eliminate all liquor from the Dominion, so that no person could procure any drink for beverage purposes, you would not thereby eliminate all poverty. Drink is not the only cause of poverty. I grant that drink may be taken to be one of the causes of poverty, but perhaps it is not the main cause. Poverty, I think, may be characterized as a sort of industrial disease, and you will have it in this or any other country until industrial conditions have very much improved over what they are at the present time. Another cause of intemperance is the absence of adequate provision for social intercourse and healthful recreation. That brings me to the suggestion which I desire to make, and which, perhaps it may be said, has not any direct bearing on this legislation now before us. Reforms, it seems to me, must be constructive as well as restrictive. If we are going to have liquor sold in any province, I think the State should handle the sale—that it should be a State monopoly. There should be a system of local restriction and control, and if we are to be consistent we must cut out the State profit in liquor just as we would eliminate individual profits in the business. Therefore I say that any profits which arise from the sale of liquor by the State should be used to provide counteracting influences to provide some forms of healthful recreation, some attractions to draw the people away from the place where liquor is sold.

That principle has been recognized in many places in England, Scotland and Wales; it has been recognized in many places in Norway and Sweden, and it has worked with splendid success. Rooms have been provided where the men can meet, have social intercourse, enjoy games and recreations, and the money required for providing those places was the money obtained from the sale of liquor. I commend that suggestion to this committee, and in order to give point to that suggestion, may I be permitted to place on Hansard a few words from the pen of Mr. Robert Blatchford, who, writing in regard to conditions in certain parts of London, stated:—

> Imagine for a moment the common lot of our London poor. Ignorant and untrained minds, weary and unhealthy bodies, gloomy and demoralising environment, monotony and weariness of life, out of these evils spring the seeds of vice. Drudging in their vile stews day after day, night after night—always with the black future like an ominous cloud, casting its chill shadow on their anxious hearts; always with the mean walls hemming them in, and the mean tasks wearing them down, and the mean life paralysing their sick souls; with no pleasure but drink, with no club but the public house, with work precarious and wages low, in hateful and cheerless surroundings, and with faint hopes ever narrowing, the toiling millions bring their worn bodies and bewildered souls to fight against the devil and all his works—and the devil, amongst other weapons, uses gin. Out in the horrible East the women drink. What wonder! if you go amongst these poor women you will feel suddenly stricken old. What culture have these poor creatures ever known? What teaching have they had? What graces of life have come to them? What dowry of love, of joy, of sweet and fair imagination? Think what their lives are, think what their homes are, think of the darkness and confusion of their minds and then say, is it a marvel if they take to gin?

I place that quotation before the Committee because I think it has a very direct bearing upon two things to which I have previously alluded, one being the fact that poverty is not entirely due to drink, but is largely a result of wrong industrial conditions. But we find, it seems to me, in those words, ample justification for the adoption of any means which will lessen the evil of

intemperance. Notwithstanding what I must regard, from my reading of statistics, as the failure of the attempt at prohibition in the United States, at least in so far as applies to urban centres, I find in the success which attended their efforts in the rural communities very great encouragement for Canada, because this Dominion is largely rural as yet, although there is a tendency towards the cities. I do not mean to say that any law on prohibitory lines which was successful in the rural parts but a failure in the urban centres is a complete success; it must succeed in both the urban centres and the country districts to be a complete success. But because our population is largely rural, I believe that there is a good opportunity for a greater success of any temperance measure in this country than has attended similar measures in any other country in the world.

I do not believe that legislation in Ontario or in this House is due entirely to temperance sentiment in Ontario or in this House. I believe it is largely due to the fact that it is supposed to be and is, unquestionably, a popular measure at this time. As has been stated by some hon. gentlemen, the position taken in Ontario at the present time is a most inconsistent one. Ontario prohibitionists hold up their hands in holy horror at the thought of any man drinking beer of a greater strength than 2½ per cent, but our friends are quite ready to allow a man to drink wine of a strength of 10, 15 or 20 per cent, so long as it is made from Ontario grapes. Ontario says in effect: It is a crime and a shame for a man to get drunk on beer, but it is quite permissible for him to get drunk on wine so long as the wine is made in Ontario and of Ontario grapes. That is an inconsistent position and shows that some temperance agitators in Ontario are not prepared to go as far as they would like members of this House to go in matters of prohibitory legislation. Again, I say the only safe and proper way for us to take here is to go no further than each province is prepared to go. We have no right to force upon Quebec, for instance, the views which may obtain in Ontario or Manitoba, and we have no right to force on Manitoba the views of the majority of the people of Saskatchewan. But we are quite safe in passing legislation here which will make effective any attempts of the various provinces along temperance lines.

Mr. McISAAC: I desire to say a few words in favour of the Bill before the House, in the first place, because I come from a province which has taken the lead and is the foremost province in Canada to-day as regards prohibition legislation, and second, because I myself am a temperance man, that is, I have been a total abstainer all my life. I am, therefore, pleased to give my feeble word in support of any temperance legislation. I think the Government are to be congratulated on having brought in a Bill to give legislative sanction and statutory enactment to the Orders in Council, and also because they have made this legislation adaptable to the conditions of the different provinces. Whatever prohibtion legislation the different provinces may have will not be interfered with; on the contrary, this Bill will so adapt itself as to meet their wishes and enactments in that respect. It is, therefore, most commendable legislation. Within the last few years there has unquestionably been a great advance in temperance sentiment throughout the Dominion, and it is pleasing to know that such is the case. After all, we cannot make men altogether temperate by legislation, because true temperance is a moral virtue; but all legislation that tends to bring about temperance and that will lessen temptations and remove dangerous occasions from those who may have a weakness for intemperance, is good for the uplifting of the people.

Any legislation that will promote temperance will improve the moral welfare of the community. A good many stories have been told by hon. gentlemen of the evils of intemperance; we have all encountered cases of this kind. The hon. member for East Algoma told of a man in his employ who was called home to the death-bed of his wife, but who instead of going home went to the tavern and got drunk, and finally met his death through drink. It occurred to me, while my good friend was telling his story, that he would have performed a good and meritorious act if, knowing the man's weakness, he had kept him in his office for the two hours the man was waiting the train, and my hon. friend might even have accompanied him to the station and seen him on board the train. He was not obliged to do that, of course, he is not his brother's keeper; but I could not help thinking that if he had done so, it would have redounded to his everlasting credit.

I shall not deal at greater length with the Bill because the matter has been pretty well discussed. I most highly commend the Government for the action they have taken, and the way in which they have

framed this legislation to meet the requirements of the different provinces. The legislation will have no effect so far as my own province is concerned, because at the recent session of the legislature the provincial prohibition Act was amended so as to place the sale of liquor in the hands of the Government. We have gone further in the matter of prohibition than any other province in Canada, I believe.

Mr. CRONYN: Before you put the motion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reply to those two members, excluding the President of the Privy Council, who alone touched on the question of the amendment. So far as I was able to follow the speeches this afternoon, I heard only two criticisms directed against the amendment I proposed.

In the first place, the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) called it an immoral proposition. Well, it is always easy to call a thing names, and even outside of the legal fraternity it is not an unknown exercise of wit by pinning a bad name to a man or an argument, to endeavour to put him or it out of court. But I would ask you for a moment to analyze just what this "immoral" proposition is. The whole proposition is founded on the rights of the province of Ontario or any other province to legislate on this matter of prohibition, and my contention is that the Order in Council and the Bill as drawn do not recognize the Ontario law. If I am right in that contention, my amendment simply seeks to implement or follow the Ontario law, and if there is any immorality in the proposition, that immorality rests upon the Government of the province of Ontario. I understand that my hon. friend from East Algoma was, and perhaps is, an ardent supporter of that Government, and I call his attention to the fact that not merely the export of three per cent beer, but the export of any kind of intoxicating liquor, was permitted under the Ontario Act. That is made abundantly clear by the sections which I read this afternoon. I suppose my hon. friend from East Algoma, if my "doxy" did not agree with his, might call me heterodox; and so he may call a proposal to export three per cent beer "immoral." But let us look a little further. The state of Maine has been mentioned during the debate. It has had prohibition for something like sixty years, and the statement is made, and I think has not been contradicted, that for many years the state of Maine has accounted beer containing three per cent alcohol by weight a non-intoxicant. Would Maine then think that the drinking of beer containing two and-a-half per cent alcohol by weight was "immoral?" Would the province of Quebec consider it an "immoral" transaction to drink beer containing two and-a-half per cent alcohol by weight if the same were made in Ontario and exported to Quebec?

Something has been said about the progress of temperance in Denmark and Sweden. Now, in Denmark, as in Maine, the Government declared beer containing three per cent alcohol by weight a non-intoxicant, and removed all duties thereon. The temperance societies in that country, large and powerful, established cafes and restaurants throughout the country and placed this excise-free three-per-cent beer on sale. They believed that to be a good move; they believed it to be in the interests of temperance, and the result is shown by the figures. You will remember that there is no general prohibition law in Denmark. The figures show that in consequence of this move the sale of three-per-cent beer went up in a most tremendous fashion, and the sale of ardent liquors decreased in a similar way. So, I think it cannot fairly be argued that this particular amendment—and no other result is possible in the time in which this law will last—is immoral.

The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) suggested this case: Suppose, he said, Ontario voted to go completely dry, to allow no sales of beer of any kind; how strange and illogical it would be to allow the export of three-per-cent beer into Quebec. That is a striking supposition, but quite an impossible one. This legislation will last, at the outside, for fifteen or sixteen months—until peace is declared and one year thereafter. The people of the province of Ontario are to vote next autumn on the question of the continuation or otherwise of the Ontario Temperance Act, and under no possible combination of circumstances, on no vote that can be given on that Act, can the province of Ontario go absolutely "dry." So that the danger conjured up by the member for North Grey does not apply in this case. At the present moment under these very Orders in Council the breweries can export to licensed vendors anywhere, so that whether Ontario went "dry" or not that export business could continue. The President of the Privy Council pointed out the genesis of the Ontario Temperance Act, and I am not at all in a position to argue or contradict him in that respect. He said

that this Act followed generally the Macdonald Act of Manitoba and that the clauses permitting export and transportation were put in to avoid any question of jurisdiction or any attack in the courts as to the constitutionality of the Act. I would like, however, to call the attention of the Committee to one clause of the Ontario Temperance Act which I did not read, as I did not think it dealt with the matter before the Committee, but which is in striking contrast to the clauses I did read. I would suggest that this clause is the type of clause which the Government would insert in an Act so as to prevent any possible question as to constitutionality, whereas the other clauses are of a wholly different type, and are framed, I submit, for quite another purpose. Clause 139 reads:

> While this Act is intended to prohibit and shall prohibit transactions in liquor which take place wholly within the province of Ontario, except under license or as otherwise specially provided by this Act, and to restrict the consumption of liquor within the limits of the province of Ontario, it shall not affect and is not intended to affect bona fide transactions in liquor between a person in the province of Ontario and a person in another province or in a foreign country, and the provisions of this Act shall be construed accordingly.

This is a clause such as one could well imagine the Government inserting, out of an abundance of caution, to protect the constitutionality of its Act. But clauses 43, 45 and 46 are on an entirely different basis. They deal with the right of common carriers to carry liquor for export, and the right of the manufacturer to sell for export. The President of the Privy Council said, in answer to a question by an hon. member, that the test of the right to export is the right of sale within the province. That is the test as matters stand today. Under the Bill which the Government has introduced you can export wine of Quebec strength into Quebec because Ontario allows the sale of that wine. But as I pointed out in moving the amendment, if Ontario next September allows the sale of beer of 3 per cent or 2½ per cent alcohol by weight—if it follows the Quebec lead in that respect—even then, when the sale of that beer is allowed in Ontario, under this Act as brought in, that beer could not be exported into Quebec nor could beer be imported from Quebec. So that the sale test is only partly applied and unless the amendment which I suggest is adopted there will be that defect, that illogical position. I desire to repeat briefly what the general effect of my amendment is: It allows the manufacture in Ontario of beer of a strength which is permitted to be sold in Quebec, and the export of that beer to Quebec or any other place where it may lawfully be sold.

Amendment (Mr. Cronyn) negatived.

Mr. FIELDING: Subsection 3 of this section says:

> The Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue shall have power to make such regulations as he may deem necessary to prevent intoxicating liquor from being illegally manufactured in or from being imported into Canada—

—and so on. This language certainly is very unusual. The Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue is to have power to make any regulations that he personally may deem necessary. They are not to be approved by the Governor in Council nor published in the Canada Gazette. The minister has an absolute and unqualified power; I would call the attention of the minister to this subsection because it seems to me to be a very usual proceeding.

Mr. ROWELL: This is in the form drafted by the Parliamentary Counsel, but there is not the least objection to substituting "Governor in Council" for "minister." I presume the regulations will be important and it would be wiser to have them passed upon by the Governor in Council.

Mr. FIELDING: The words as drawn give the Minister of Inland Revenue absolute and unqualified power in the matter. No broader words could be used. I have never to my recollection seen such broad language in any previous Act.

Mr. ROWELL: I understand from the Parliamentary Counsel that these are the usual words in many Acts, and that in drafting this clause he has followed precedent. But I see no objection to an amendment to provide that the regulations shall be made with the approval of the Governor in Council and published in the Canada Gazette.

Mr. FIELDING: That would be better.

Mr. ROWELL: That is what the intention is. I move that subsection 3 be amended by striking out the words " Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue " and substituting therefor the words " Governor in Council," and inserting at the end of the clause the following words:—

> All regulations made hereunder shall be published in the Canada Gazette.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On the title:

Mr. ROWELL: It has been said that the title is rather long and cumbersome. I would suggest that the following be inserted in section 1:—

This Act may be cited as the Intoxicating Liquor Act, 1919.

That is for convenience of reference.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CANNON: By referring to section 1 paragraph (a), it will be seen that paragraph (a) provides for the amendment of subsection (c) of regulation 1. If we amend subsection (c) of regulation 1 as provided in paragraph (a) of section 1, I do not see that there will be any meaning to it at all. It says that you shall strike out the word "wine" in the last line and there is no word "wine" in the last line.

The CHAIRMAN: The word "wine" is found in the last line of paragraph (c) regulation 1 page 3.

Mr. CANNON: Paragraph (c), as I read it, says "native wine is permitted." The word "wine" is not in the last line. If the paragraph is amended I do not think it will have any meaning at all.

Mr. CRONYN: I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. Cannon) is aware that the Order in Council as printed and first distributed differs from the Order in Council as printed in the Bill. The original Order in Council read "wherein the sale of native wine is prohibited" and the Bill reads "wherein the sale of native wine is permitted"—absolutely and entirely changing the Order in Council.

Mr. CANNON: I am reading from the Bill.

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend will turn to the schedule he will find that paragraph (c) regulation 1, says:

"Prohibited area" means any province, territory, municipality, district, county or other area wherein the sale of intoxicating liquor is under or by any law, federal or provincial, prohibited, and shall include any such area wherein the sale of native wine is permitted.

The words after the word "wine" are stricken out and the following substituted: "or other intoxicating liquors of limited alcoholic content are permitted."

Mr. CANNON: I understand that but it says the word "wine" in the last line, when it is not in the last line. It may be in the Order in Council but it is not in the Bill and the Bill is going to be the law.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is correct. There is a line in which half of the word "permitted" appears. It should be changed to read "the fifth line thereof." I therefore beg to move:

That Regulation 1 paragraph (c) be amended by substituting for the words "the last line thereof," the words "the fifth line thereof."

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

MILITIA PENSION ACT AMENDMENT.

COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS AND MEN.

On the motion of Major-General Mewburn (Minister of Militia and Defence), the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Militia Pension Act, chapter forty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide:—

1. That an officer who is retired compulsorily, for any cause other than misconduct or inefficiency, after ten years' service, shall be entitled to a pension for life, not exceeding one-fiftieth of the pay and allowances of his rank or permanent appointment at the time of his retirement for each completed year of service.

2. That in the case of an officer who has been seconded or given leave of absence for service in a position in the public service of Canada or in the Canadian Expeditionary Force or in any other military force raised in Canada for service outside Canada, and paid and maintained by the Government of Canada, or who has been permitted to serve in any such force, deductions at the rate of five per cent per annum shall be made from the salary or pay, as the case may be, which such officer is receiving in the said public service, or as an officer in any such force, and those deductions shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and shall be treated in all respects as deductions under section eight of the Militia Pension Act; and, notwithstanding anything in that Act mentioned, the pension granted to an officer thus seconded, or thus serving in any such force, shall be based on his salary and allowances, or his pay and allowances, as the case may be, which at the date of his retirement the said officer is receiving from the said Government in the public service or in such force.

3. That the time served as an officer, non-commissioned officer or man on active service during the war between Great Britain and Germany, which commenced on the fourth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, shall be counted for pension purposes under the said Militia Pension Act.

4. That every militiaman shall be entitled to retire and receive a pension for life who has completed not less than ten years' service, subject to the provisions of the Militia Pension Act.

5. That the pension to a militiaman on retirement shall be:—

(a) if he has completed ten but less than twenty years' service, an annual sum equal to

one-fiftieth of his annual pay and allowances for every completed year of service;

(b) if he has completed twenty but less than twenty-five years' service, an annual sum equal to twenty-fiftieths of his annual pay and allowances, with an addition of two-fiftieths of his annual pay and allowances for every completed year of service above twenty years;

(c) if he has completed twenty-five years' service, an annual sum equal to thirty-fiftieths of his annual pay and allowances, with an addition of one-fiftieth of his annual pay and allowances for every completed year of service above twenty-five years: Provided that tht pension shall not exceed two-thirds of his annual pay and allowances at his retirement.

6. That the time served as a militiaman on active service during the war between Great Britain and Germany, which commenced on the fourth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, shall be counted for pension purposes under the said Militia Pension Act.

7. That the Governor in Council may as to him seems fit grant a pension to the widow and a compassionate allowance to each of the children of any officer who, having completed twenty years' service, was at the time of his death on full pay, or who, having completed ten years' service, was at the time of his death in receipt of a pension.

8. That the pension of a widow shall, if her husband was at the time of his death on full pay, be an amount equal to one-half of the pension to which he would have been entitled if he had been retired compulsorily immediately before his death, or, if at the time of his death he had been pensioned, an amount equal to one-half of such pension.

9. That pensions to widows heretofore granted under the provisions of the Militia Pension Act may be re-adjusted in accordance with the provisions of these resolutions; but no such re-adjustment shall authorize the increase of any payments for pension that accrued before the passing of the Act based upon these resolutions.

Major-General MEWBURN: The object of this resolution is to carry into effect one or two amendments in the old Militia Pension Act, which now provides for compulsory retirement after twenty years' service. Under the old Militia Pension Act an officer or a man could only be pensioned compulsorily after twenty years' service. This amendment permits the pensioning of officers after ten years' service instead of twenty. It will enable us to pension certain officers instead of keeping them on the strength for twenty years; especially the large number of officers promoted from the ranks who have served overseas during the present war, and who cannot be absorbed in the establishment. The second resolution makes provision in connection with officers of the permanent force who have been seconded, or given leave of absence in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or other military forces. The Pension Act only provides for officers seconded in the public service in Canada and, by adding the words "Canadian Expeditionary Force," it will enable us to pension officers of the Permanent Force who have been promoted from the ranks, or officers of the Permanent Force who have been promoted to a higher rank in the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The present Act, of course, was passed without any thought of this war. This does not provide for voluntary but compulsory retirement. It provides for the recognition of war service and makes it unnecessary for officers and men of the Permanent Corps who distinguished themselves in the war to return to their lower ranks. It would be manifestly unfair to require non-commissioned officers and men who have distinguished themselves to revert to their rank as non-commissioned officers and men. In connection with section 3 of the resolution, I might also refer to section 6 which provides that the service of men in the recent war will be considered towards pension. Under the old Militia Pension Act provision was made for men who had served in the South African war or the Yukon. In accordance with the precedent created after the South African war this section enables us to count towards pension the time that officers, non-commissioned officers and men have served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force. Section 4 provides that the men are to be pensioned on the same ratio as the officers. It also gives the right to a man, which the officer does not possess, to retire voluntarily at the end of ten years service. Section (5) subsection (a) provides that militamen can be pensioned after ten years' service. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 5, are the same as now provided in the Act, except in the addition of the word " allowances."

Mr. MORPHY: What is the difference between "militiaman" and "man"?

Major-General MEWBURN: In the interpretation clause "militiaman" means a non-commissioned officer or private of the force. All ranks below the commissioned rank of lieutenant would be included in the word "militiaman" under that interpretation.

Sections 7, 8 and 9 are identical with the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Pensions Bill which went through the House last week. Section 7 simply provides for the reduction of time from twenty years to ten years, in which time a pension can be granted to a widow, provided her late husband was in receipt of full pay or pension.

Section 8 is identically the same as the Mounted Police pension. It provides that the widow of a husband if he were, at the time of his death, drawing full pay, should receive equal to one-half of the pension to which he would have been entitled. Section 9 makes provision identically the same as under the Mounted Police pension, that is, the pension of widows already granted under the provisions of the old Act, can, by Order in Council, be readjusted from the date of the passing of this Act.

Mr. NESBITT: What would a militiaman receive after ten years' service?

Major-General MEWBURN: A warrant officer of the Permanent Force, after twenty-five years' service, comes under a pension of $739.25. He gets one-fiftieth of his pay for every year of service.

Mr. BELAND: How much would a militiaman receive who had been nineteen years in the service?

Major-General MEWBURN: He would get nineteen-fiftieths of the pay and allowance he was drawing.

Mr. BELAND: It says here one-fiftieth of his annaul pay.

Major-General MEWBURN: For every year of service.

Mr. BELAND: It does not say so. It does say that, however, in the case of a man of over twenty-five years' service. I refer to subsection (a) of section 5. It reads that if a militiaman has completed ten, or less than twenty years' service he shall receive an annual sum equal to one-fiftieth of his annual pay and allowance for every completed year of service.

Major-General MEWBURN: The amount is equal to one-fiftieth of his annual pay and allowance for every completed year of service.

Mr. BELAND: The provision reads differently in the one case from the other. It is a little confusing.

Mr. CANNON: The resolution provides for the case of officers and men who have taken part in the war against Germany?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: Take the case of men who fought in the advance from Saloniki.

Major-General MEWBURN: The resolution applies to any man belonging to the Canadian Expeditionary Force who took part in the great war.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Mr. CANNON: I do not know about that. There are men who participated in the engagements in the Balkans and never fought against the Germans?

Major-General MEWBURN: Canadians who fought there would be members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. If a man served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, no matter where it was, he would come under the terms of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON: Would that apply also to men who served in Siberia?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes, if they were in the Permanent Force.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times and concurred in.

Major-General MEWBURN thereupon moved to introduce Bill No. 118 to amend the Militia Pension Act, founded on the resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HALIFAX HARBOUR MASTER.

On motion of Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a Harbour Master at the Port of Halifax, chapter forty-nine of the Statutes of 1882, and chapter seventy-eight of the Statutes of 1885, by providing:—

1. That the Harbour Master of the Port of Halifax shall be remunerated for his services solely by the fees, or the portion of the fees, which he may be authorized, by the rules and regulations, to collect in respect of all ships over twenty tons register, entering the Port of Halifax, but which shall not at any time exceed the following rates:—

(a) For every ship over twenty tons and not over fifty tons register, fifty cents;

(b) For every ship over fifty tons and not over one hundred tons register, one dollar;

(c) For every ship over one hundred tons and not over two hundred tons register, one dollar and fifty cents;

(d) For every ship over two hundred tons and not over three hundred tons register, two dollars;

(e) For every ship over three hundred tons and not over four hundred tons register, two dollars and fifty cents;

(f) For every ship over four hundred tons and not over five hundred tons register, three dollars;

(g) For every ship over five hundred tons and not over seven hundred tons register, four dollars;

(h) For every ship over seven hundred tons and not over one thousand tons register, five dollars;

(i) For every ship over one thousand tons register, seven dollars.

Ships of twenty tons register and under not to be subject to any duty under this resolution, nor ships engaged in trading or plying between ports and places in the Dominion of Canada.

2. That the Harbour Master of the Port of Halifax may, out of the moneys received by him for fees, retain for his own remuneration such sum, not exceeding three thousand dollars per annum, as the Governor in Council may authorize; and if the moneys received by him for fees in any calendar year amount to a less sum than that allowed him by the Governor in Council, then such sum shall be his remuneration for that year.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The object of this resolution is to enable the Government to pay a reasonable salary to the harbour master at Halifax, having regard to present-day conditions. In 1885 the salary was fixed at $1,800 a year, but out of this he was obliged to pay boat hire and the expenses of his office. It can scarcely be said that such remuneration for an officer looking after a harbour of the importance of Halifax is sufficient. If this salary was considered reasonable thirty-four years ago it is manifestly inadequate to-day. The resolution is to provide the means of putting the matter right. The resolution also deals with the fee collectable on vessels of over one thousand tons registered tonnage entering the harbour, the amount being increased from $5 to $7 per ton. This will add greatly to the revenue, which in ordinary times is scarcely sufficient to make ends meet. The resolution, which involves the expenditure of money, has been duly recommended by His Excellency the Governor General. The total fees collected in Halifax from 1914 to 1918 were as follows: 1914, $1,822.50; 1915, $1,714; 1916, $1,783.50; 1917, $1,832; 1918, $3,351.

The large sum collected in 1918 was due almost entirely to the war, and to so many vessels entering the port of Halifax. The object of this Bill is to enable the harbour master to get a larger remuneration than $1,800, but in no event can his salary be more than the total amount of the fees he collects. As a comparison I might take some of the other ports where the harbour masters are not paid by fees. The harbour master of the port of Montreal receives $5,000; of Quebec, $3,500; of Vancouver, $1,800, and fees as shipping master; of Three Rivers—the amount is not inserted, but I know from memory that it is $900 a year. Two important matters are embodied in this Bill. One is to enable the harbour master to draw more than $1,800 a year, provided the fees exceed that amount; and the other is to increase the fees of vessels over 1,000 tons register from $5 to $7.

Mr. FIELDING: Has the hon. minister any special reason for changing the system? On general principles the payment of any important official by fees is objectionable; it is better that the fees be turned into the public treasury and an established salary be paid. That seems to be the rule in the harbour of Montreal, as my hon. friend has said, and unless there be some special reason to the contrary, it seems to me that that would be the wise policy in the case of Halifax or any other port.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The reason the harbour master is not paid by fees at Montreal is because the port is under a harbour commission. The port of Halifax is not under a harbour commission, and since 1885 the harbour master's salary has been fixed at the maximum of $1,800. He cannot get one cent above $1,800 unless this Act is passed.

Mr. FIELDING: But he has been paid a salary in recent years as I understand the hon. minister?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. FIELDING: By fees?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, entirely.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of the Bill is to give him a larger salary?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The object of the Bill is to enable him to draw more than $1,800.

Mr. FIELDING: Up to $3,000?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. But if the fees were only $1,700 a year, that is all he would draw as remuneration. On the other hand, if the fees reach the maximum of $3,000, that is what he would draw. But according to the amount of fees during the period of years that I have given to the Committee, it is not at all likely that he will draw much over $1,800. I would like to put the harbour master of the port of Halifax in such a position that if the fees collected amounted to $2,800 he would be able to draw that amount of remuneration. It is manifestly unfair to have the harbour master of such an important port drawing the meagre remuneration of $1,800 a year, and that has been in vogue during the past thirty-four years. It is time we changed it, I think.

Mr. BELAND: Is there a harbour commission at Three Rivers?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: And the harbour master receives, if I understood the hon. minister aright, only $900 a year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not a memorandum of the exact amount, but I believe that is correct.

Mr. BELAND: I think the hon. minister gave it as $900?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I did. But with all due deference to the port of Three Rivers, it cannot be considered to be as important a port as Halifax, neither does it have as many ships coming in and going out.

Mr. BELAND: I am sure if my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) were here he would resent very much such a declaration.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No doubt.

Mr. BELAND: Because the harbour master of the metropolitan city represented by my deskmate should receive more than $900.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is a matter that can be remedied by the harbour commission of the port of Three Rivers. But the harbour master of Halifax cannot draw any more than $1,800 even if he collects fees to the amount of $2,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister say how much the pilotage rate is being increased?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We are raising the fee for all vessels over 1,000 tons registered tonnage entering the harbour from $5 to $7 per ton. These fees are payable once a year for small ships under 100 tons and twice a year for those over that tonnage.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: No more than twice a year in any case?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No more.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: For example, the liners that come in from Boston or any other port will only have to pay on two occasions each year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is the meaning of it.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the reason for the change? Is it because the present dues are insufficient to pay the harbour master?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is one reason; and the other reason is to enable the harbour master to draw more than $1,800 from the fees collected. For instance, in the year 1915 he was only able to collect in fees $1,714, which really is too small an amount for a man who has the responsibilities of harbour master for a port like Halifax.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How much did he collect last year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That was a very large year, $3,351. But the harbour master stands no show whatever of getting an income beyond $3,000, because the war is over and the amount of shipping going in and out of the port of Halifax will not be so large that he will be able to draw such a salary, but he certainly will draw more than $1,800—I hope he will, anyway.

Mr. DUFF: Has the Board of Trade or any other body at Halifax asked to have these changes made?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No one has asked it as far as I know. It is just a matter of what the minister would consider fair and just in the way of remuneration, and I think that a harbour master who has been in the service for thirty-four years, considering the high cost of living, would not be treated fairly if the Government only gave him $1,800 a year. I am sure hon. members will agree that if he can collect more fees than $1,800 he certainly ought to be entitled to them.

Mr. DUFF: I agree with the hon. minister that $1,800 for the harbour master of Halifax is not sufficient remuneration, and I think the vessels can afford to pay the fees laid down in the resolution.

Mr. McKENZIE: How are those fees collected ?

Mr. DUFF: At the custom house, are they not?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I presume so.

Mr. McKENZIE: This will be an amending Act, I understand ?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I should like to have it clear that those fees are collected at the custom house. I do not like the idea of an officer going aboard a ship and collecting fees for himself.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is what the resolution states:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a Harbour Master at the Port of Halifax, chapter forty-nine of the Statutes of 1882, and chapter seventy-eight of the Statutes of 1885, by providing:—

1. That the Harbour Master of the Port of Halifax shall be remunerated for his services solely by the fees or the portion of the fees—

It does not say how he collects them, but I am quite certain that must be done through the custom house.

Mr. DUFF: That is the way it is done.

Mr. CANNON: Does that official fall within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. CANNON: He is under the minister?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. BALLANTYNE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 119, to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a harbour master at the port of Halifax.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Newton W. Rowell (President of the Council), Bill No. 116, to amend the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 9—those who left Force to serve in war on rejoining Force, service in war to be included in computing pension:

Mr. BELAND: Are there many who joined the forces?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, several hundreds went to the war.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—rates of pay:

Mr. ROBB: How will this rate of pay compare with the previous rate?

Mr. ROWELL: This rate of pay was the rate established by Order in Council last autumn when we decided to recruit the Force up to the authorized number of 1,200 men. The rate is 50 cents per day for constables and non-commissioned officers above the rate of pay that prevailed before the war. It is only right here to mention to hon. members that, as was suggested when we were discussing the resolution, the rate of pay during the next two or three years will have to be increased above this amount, and provision for that is made in the latter part of the section by giving the Governor in Council power to do so. I think the rate of pay of constables will have to be 50 cents per day above the amount fixed in the Bill which will make the constables start at $2 a day. It is not possible, we think, to get the most desirable men and to recruit up to strength unless we make the pay for the next three years start at $2 per day. We should also increase the pay of non-commissioned officers by 75 cents per day and the officers by $1.25 per day.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—creation of a reserve of officers and men who have served in Force.

Mr. ROWELL: I desire to make a slight amendment in this clause. Members of the Committee will see that subsection 3 reads:

When such officer or man of the said Reserve shall have been called up for duty he shall hold the rank and draw the pay which he received on the date of his retirement or discharge from the Force.

We should make that read "current rates of pay when he is called up." I therefore move to amend the clause by striking out all the words after the word "rank" in the second line and substituting therefor the following:

Which he held on the date of his retirement or discharge from the Force and shall receive the current rates of pay for such rank.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CANNON: Subsection (7) of this section reads:

Any member of the Reserve may retire therefrom on giving one month's notice in writing to the commissioner.

Does this extend to the man who is called for service, because that would be most acceptable?

Mr. ROWELL: No, this reserve applies only to men who have served their full period in the Force and have retired or been discharged. It provides for creating a reserve of retired men who have served in the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. They cannot be brought in unless they voluntarily consent to do so, and if once they are brought into the reserve and called for service, they may retire on a month's notice.

Mr. CANNON: Subsection 2 says:

Such reserve, or any portion or member thereof, may be called up for duty by the Commissioner when he deems it necessary.

Mr. ROWELL: They must be enrolled in the Reserve, then they may be called up

for duty. After a man has been called up for duty and is serving, he may give notice that he wishes to withdraw at the end of the month.

Mr. FIELDING: In that case would he receive both pay and pension? These men forming the reserve are presumably pensioners, and in emergency they may be called out. They would receive the pay of their rank at the time of retirement. Would they receive both pay and pension? That is allowable only under certain conditions which I do not care to mention here.

Mr. ROWELL: I admit there is a good deal in what my hon. friend has suggested. The situation is simply this: We want to enroll this reserve at once, as it appears desirable in certain sections of the country that they should be enrolled, and we want to make the inducements as generous as possible. The time the men would serve would not count for any additional pension. And the amount of pension the members of the force receive is very small. I beg to move that subsection (7) of section 11 be amended by substituting the word "two" for the word "one" in line 10.

Major-General MEWBURN: After an active officer in the Militia retires he goes on the reserve of officers, so that he can be called upon in case of emergency. During peace time he is permitted to resign after three months' notice, I think. Our object in the Militia is to create a reserve so that the men will be available in case of emergency.

Mr. CANNON: According to the Bill he could resign while on service.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 16:

Mr. ROWELL: I beg to move that there be inserted in the Bill as section 16 the following:

Subsection (c) of section 60 of the Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor: (c) to every officer in the force on the first day of July, 1902.

Section 60 created this pension system for the officers of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. Prior to that, they had certain rights to a pension under the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act. When the Mounted Police Act was amended by creating a pension fund to which the officers of the force must contribute, every officer was given a certain period in which to elect whether he would come in under the Mounted Police Act or retain his rights under the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act. There were two officers of the force out in the North country, either in the Yukon on the Mackenzie River district, I am not sure which, who were not able to take advantage of the Act in time, and they have been unable to come in under its provisions in consequence. They have wanted to do so, but as the Act was not being amended, it has not been possible to permit them to come in. The amendment I have proposed is simply to enable them to take advantage of the opportunity enabling all the officers to come in under the Act, and of which the great majority have taken advantage.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell, the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Thursday, May 22, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

CONFERRING OF TITLES ON CANADIANS.

MOTION BY MR. NICKLE TO ADOPT REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

On motions being called:

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston) moved:

That the report of the Special Committee appointed to consider the question of conferring honours, etc., upon subjects of His Majesty resident in Canada be concurred in.

He said: You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that on April 14, as an amendment to a motion proposed by me, the acting leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) concurred in a special committee being appointed which should, without partisanship, consider the questions involved in the motion and certain other questions raised by him on his amendment. At the time concurrence was reached with reference to that committee the hon. the leader of the Government impressed on me that his wishes would be best met if at the earliest possible moment the committee's report was presented to this House for consideration and decision.

As a result of his injunction and of the desire of the Committee, consideration was first given on the 24th of April, to the subjects that were to be taken under review and the committee's report was, as

you will remember, presented to the House on the 14th of this month. In justice to the committee I should say that during its deliberations full consideration was given to the questions passed in review, and that while the debates were at times vigorous they were never characterized by anything that could be otherwise considered than in the very best of friendly spirit. I can assure you, Sir, and the House that careful consideration was given to the subject matter viewed from every possible angle. The report of the committee in the main reflects what I might call its unanimous opinion, although some findings did not secure unanimity.

Those who took an interest in this matter last year will remember that among the recommendations adopted by this House was one to the effect, that hereafter no hereditary titles of honour should be conferred on a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada. The Acting Prime Minister in his address to this House directed the attention of hon. members to the fact that the reply of the British Government was couched in the following language:

> His Majesty will not hereafter be advised to confer any hereditary honour upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada save on the formal recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada.

The British Government in its reply seems to have overlooked the fundamental principle enunciated by this House, that this House, expressing the collective wish of this country, desired that no hereditary title be hereafter conferred on any Canadian, and the British Government went no further than to say that no such title should be granted except on a formal recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. SHEARD: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that that was carried by this House?

Mr. NICKLE: The hon. member for South Toronto quite correctly understood me. The recommendations of the Prime Minister last year, embodied in the Order in Council passed prior to the debate taking place, were summarized by the Prime Minister, and the third recommendation was:

> No hereditary title of honour shall hereafter be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada.

The amendment of the Prime Minister was passed by this House on a vote that I do not think can have escaped the memory of the hon. member for South Toronto.

Now, I wish to direct the attention of the House for a moment to the principle which I was discussing. This House laid down the principle that we, as Canadians, did not want hereditary titles to be hereafter conferred. The British Government did not appear to be willing to recognize that principle in its full operation, and simply went the length of saying that they would not grant hereditary titles provided the Prime Minister of the country from time to time did not want such titles granted. The result was that in its report this year the committee enunciated the principle—in so far as that principle is now being passed under review by me—that the Canadian Parliament did not want any further hereditary titles granted in Canada.

The fourth recommendation contained in the amendment adopted last session by the House, was as follows:

> That appropriate action shall be taken, whether by legislation or otherwise, to provide that after a prescribed period—

I direct the attention of the House to this language.

> —to provide that after a prescribed period no title or honour held by a subject of His Majesty now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canada shall be recognized as having hereditary effect.

The resolution adopted by the House last year did not define what was meant by the phrase "after a prescribed period." This year the committee goes further than the resolution of last year by deciding beyond the possibility of doubt that the expression "after a prescribed period" should be taken to mean "at the death of the present incumbent of the honour" or "at the death of the person at the present time enjoying the honour." In other words, it is recommended that when a person enjoying an hereditary title should pass away, the hereditary character of the title should cease with him, and that those who follow him should not be enabled to have the recognition or to enjoy the title.

The reply of the British Government to the resolution of last session, which I have just read, and which asked that after a prescribed period no title or honour held by a subject of His Majesty now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canada should be recognized as having hereditary effect, is in this language:

> This presents many difficulties that would require very careful consideration. Action for the present remains in abeyance.

Translated into the language of the street, this reply means that the British Government say: "We see very great difficulties in the way, and, appreciating those difficulties, we are not at the present moment prepared to meet them." Speaking with all deference from my place as a member of this House, I think that I would not be going beyond the limits of propriety if I said—in reference to the suggestion in the reply that I have just read, that many difficulties would require careful consideration—that careful consideration ought to be given in the spirit that prompts action and that assures results by finding a way or making it. We do think that the deliberate expression of the opinion of this House in respect of a matter that is particularly within its jurisdiction and that affects in a peculiar way the people of this country is entitled to be very carefully considered, and considered in such a way that we may obtain results. It cannot be that the British Constitution, concerning the flexibility of which we hear so much, is rigid on this particular point; that when something that Canada particularly wants is concerned, the flexibility becomes rigidity and it is impossible to secure the realization of that desire because constitutional difficulties stand in the way.

The resolution adopted by this House last year confines itself to a very great extent to what I might call ministerial responsibility and to the question of hereditary titles and titular distinction. The committee of this year, which passed in review the questions now under discussion, goes further in the report than the resolution last year went, and, in paragraph (a) of their report, recommend that an address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty might be graciously pleased to refrain hereafter from conferring any title of honour or titular distinction upon any of his subjects domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada, save such appellations as are of a professional or vocational character, or which appertain to an office. The effect of that recommendation, if adopted by the House, would be to do away with what are commonly known as titular distinctions, and also—if they are not included in that expression, which I think they are —with what are known as the lesser classes of the various orders.

I shall not re-argue this question. It was debated fully in 1918; it has been debated fully in the House this year, and certainly it was debated fully before the committee. Anything that I might say would simply be a re-statement of what has already been better stated, perhaps, than I could state it now. It would, if I may speak figuratively, be threshing straw that has already been threshed, and I therefore would not be justified in taking up the time of the House. I shall say nothing further than this: The effect of the recommendation to which I have just directed attention, if acceded to by those who have authority in England, would be to take away entirely titular distinctions in this country.

A further finding of the committee was in reference to foreign titles. The question was mooted before the Committee that if the committee were to go the length—as it did go—of reaching the conclusion that titular distinctions should be not granted by the British Crown, it was only consistent and proper that titular distinctions and honours should not hereafter be received by Canadian from foreign rulers or governments. A recommendation to that effect was carried, which reads as follows:

> Your committee further recommends that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to provide that hereafter no person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada shall accept, enjoy or use any title of honour or titular distinction hereafter conferred by a foreign ruler or government.

Having made that recommendation, the committee were confronted by the suggestion that hereafter the titles of "Right Honourable" and "Honourable" should be not further recognized in this country. The committee reached a conclusion, which reads as follows:

> A suggestion was made that the titles of "Right Honourable" and "Honourable" be discontinued, but the suggestion did not meet with the approval of the committee.

The question of such decorations as the Victoria Cross, Military Medal, Military Cross, Long Service Medal, and so on, was also considered, but there was unanimity of opinion that nothing should be said in the committee's report that would lead the House to the conclusion that the committee disapproved of the granting of these decorations. The language of the committee's report in this regard is as follows:

> Your committee, however, do not recommend the discontinuance of the practice of awarding military or naval decorations, such as the Victoria Cross, Military Medal, Military Cross, Conspicuous Service Cross, and similar decorations to persons in military or naval services of Canada for exceptional valour and devotion to duty.

Generally speaking, so far as I have been able to appreciate public sentiment as gathered from the press and from communica-

tions that have reached me, the mass of the Canadian people seem to approve the findings of the committee. Possibly, however, I would not be doing my entire duty if I did not say that there are a few who do not seem to go quite as far as the committee's recommendations go. There are those who say that the principle of titular distinction is not wrong, is not objectionable; that what is objectionable is the method that has been followed in this country and elsewhere for some time past in awarding these distinctions and dignities.

There are those who say that it is not desirable to abolish titles of distinction entirely, and that the matter should be left to His Majesty the King and to his constitutional advisers, but that greater discretion should be displayed in the selection of recipients, and the number to be decorated. Needless to say I am not one of those. In my judgment, the granting of these titular distinctions, these titles of honour, is out of tune entirely with the spirit that should, and that, I believe, does prevail in this country. The attitude to which I have just directed the attention of the House and which they seem to lay down as a principle to be followed in Canada, namely, that these recognitions are right in principle, but that greater discretion should be shown in the selection of recipients, and that a lesser number should be decorated, carries with it the conclusion, as the night follows the day, that those gentlemen would advocate the establishment, if I may use the expression, of a super-selected class; that to this class only the few should be admitted, and that in place of a generous recognition, if I may use that word, as we have had heretofore, there should be a very restricted recognition, in fact, the engendering of an aristocracy, in the true sense of the word, in this country of ours. There is a fine irony in that idea that greater discretion should be displayed in the selection of recipients. We have heard much that these honours come from His Majesty the King, and yet those who advocate that greater discretion should be displayed in the selection of recipients, have the audacity to suggest that His Majesty's attention should be directed to the fact that he has not been exercising his constitutional prerogative with the care, judgment, and discernment that certain people think he should. The whole thing is stamped with inconsistency, and the inconsistency lies in this; that those who are advocating the continuance of these dignities and honours, seem afraid that the thing should be seen in its true light. They are afraid to strip the veil of mystery from what might be called the Imperialistic prerogative.

There is not in this House a man who has listened to these debates during the past few years but knows that these titular distinctions and honours do not emanate from His Majesty, but are granted on the recommendation of ministers from time to time. And last year, in reply to my resolution urging ministerial responsibility, the leader of the House, Sir Robert Borden, by the Order in Council that had been passed prior to the debate being precipitated in this House, recognized the principle of ministerial responsibility, and stripped forever, if I may use the expression, the camouflage from the idea that these honours, titles, and dignities originated from His Majesty. Because the House, by the adoption of the resolution and the principle enunciated in the Order in Council made it abundantly clear that, in so far as Canada was concerned, once and for all we recognized that honours, titles, and distinctions did not come from His Majesty of his own motion, but should come from His Majesty on the recommendation of the man who, from time to time, happened to be the leader of the Government in this country.

Mr. EDWARDS: Did the committee give any consideration to titles of honour conferred on judges. For instance, a judge is referred to as "His Lordship."

Mr. NICKLE: I think the title of "His Lordship" was not, so far as my memory goes, discussed by the committee. Certainly no formal resolution was passed regarding the matter. I doubt very much if the title of "His Lordship," as used in the courts, comes from His Majesty at all. My opinion would be—and I am giving only the opinion of the moment—that that is simply a title of courtesy, just the same as a man is called "Mr.". I have no knowledge of such a title emanating in any way from His Majesty or being conferred by any formal document.

Let me just for a moment direct the attention of the House to the position of those who advocate that the granting of these titular distinctions is not wrong in principle, but that it is the method of distribution only that is wrong. Might I say that it seems to me that those gentlemen fail to appreciate the significance of what has prevailed and is prevailing in the old country to-day? So far as we are concerned, Britain is the parent State, and if

it has been found impossible there to devise a method that will permit these honours and distinctions being granted without corruption becoming rampant, how can we hope to do better in this country? Last year, I read to this House at great length from the debates that took place in the House of Lords in 1914, and again in 1917, and if I ever proved anything by documentary evidence, I proved that in the granting of these titular distinctions in Great Britain corruption prevails. I was criticised severely in certain parts of this country for daring to rise in my place in this House and direct attention to what was taking place in Great Britain; I was told that it was none of my business, was not the business of the House to consider how Britain administered her domestic affairs. Again to-day, as last year, I want to take issue with those who take that position, and so long as we occupy the position that we now do, and so long as we are a part of the British Empire—and may we long continue to be a part of that Empire—so long do I say that we are concerned with the methods that are evolved, with the principles that are allowed to prevail, that have anything to do with the selection or election of those who compose the British House of Commons or the British House of Lords, and it is not beyond the purview of this House to direct attention to irregularities in the selection of those who may, from time to time, obtain a seat in the House of Lords.

And I think that those who argue that titular distinctions, honours, and decorations should be granted at the present time fail to appreciate the magnitude of the national effort as measured in this war. How are you going to determine to whom recognition shall be given? How are you going to say what man shall receive and what man shall not receive, or what woman shall get and what woman shall not get? How are you going to determine sacrifice and service? How are you going to determine or measure the proportion of the sacrifice of the individual? Are these recognitions to be given only to him or to her who does great things in relation to the national effort? Are we to leave out of account entirely the great individual service of the person who occupies a humble position in life? Is the man who gives $5,000, $10,000, $15,000, or $100,000 to a great cause to receive recognition, while the widow who gives her all, who gives her years of labour, is to be overlooked? Have those who advocate the principle to which I have just directed attention forgotten the parable of the widow's mite? If that parable was good in the time of Christ it is equally good in the year 1919, when Canadians were rallied to the flag to fight for liberty, for freedom, and for the rights of the humble people. The philosophy of those who so advocate is bad in this, that it endeavours to establish the principle that the hope of recognition is the incentive to service.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: Recognition should not be the incentive to service to a man who has a true appreciation of duty. The consciousness of duty well done should be reward enough for any man, and I say that the true philosophy that underlies the granting of these titles should not be that recognition is that which prompts to action, but should be a keen appreciation that what rankles in a man is neglect and oversight; that recognitions are soon forgotten, and that men who have done their utmost and women who have given their all will smart and chafe under the neglect that leaves them without anything while others who apparently have done much more from the national point of view but infinitely less as viewed from the personal standpoint, receive recognition.

As I have said, Sir, this trouble is not altogether confined to Canada; it is not purely a local issue. The subject matter of the discussion I have brought before this House this afternoon is shaking social England. I do not ask you, Mr. Speaker, nor do I ask the House, to take my words alone. Being a lawyer, I realize that if you want to sustain an argument it is an excellent thing to have a precedent, and if you want to win a point it is well to cite a statute; and when I say that the principles I am enunciating this afternoon are stirring social England, I do not state it on my own authority alone. I can support it by a letter I am now about to read from the London Times of the 29th of August, 1918. The letter reads:

> Sir,—Even in the midst of the anxiety arising from the war we think it necessary to point out in public the serious danger which may arise from a continued bestowal of honours without any real safeguard against abuse. Habits contracted in time of trouble and pressure, if unchecked now, will be difficult to counteract hereafter. This subject has been debated in the House of Lords. Before those debates some of us endeavoured in vain to procure from the Government such public assurances as might avert the necessity of a Parliamentary discussion. When the discussion came on, the scandal was neither denied nor defended, but the securities embodied in resolutions have proved inadequate. There has been

some improvement in the form of the Gazette notices, but the root of the evil remains. Nominally the Prime Minister is responsible for the advice given to the Crown. In reality, it has become obvious that a minister overwhelmed b public duties of the most arduous kind cannot possibly supervise the distribution of honours or prevent the monetary corruption and debasement of standards which will assuredly ensue. He would be obliged to neglect other vital duties.

The same mischief shows itself in another direction. A new Order, that of the British Empire, has been instituted, and in a recent Gazette the names cover no less than 60 quarto pages. We make no suggestion of corruption in connection with this Order, but the wholesale scale upon which it is granted makes it obvious that no responsible minister can control the selection of recipients, much less that it is a real mark of His Majesty's favour.

Our feeling is that, unless the bestowal of honours and titles is protected from this sort of cheapening and is unmistakably cleared from the danger of a peculiarly mean kind of pecuniary corruption and reserved for real merit, honours may come to be regarded as dishonours, leaving no way out except their entire abolition.

It is an additional and very grave evil that the money obtained by the disgraceful traffic in honours has gone to swell and, if rumour is true, has mainly constituted, the large party funds which are at the service of party leaders and are used for party purposes.

We have no sort of desire to embarrass the Government. It is quite impossible for Mr. Lloyd George to spare the time necessary for supervising these lists, and yet it is due to the Crown that the constitutional advice to which it is entitled shall not emanate, almost without being filtered in its passage, from underlings accessible to all kinds of influence. Signed by:

Balfour of Burleigh.	Henry Hobhouse.
F. G. Banbury.	Fred Huth Jackson.
Beresford of Metemmeh.	Loreburn.
	Herbert Maxwell.
Carnock.	Fred Milner.
R. Cavendish.	Francis Mowatt.
Chaplin.	Parmoor.
Dartmouth.	Phillimore.
Desart.	Salisbury.
Durham.	Selborne.
Halsbury.	Edward Seymour.
George Hamilton.	Sumner.
Laurence Hardy.	Sydenham.

I therefore think I may take it as proven that the conditions which I allege may prevail in Canada are undoubtedly prevailing in Britain to-day. Then, I desire to read to the House a few words from the London Globe of Friday evening, May 2, commenting on the discussion that took place in this House on May 14, 1918.

So it has come to this: Honours and titles have been distributed in such a haphazard and undiscriminating manner that Canada, at any rate, wishes to have no more of them. South Africa, too, has already shown that it is more or less of the same opinion, almost the whole press of the Union having criticised and ridiculed the honours conferred last year on South Africans. One Cape newspaper in referring to the question remarked that when South Africa had ceased laughing over the honours it would assuredly resent having been made a laughing stock in front of the rest of the Empire.

In view of recent Honours lists, and especially in view of the one issued this week, we are inclined to share the opinions of our colonial brethren; indeed, conservative though we be, and always will be, it seems to us that a motion regarding the conferring of honours on residents in the United Kingdom, similar to that introduced by Mr. Nickle regarding Canadians, might with advantage be put forward at Westminster.

To the attention of hon. gentlemen who say it is not wrong in principle to grant titular distinction if the methods adopted are proper, I would direct the last words of the article I am reading:

If we saw any hope of titles being given in a thoroughly equitable manner or of honours being conferred on those to whom honours are due, whether the latter be soldiers or sailors or civilians, we should think otherwise. But we see no such hope.

And if the editor of a British paper sees no such hope, then I think it is not beside the mark to suggest that we in Canada are at least purblind where they are blind. I may now read an extract from the London Daily News of May 5, 1919. It reads:

It has always been the hope of those who realize the pernicious influence of titles that the evil would be kept out of the overseas dominions. Canada yielded in some measure to it, and there have been symptoms of late that Australia and New Zealand were in danger of succumbing; but the hostility which has taken such vigorous shape in Canada may be expected to fall like a killing frost on the very objectionable weed everywhere.

The self-denying ordinance of Canada extends to the O.B.E., the latest distribution of which is now imminent. In that connection it is useful to recall the Olympian defence of the Order which the Earl of Crawford, Lord Privy Seal, made in the House of Lords on Nov. 13 last:—

I suppose, without being in a position to speak with great positiveness, that that defence was made in answer to the article I have just read from the Times. This is what Lord Crawford said:

The people who have been receiving the Order of the British Empire are humble people who have been, and are, doing great work for the country. It has been my duty on more than one occasion to make recommendations to that Order, and I cannot say how bitterly I resent the comments of persons of high standing and full of honours about the humble people who are receiving well-earned recognition for work of incalculable value.

Those who are doing great work for the country, those people who are doing services of incalculable value, can only receive the Order of the British Empire, while those who are full of honours and high distinctions are to be awarded with peer-

ages and hereditary titles. Let us ponder on what the editorial writer says:

It is possible that the "humble people" in question will find the frankly hostile comments of "the persons of high standing" rather less insufferable than the high-born patronage of their defender. But one never knows. Perhaps "humility is the badge of all their tribe." Perhaps it is as members of the Order of the Humble that they accept these crumbs from the high table where Earl Crawford sits. In any case, it is gratifying to know that the new list is to be the last and that henceforth people may serve their country without any suggestion of being engaged in a vulgar scramble for meaningless distinctions.

That is all I am going to offer from the popular press of England, but I want to quote a short extract from the London Spectator of May 3, 1919:—

The Honours List was issued on Monday evening, during an outburst on the part of our wonderful climate, which did its best to make us forget that the list had been postponed from the New Year. The list contains four new Barons, twenty-three Baronets, and forty-nine Knights. Lord Burnham and Lord Rothermere both go up a step in the Peerage and become Viscounts. The new Barons are Sir J. H. Roberts, Sir R. T. Hermon-Hodge, Sir T. R. Dewar, and Mr. T. H. A. E. Cochrane. Among the Knights we notice with interest the name of Mr. Harry Lauder.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

But the feature of the list is the steady stream of honours which flows through Fleet Street.

Fleet street, as hon. gentlemen know, is the newspaper centre of Great Britain.

The Navy and Army are still unhonoured.

* * * * *

Lord Burnham, of the Daily Telegraph, and Lord Rothermere, of the Daily Mirror, as we have already said, both go up a step. Lord Burnham has been a most faithful liaison officer between the daily newspaper press and the Government, and Lord Rothermere worked hard at the Royal Army Clothing Department and figured less successfully at the Air Ministry. A baronetcy goes to Mr. Sutton, who is connected with the Daily Mail and its kindred papers; another baronetcy to Mr. Davison Dalziel, formerly proprietor of the Evening Standard, another to Mr. Edward Hulton, who is proprietor of the Daily Sketch, the Daily Dispatch, the Sunday Chronicle, and other newspapers, and who is the only colourable rival to Lord Northcliffe; and yet another to Mr. W. T. Madge, managing director of the People, and formerly manager of the Globe.

What is the insinuation contained in that article? The insinuation is that these men gained their dignities, titles and promotions, not by virtue of any great national service that they had rendered, but by virtue of the fact that they had been instrumental in maintaining a certain Government in power.

[Mr. Nickle.]

Let me read a word or two further from the Saturday Review (London) of May 3, 1919:—

Lord Rothermere's promotion to a viscounty will be gall and wormwood to the irate Polypapist on the Riviera, as the brothers are not on very good terms and there has always been a certain amount of jealousy between them.

That is Lord Northcliffe.

Unless Lord Northcliffe is quickly made an earl, the war of Carmelite House on the Premier will grow hotter. We fail to see why the miracle of turning water into whisky, and selling it at exorbitant prices, should be rewarded with a coronet. If political services go for anything, the peerage of Sir Robert Hermon-Hodge, a hero of many campaigns without an enemy, has been well earned. It would be interesting to learn a little more specifically what are the services to Parliament and the public which entitle the company promoter, Mr. Davison Dalziel to a baronetcy. As for the knights, with the exception of a couple of music-hall mimes (Sir Harry Lauder is a genius), they may be dismissed, as the Morning Post dismisses minor arrivists, by the words "and many others." We are astonished, and grateful, that no Canadian financiers have been ennobled.

We at least have this satisfaction, that the debates that have taken place in this House have apparently had the effect of holding up the list of honours in Canada. I have spoken longer than I intended when I rose to address the House. I have endeavoured to put before the House the argument and principles as enunciated in the resolution of last year; I have endeavoured to place before the honourable members the principles that moved the Special Committee which was appointed to consider this matter this year, and I have endeavoured to show you that the position that I take to-day is exactly the same position that I took over a year ago.

I tell you, Sir, and I tell this House, that when I introduced this matter over a year ago I was moved by a sincere desire that there should be a reform. I thought that the grappling with this problem had been too long delayed. I do not stand for any halfway measures with regard to it. Some men on your right or on your left may call me an extremist, but my experience in public life has led me to the conclusion that if you want to get anywhere, or if you want to advance toward the achievement of that which is right according to your conviction and judgment you have to be prepared to sacrifice something for the attainment of that principle.

I believe that the spirit of the Canadian people is against the continuance of the practice of granting honours, dignities and titular distinctions to Canadians. The press, the conversations that you have with people, and the platforms enunciated by various

political and social organizations all show that the people are against it.

This is not a quarrel with merit; it is a quarrel with the principle that seeks to give recognition to some, not because they are more successful or more entitled to it than others, but simply because they are more successful in obtaining recognition. If I might express my sentiments in a word, in language more apt than I could use, I would say: " Let us be done with the business. Let us build up a public opinion which repudiates these things as an insult to democracy, which holds honest and disinterested service to the Commonwealth as its own reward, which regards the offer of a title as an indignity and its acceptance as a personal degradation."

I have much pleasure in moving the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, we have listened with a great deal of interest and attention to the very eloquent speech of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). I suppose we have a right to assume that the attention of this honourable body of legislators would not have been got so promptly or kept for so long a time on various occasions by the hon. gentleman unless he felt he had a subject of paramount importance to present to the House. I cannot work myself into a fury over this question, because I do not think it is worthy of the great attention that has been bestowed upon it. I do not think it is such a crisis in this country as to warrant it taking up the time of the House to the very great extent that it has taken up our time for the last two years. I would submit to my hon. friend (Mr. Nickle), who has talent and ability to burn, that there are a great many things in this country which require his attention much more than titles. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he would have won the plaudits of the people if he had dilated to-day to the same extent on the situation of some poor boy who could not go to school because he had no shoes, or some little girl who did not have a proper dress, or of some poor children who had to go to bed hungry.

This subject will have to be disposed of, and I do not wish to belittle the ideas put forward by my hon. friend. I would like to tell him that the discussion should not be prolonged too much, for fear that he may change his mind and vote against his own resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope, to recall the old saying, that we may strike the iron when it is hot and catch his vote on this occasion. The hon. gentleman seemed to be very much disturbed about the way in which the British people govern themselves. He seemed to think that there was a serious danger to the world if the British people should be permitted to deal with their own affairs, and that we must step in and tell them how to apply democratic principles in that country.

I do not share in that fear; I believe that the British people are quite capable of looking after their own affairs. I submit, Sir, that the granting of titles is entirely a matter for the people; and if we can educate our own people to say that titles are unnecessary, that they should not be recommended and that Canadians should not receive them, then they will not be granted. If the granting of titles is coming to be a matter of disgrace, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nickle) said, and a matter of corruption in the Old Land, the British people will deal with that, and they will see to it that a Government will be put in power who will not make those recommendations which should not be made. That I think is the way in which this question must be effectively dealt with.

It has been acknowledged by the hon. gentleman, and I think quite truly and properly, that His Majesty the King is not responsible for the creating or making of these titles; that he is simply carrying out, or allowing his name to be used in connection with recommendations made by the Government of the day in every country in which those titles are being conferred. It is one of the basic principles of our constitution, under responsible government, that the King can do no wrong. We have to stand by that principle, and to realize that the King acts upon the recommendation of his advisers, and that his advisers are responsible to the people; and if there is any abuse of His Majesty's prerogatives or power, the abuse must be visited upon the Government and rectified by the people and not make any direct representations to the King himself. I am in favour, Sir, if I have anything to say about it, of the language of this resolution. I am not in favour of bringing this matter directly to the notice of His Majesty, but I do believe in this House declaring itself, as a principle of democracy, against titles. When that happens we are declaring, as far as this House can declare,

to the Canadian people whom we represent here, that henceforth we are in favour of an enlarged democracy in this country, and to a continuation of the democracy which we possess by telling the Government—whichever Government it may be—that the nation is not in favour of such recommendations for titles being made to the King.

The creating of titles, as is well known, is one of the prerogatives of His Majesty. In these days when the liberty of the British subject is of a broad and deep character, and based upon such a solid foundation, we can recall that those who had to do with the circumventing of the power of the King, or the cutting off of whatever they regarded as dangerous, left this prerogative of conferring titles to His Majesty. We must, therefore believe that this prerogative having stood the test of many ages, was not regarded in the early stages as dangerous, and is not so regarded now, in view of the fact that that prerogative is not exercised by the King except upon the will, wish, and recommendation of a responsible government. Therefore, Sir, if there is anything to be reformed in connection with it, it is a domestic reform so far as Canada is concerned, and should be, and can be carried out, without referring the matter to His Majesty the King, or to any authorities beyond the seas, except in so far as cutting down the titles that are already conferred; I presume it would be necessary to have some legislation enacted in the Motherland in regard to that.

It is unnecessary for me to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not in favour of hereditary titles, for the reason that while I am not opposed to a man who earns a distinction getting it—I believe there are occasions when worth or ability, noteworthy discoveries, or inventions, and matters of that kind, should be recognized by honours—I do not think the honour should be handed down by way of heredity to somebody who had nothing whatever to do with it, and did nothing to win it except that he had the good fortune to be the child of the person who had earned that distinction. My idea of democracy, to use a commonplace expression, is that every tub should stand on its own bottom; that every man and every woman in this country upon whom a title is conferred should have the distinction of having earned such title himself or herself. That, Sir, is the position which I take, and for that reason I am opposed to hereditary distinctions.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I was not in favour of taking up too much of the time of the House in discussing this subject, and therefore I should not transgress beyond reasonable bounds. I think we have occasion to be grateful to the hon. member (Mr. Nickle) for having brought this matter before the House because it affords the opportunity of thrashing out these matters and showing what real democracy is. I have met a great many knights in this country—gentlemen upon whom titles had been conferred. They are not any more to me to-day than they were before they enjoyed those titles; in fact, perhaps I thought more of them before than I do now. We have "Sirs," sitting in this House; they are estimable gentlemen now, and they were estimable gentlemen before they were knighted; I do not see any difference in them in that regard. I am almost in the position of the old Scotchman—a great big burly fellow, who was being beaten by a small handful of a wife. He was asked, "Why do you permit that little midget of a woman to beat you?" "Why," he said, "it pleases she and doesn't hurt me." If it is a gratification and satisfaction for any person to be called "Sir," very good; it does not hurt me in the slightest degree and I lose no sleep over it. But, as I have already said, there are a great many other things in this country which call more for the attention of the pure democracy of this House than the question of titles, although I am not finding fault with my good friend for bringing the matter forward.

Now as far as the prerogatives of the King and the exercise of them are concerned, I think we might well say about them what a very excellent Governor General of Canada told me on one occasion. He said, "I understand that a Governor General is permitted to have opinions in Canada provided he does not express them." That is very much the same as in the case of the prerogatives the King has, providing he does not exercise them except upon the advice of his ministry for the time being. Therefore I think that we can be just as democratic as we please in respect of any prerogatives that the King or the Governor General may be exercising here or in the Homeland. However, I think we are apt to go too far with our democracy, like everything else. We must not forget the magnificent stability given to the institutions of this country by reason of the fact that we have a King, and the prerogatives of His Majesty and the prerogatives of

the Governor General and the continuity of power and excellence in connection with our institutions and our Government do not suffer by reason of that stability. It would be well not to try and strike too close to the foundation in case we might find ourselves doing discredit to the fountain head of constitutional justice, power, and right unintentionally and not meaning to do any such thing. No doubt power and wealth, and what you might be pleased to call aristocracy, jar upon the poor man, and some people for the sake of getting relief and satisfaction think they should strike down those institutions. That is a great mistake. There is only one true liberty—the exercise of the right of citizenship within the law. And that law is only stable as we recognize the fountain head, the prerogatives of the King and of those who are in office by virtue of the powers that flow from him.

I am prepared, Sir, to vote for this resolution, as I have nothing to the contrary to offer, but I am not doing so because I feel I am accomplishing anything very great. However, it seems to be the desire that an expression of opinion should be obtained from this House as to the cutting down of the multiplicity of titles. I want to say to the Acting Prime Minister for the benefit of this Government and of any future Government, that great care should be taken that no person is recommended for the honour except one who is highly worthy of it, and to whom the granting of a title would be recognized by the Canadian people as something that was eminently deserved. These titles are becoming so common that before very long some men will be ashamed to acknowledge that they have them; they are no distinction at all. If they are to be an incentive to or a recognition of honourable conduct and better service, they must be kept within the bounds of respectability.

I have reason to know that there are sitting in this House men from my own province who deserve distinctions and who could have easily have had them, but who turned them down. I have no doubt, Sir, that on more than one occasion the hon. gentleman who represents Shelburne and Queen's (Hon. Mr. Fielding) could have been knighted; but his own name, a name that has been a household word in this Dominion for the last twenty years, is greater to him and to his friends than any knighthood. I had the pleasure of sitting with the now distinguished premier of the province of Nova Scotia when word came offering him a knighthood, and he replied, "I want no knighthood. I will not accept it." That is no reflection on the gentlemen who accept knighthoods; it is simply a matter of temperament. But the men who enjoy the respect and confidence of the people of this country are honoured just as much without titles.

If, however, occasions should arise in the future when men should be honoured by titles, I would not care to say that the door is absolutely closed against His Majesty conferring titles upon them. I like freedom in these things as well as freedom in everything else, and if it be proper that the time honoured custom of conferring a title here and there on worthy citizens should be continued, I am not entirely opposed to it.

Let me say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that if the motion of the hon. member for Kingston is a step towards broader democracy, if it is a step by which the common people of this country will be more consulted and have more to say and feel themselves more a factor in the Government of this country he has done much and has my thanks for the discussion which he has brought on in this House.

Mr. CHARLES SHEARD (Toronto South): Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the adoption of the report, for the reason that I consider it unwise in its expression, unconstitutional in its tendency and unreasonable in its application. If I may quote from the report of the committee, I find that we approach His Majesty with what is practically a rebuke. We, the people of Canada, as represented in this assembly, ask His Majesty in paragraph (a) "to refrain." As one of His Majesty's Commoners in this Parliament, I entertain too high a respect for His Majesty to approach and address him in that particular form. I venture to say that if we had set forth the facts; if this committee is prepared to vouch for the facts and to submit evidence to His Majesty in a proper form to illustrate and to substantiate the view that the people of this country are greatly perturbed about the granting of titles, it is right and proper that that evidence should accompany so peremptory a demand as the report of this committee appears, to my mind, at least, to make.

The hon. member for Kingston has said that the heather is on fire in the Dominion regarding the distribution and application of these titles; that there is a tremendous stir, not only throughout Canada, but throughout the British Isles, and that in England some newspaper writers, notably

among others, the owner and director of the Times, have shaken the Empire to its very base. I must confess that in my goings to and fro amongst the people of this country I have yet to find a single individual in any walk of life who is a hundredth part as agitated about this matter as the hon. member for Kingston appears to be.

I have listened last session and this, and at times somewhat wearily, to the prolonged debates upon this subject, and I must confess that the thought often entered my mind, that it would have been better if we could have turned our attention to something far more inspiring and far more important. I am not going to be a transgressor against the principles which I am now voicing and I do not intend to speak very long upon this subject; but I do think that it is right and proper for those who hold contrary views to demonstrate that something can be said for the other side.

At the outset I am free to say that the whole discussion upon this question has been caused, in my judgment, not by the principle of bestowing titles, but the unfortunate fact that many men have been distinguished by the conferring of titles,—particularly in the city a part of which I represent,—who have done nothing whatever that the ordinary man on the street could discover to deserve their being so honoured. It has appeared that this special distinction is claimed and enjoyed by the banker, the broker, and the money maker, and that the only qualification is ability and power to amass wealth. Well, if that be so, all I have to say is that those who make the recommendations to His Majesty should receive the rebuke, not the head of the Empire, who acts upon the recommendations and advice of his advisors.

Secondly, I consider that in its tendency the recommendation in the report of the Committee is unconstitutional. In its effect it aims at the destruction of the House of Lords. If we carry it to its logical completion, we would necessarily, in the next step, ask His Majesty to abolish the House of Lords. We all know that in order to occupy a seat in that body a man must have a peerage; a peerage must be created before a man is advanced from the House of Commons to take a seat in the House of Lords. In Canada, following the constitutional practice observed in Britain, we too have an Upper House, composed of the honourable members of the Senate. If we are going to be practical and radical in this matter, we will start to carry out the principles which we are enunciating by abolishing the Senate. I might get considerable support for this suggestion among the rank and file of the people of Canada. I venture to say that if the question was put before the people to-day: "Which is more important, the abolition of titles, or the abolition of the Senate,"? my recommendation, if I made such would carry. If we are to be consistent and constitutional, before this resolution is adopted, the member for Kingston and those who second and support it, must, in my judgment, bring forward for the consideration of this Parliament a recommendation to abolish the Senate.

Let us consider the effect and application of this resolution. I am one of those who believe that titular distinction is a very strong incentive, and has been all through history, to earnest, honest, devoted work in certain lines, professions, and callings. I propose to address myself more particularly to this phase of the question.

From the cradle to the grave the greatest incentive and the strongest inspiration to extra effort and extra endeavour on the part of the human being is appreciation. Even the nursing child in its mother's arms performs its little tricks more earnestly under her smile and when surrounded by the approval of its friends. I have often wondered as I listened to the member for Kingston expounding on this question whether he was among the dull laggards at the bottom of his class in school, college, or university, or whether he was among those who strove to achieve distinction there. From what I know of him, I venture to think he was in the latter class. We see boys at school working for certificates of honour; we see young men at colleges and universities burning midnight oil and making every effort, putting forth every energy, to improve and strengthen their mentality—for what? Simply in order that they may be distinguished among their fellows as being the recipients of honour certificates, of prize books of award, or of medals. These distinctions are regarded by their recipients not, as of so much intrinsic value in themselves, but as valuable to those who win them—valuable not only during their university and college careers, but throughout their whole lives, because such certificates or awards bear the imprimatur of the institution whence they graduated and indicate their high standing and progress among the classes. In the great school of life this principle still prevails, and I sincerely trust that Parliament will not put any stumbling-blocks in the way of the applica-

tion or bestowment of such evidences of appreciation.

It has been argued that titles are of no value. We have been told that they make a class; that they engender class hatred in the smoking rooms of the cars and among those who travel up and down as does the hon. member who submits this report. Well, let us go back and see. I have in mind those of my own profession who have been so distinguished, and worthily distinguished, and if I do not weary the House I should like to submit one or two names in this connection. Would any one claim that the bestowment of a peerage upon the great surgeon and discover of antiseptics, Sir Joseph Lister, did not inspire and benefit the whole of the surgeons of the British Empire, from himself down to the humblest worker and striver in the same field? I say that it did.

Mr. BURNHAM: The hon. gentleman is surely aware of the fact that Lister ascribed all his achievements to Pasteur, and that Pasteur had no honour or distinction of any kind.

Mr. SHEARD: I am well aware of Sir Joseph Lister's achievements; I know what they were long before he was raised to the peerage. I am also aware of how much he owed to the distinguished Frenchman, Pasteur, the very apostle and centre of all germ theory and germ progress. But I fear that the hon. member has failed to grasp my point, which is this: the distinction which Sir Joseph Lister secured did not affect him so much as it affected students, workers, and votaries in the same class, at a time when men were defaming him and decrying his efforts and his claims because, it was contended, they had no value.

I will give another illustration. Sir James Y. Simpson, the discoverer of chloroform, struggled alone in his back office for twenty years trying to demonstrate the feasibility of anaesthetics as a benefit to patients who were undergoing surgical operations. He was actually expelled from the surgical society of the city of Edinburgh because of his theories and experiments in this regard. His critics said: "He has gone crazy upon an impossible condition." It was not until Queen Victoria permitted him to administer to her an anaesthetic, and afterwards knighted him, that it was clearly demonstrated to every one that anaesthetics were of value, that their application was feasible, and that their use enabled the surgeon to gain access to parts of the human frame which previously he had been unable to reach.

I go further and give to my hon. friend another illustration—one nearer home. I was fortunate enough to be intimately associated with and a personal friend of one of the most distinguished physicians Canada ever produced. That gentleman worked in the same scientific field with me, occupying a professional chair in the University and Medical Faculty of McGill College, Montreal. He devoted his energies to what? Not to the making of money, but to increasing and improving the status and condition of the medical profession throughout the length and breadth of this country. He put in hours and hours, aye, often day after day, week in, week out, and year in, year out—he devoted as many as four, five, and six days' service in the week amongst the paupers and poor in the public hospital of the city of Montreal. His efficiency being recognized, he was invited to become the assistant of Pepper, of Philadelphia, and I well remember his being with me when he was about to remove to that great centre, and while driving him over to the General Hospital in Toronto, I asked him: "What are the emoluments in connection with your new appointment?" "Oh," he said, "the emoluments are nothing; they are not enough to live on, but the field is large, and the possibilities for scientific achievement on behalf of medicine in this country are very great, and it is that which attracts me and makes me anxious to get into the work that I want to serve." Then when he was transferred from there to Johns Hopkins University, one of the most famous institutions upon the North American continent, he revolutionized the clinic in the medical department, establishing a clinic that was world famous. And when from there he was invited by the University Authorities to take the Chair of Medicine in Oxford University and created a baronet, there was not in the Dominion of Canada a man but was proud to see him so honoured, and there was not in the rank and file of the medical profession a man but who felt stimulated to greater service and endeavour, because one so worthy had been so greatly honoured. I need hardly say that I refer to our great and distinguished Canadian citizen, Sir William Osler.

I do not want to say that all the advantages are to the doctors. I might quote almost every branch of science and art to show where titular distinctions have been

of advantage. Indeed, no man who knows the history of or anything about art will deny how much the National Art Gallery of Great Britain has owed to the work and teachings of Sir Joshua Reynolds. Yet, Sir Joshua Reynolds did not receive much attention until he accepted the distinction of knighthood, because, even in the early part of his career, artists in England were classed with sign painters and interior decorators of buildings and houses. There was no real admiration for art for art's sake. There was, amongst the rank and file, a general impression that such effort was only wasting time and trifling and frittering away greater and more glorious opportunities, but by the conferring of titular distinctions amongst its votaries and leaders who, because of their work, genius and calling, received a separate and official distinction, the whole art of painting was benefited and blessed.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is the hon. gentleman aware that Zeuxis, Praxiteles, and Leonardo da Vinci bore no titles?

Mr. SHEARD: I am not saying that for a second. The hon. gentleman entirely misunderstood me. I am not saying that titles and distinctions are the only things in life. But titles have their use, and the abuse of them is no argument to put up that they are an injury to a progressive and democratic people. I was about to refer when interrupted, to that great astronomer who under the greatest difficulties and objections from the populace, developed under the patronage of George III, and discovered the planet Uranus, and history records of him that as regards all the facts in connection with the demonstrations of astronomy, no man has done so much for astronomical science as Sir William Herschell. Some one may say: Did the title make him do that? Certainly not, but it altogether separated him from the common remark—"star-gazer and trifler and fool that wants to find out something where there is nothing." It showed that there was an expression of national spirit, a national feeling, a national judgment, that that science in its greatest votary was a thing to be recognized, restored, and esteemed amongst the people.

When I come to the arts, painting, literature and the like, hon. members will remember what was said of Englishmen during the last of the Georges and on the accession of Queen Victoria. It was said on the continent of Europe that the English were nothing but a nation of shopkeepers, and why? Because, nothing had been said or done to distinguish the man of art, of science, of letters, in the nation. I say that these very distinctions counteract that tendency amongst the people of a new country and a new land, and they have value.

I take the resolution and I see a weakness in it at the start. This resolution proposes to leave untouched distinctions and honours acquired by military men. That was very wise on the part of the committee at this present time. Those distinctions may be trifling in intrinsic value, but they are the dearest possessions of many a soldier whose breast they adorn. Will any man in this House dare to say that above all the treasures a true British soldier possesses, the Bronze Cross that adorns his breast, the Victoria Cross for valour, is not amongst the highest of his achievements? It is but a recognition in military life what knighthood, forsooth, may be in civil life. It has stimulated to greater effort and sacrifice; it has developed and produced throughout all the officers and all the rank and file a determination that they will sustain the men who have been so decorated by His Majesty the King. If such be true of men who have borne so much sacrifice, sacrifices so great in the military ranks of this Empire, does it not illustrate the fact that decorations, although different in kind—acknowledgments conferred with honour and formality—have also the same and equally useful purpose in the great work of civil life? These are the decorations which keep life, hope, and courage in the hearts of desperate men, and without them there would be, in my humble judgment, a lack of effort and a lack of energy. Go to the great republic to the south, the great home of democracy. The exemplars of democracy live in that nation, and what do we see? We see that there the great measure of success is not a peerage, it is not a titular distinction, it is the bank account of the individual and the size of the cheque he can subscribe. I do not for a moment wish to say anything derogatory of that great, energetic, progressive people. I do not for a moment wish to say that there have not been noble patriotic men there who have come forward with liberal donations to every scientific enterprise and every philanthropic work. But I contend, and I say it cannot be denied, that underlying it all is a keen and earnest desire for some distinction or other which may designate them as separate and apart from the money value of the man. And to so great an extent has this been carried that it has become a matter of common remark throughout the length and breadth of this country, that

the efforts of Americans, backed up by their gold, to ally themselves with the peers of the realm of Britain and the aristocracy of England, have amounted almost to a disgrace. So that for all your democracy, there is still what I describe as an innate physiological trait in the human species, a longing for something still more distinctive. And, I could cite instances in justification of that assertion. This is a time of unrest after the war. This is a time when, in my judgment, we have to consider carefully every motion and every movement which tends to set class against class. History repeats itself. Some one in this House, I have forgotten who, just now cited an illustration of the Louis's of France and what happened to them in the French revolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that no man will adduce that period in support of this resolution and recommendation, unless he carefully analyzes the period and its history. What happened there? They dethroned Louis of France, but what did that carry with it? Every art, every culture, every moral surrounding. Yes, more than that. They obliterated all advice and opinion, and those who held contrary ideas hesitated to speak until it was too late. Men of genius and culture came forward. The whole family of genius gave forth their treasures and nobly did they yield them upon the altar of their country's exigency, but too late. The rabble blasphemer would have none of it then, and they called their polluted deities from the brothel and the fall of the idol extinguished the very flame of the altar. We need not, however, go so far back. We can go back to the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. Any man who visited Paris after that war and saw the devastation wrought and the injury done to works of art and decorations historic in their character, and saw the rabble incensed against all government, crowd the streets with cannon and grapeshot, must realize what comes to those who inspire revolutionary conditions, heedless of results, heedless of the lesson of history, but willing to go any lengths to abolish class and to bring about an equality which does not exist. I well remember, too, after that time the great French painter, Gustave Doré had to flee from Paris with his precious treasures and instal them in Regent street in his gallery. And many a quiet hour have I spent watching him at work with his brush and palette, doing his pictures so dear to his heart, when he had not even the wherewithal to buy his meals and to pay his rent. But at that time he could have no home in Paris because the Communists had got control, and had no regard for science, nor art, nor culture, nor for men of such pursuits. And I remember on one occasion, if I may tell it, while I sat in his gallery, a rich and proud American came to see his pictures and implored him to sell one. He offered Gustave Doré $20,000 for the painting, but Doré, with the true ideal of the Frenchman, refused to consider the offer. The American came back and importuned him, and finally offered him, for what was probably his greatest work of art—Christ leaving the Pretorium—$100,000. I well remember when he was pressing that offer; it was in Doré's open gallery in Regent street. I was then a student and I was watching this ideal of the great painter. Doré dropped his brush, gazed upon the painting, and saw there what he had produced upon that canvas, the great central figure of the Christ, with its lights and shades surrounding. And as he looked upon it he turned upon his would-be seducer and said: "No; money can never buy that painting, for it represents the life and work of Gustave Doré." I will not say positively, but I believe that France afterwards adopted these works as national treasures, and bestowed upon Gustave Doré the cherished distinction of the Legion of Honour.

I have another point to which I wish to draw attention. The report of the committee says:—

> Your committee further recommends that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to provide that hereafter no person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada shall accept, enjoy or use any title of honour or titular distinction hereafter conferred by a foreign ruler or government.

Well, if I were fortunate enough to be distinguished by the Government of France and had had conferred on me the Legion of Honour I should wear it, and if I had the button and had the right to wear it in the lapel of my coat I should wear it. I do not care what resolutions were passed by this Parliament I should wear it, because I presume I would have some idea of what it meant. And then what would you do? Either you would fall down in your resolution and your law, or you would have to pass an amendment to the Criminal Code to cause my arrest and imprisonment because a foreign nation had deservedly decorated me and I was proud of the distinction and desired to acknowledge it publicly on all occasions. And you want to argue upon the floor of Parliament that after two years' careful deliberation of the question, and after debate and a most earnest consideration of what is wisest and best to do, the

maturity of your deliberations and the expression of the opinion of the people of Canada is such a recommendation!

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if Canada ever hopes to attain a place, or maintain a position, amongst the civilized nations of the world. I do not know if this Parliament of Canada is ever hopeful to realize and recognize the proud stand of our soldiers who fought for liberty, and for their King. But if Canada is to be relieved from the stigma of a transaction of this kind which can only be characterized as a farce, she must eradicate from her records that ridiculous resolution and recommendation of the report which I feel convinced will only be regarded as a laughing stock by the country.

I said that I did not wish to speak very long upon the subject and I have probably exhausted my allotted time. I hope this House will not be hasty. I hope it will delay the acceptance of this report. I do not know that I can be altogether carried away with admiration of the ability, the statesmanship, or the mind which at this particular time would introduce here debates and resolutions which, I think, every man must realise, have for their object and effect the setting up of class against class. We are the common people; we are a united people, we are a peace loving body of citizens in Canada, and I hope that amity, unity, and admiration for all that is good and great and noble will yet be the characteristic of the true Canadian without distinction or difference.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) in whatever blame or praise is due to him for bringing this matter before the House. There has been a reproach urged against him to the effect that this is not a matter of first rate importance and that it has taken up too much of the time of this House. I ask, Mr. Speaker: Is that the fault of the hon. member for Kingston? I should say it is not. One evening last spring the House of Commons was prepared, in my humble opinion, by an overwhelming majority, to adopt and carry the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), along the same lines as the resolution before the House to-day. It was not the fault of the hon. member for Kingston, and not the fault of the hon. member for Brome, who had seconded the resolution, that it was not carried on that occasion. It was the fault, if fault there be, of the Government of the day which made the matter a non-confidence motion and whipped their followers into line. If the House of Commons had been allowed on that evening to express freely and frankly its opinion, the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield would have passed by an overwhelming majority and, in so far as this House is concerned, the matter would have been disposed of.

This session, when the hon. member for Kingston brought this matter up, urging again the same position as was assumed by the hon. member for Springfield last year, the motion would have been carried by a substantial majority had not the Government of the day thought it wise to refer the question to a committee. I believe firmly that the hon. member for Kingston has been absolutely sincere and courageous in this matter and I am proud to associate myself with him. I would say to him not to mind the sneers and jeers of those who state that he would employ his talents to greater advantage if he used them to forward some other reform. Every reformer has had to meet that. If people do not like a reform they say to the reformer: Why do you urge this reform; why do you not urge the other reform? You remember what was said to the woman with the alabaster box: Why was this ointment not sold for much and the money given to the poor?

The speech of the hon. member for one of the Torontos (Mr. Sheard) started off by saying that this resolution was a rebuke to His Majesty. His Majesty has no more to do with this than he has to do with a writ issued by a court in Canada which reads: George the Fifth, King of Great Britain and Ireland, Emperor of India, and King of the Dominions Beyond the Seas, to so and so, a bailiff of the superior court. It is merely a matter of form and every one knows it. His Majesty has nothing to do with the granting of titles and everybody knows that. The people in England who have to do with the granting of titles are the whips of the political parties and the people in Canada who have to do with the granting of titles are the Government of the day. If the title factory is continued in operation in Canada and the practice grows, the member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and if we on this side of the House get into power and this pernicious system still exists, my hon. friend from Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) will say who is to be called a knight or a squire.

The members from Toronto are so numerous that I cannot remember all their geographical descriptions, but the distinguished medical gentleman who sits for one of the Torontos need not go very far to find evidence of popular disapproval of knighthoods. He has merely to turn to the distinguished gentleman who sits beside him and whom I congratulate on his support of democracy in voting against knighthoods last session.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman's reference to a distinguished gentleman sitting beside my hon. friend from Toronto I can take to mean only one person and that is myself. I rise to a point of order. I want the hon. gentleman to correct himself.

Mr. McMASTER: Had I been referring to the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) I would have call him the "most distinguished." However, the next statement—I cannot characterize it by the appellation of argument—made by the hon. member for South Toronto was that in colleges and schools we have great incentives in the medals that are granted, and he asks why we should not have titles to take the place of medals after the college life is over. May I point out to this House that medals are open to all, not only the rich students, but the poor students, and that medals are granted on a democratic basis on examination open to all and in which the poor boy, often by the fact that temptations to waste time are removed from him, has a better chance, or certainly as good a chance, as the son of the rich man.

My hon. friend went on to detail a list of worthy recipients of the honour. Of course there have been worthy recipients of the honour. There is Sir William Osler, a most worthy man, but I would like to ask my hon. friend before he leaves the Chamber if his admiration for Sir William Osler is due to the fact that he said that all men over sixty should be chloroformed, or is it due to the fact that he said that no man after forty had ever done anything worthy of commendation.

Now as regards military decorations. In our report we distinctly did not touch the question of medals or military decorations. The committee was glad to learn from a gallant and distinguished member of this House that at the front those who originated the giving of medals and decorations were the rank and file of the army, who transmitted instances of particular bravery to their superior officers, who in turn transmitted them to their superiors. That has nothing to do with the question of titles.

My friend also spoke in eloquent terms and worked himself up to almost a fury of eloquence in denouncing the worship of money in the United States. Let me tell my hon. friend that since the children of Israel worshipped the golden calf in the wilderness, all nations have suffered from the same disease and have worshipped the same false god. But when the argument is attempted to be made in this House that the American people are greater sinners than others in this respect, I beg to give that statement a most emphatic negative. I think of Thomas Jefferson, who died a poor man, and who was a typical American democrat. He was so fond of an entire absence of titles that he preferred to call a man by the plain name of John Smith, and not even John Smith Esquire. I think also of William Howard Taft, who left the greatest position in one of the greatest nations in the world, a comparatively poor man, to go back to be a college professor. I think of Thomas Woodrow Wilson, who was forced out of the presidency of Princeton University because he was against rich men's clubs in the university as being undemocratic; they forced him out of the presidency of Princeton University and into the presidency of the United States. Then we had a tirade against the French Revolution.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But there was an English Revolution before that, and there was a Charles who was beheaded.

Mr. McMASTER: There was an English revolution, and there was a Charles beheaded; but I would not hurt the Royalist sentiments, or the tender Stuart proclivities of any hon. gentlemen who sit opposite by referring to those events. But I might speak with pride of the revolution of 1688, when William of Orange came over the North sea and landed in England to found a new dynasty there when the former king disappeared. I believe such a reference as that will not be ungrateful or ungracious to the ears of some hon. gentlemen opposite; they, like me, are warm admirers of that great Dutchman, William of Orange. But we have heard a tirade against the French Revolution. If you will pardon a personal reference, Mr. Speaker, some years ago I had the pleasure of being a student at Edinburgh

University. I belong to a literary and debating society there called the Dialectic Society, which had been in existence a little more than a hundred years. Those Scotch students of the Dialectic Society discussed the French revolution when it was in progress and spread upon their minute book—(I saw the resolution)—that the French revolution would result in greater benefit than harm to mankind. And they were right, because whatever were the extreme measures which characterized that revolution, whatever were the extravagances of those connected with the movement, it was a great liberating movement, a great forward advance in the march of liberty.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the hon. gentleman pretend to confuse the French revolution proper with the period of anarchy and Bolshevism?

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I hope not.

Mr. McMASTER: But I say that these great changes in the history of mankind are often accompanied by turmoil, disorder, anarchy and crime.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Every one has endorsed the revolution.

Mr. McMASTER: Every one has got to endorse the French revolution. My friend from Toronto—I am not sure from which geographical division—has read history, if I may dare to say, through Torontonian eyes if he does not appreciate the French revolution.

Now we come to the last argument that in this House attempting to do away with knighthoods and distinctions of this sort we are trying to set class against class. That is what they said of John Bright when he was trying to free from taxes the bread of the poor in Great Britain.

Mr. BURNHAM: And voted against the Factory Acts.

Mr. McMASTER: He voted against the Factory Acts only as regards men.

Mr. BURNHAM: And women and children.

Mr. McMASTER: He did not in the case of women and children, that is where my hon. friend is wrong. Let him read Trevelyan's life of John Bright, he will find that John Bright supported the Factory Acts for the protection of women and chidren, but he believed that as far as men were concerned—I think he was wrong as a matter of fact—they could get better economic justice for themselves through their unions than through legislation. It is an old, old story that John Bright opposed protecting women, and especially children, against the rapacity and the selfishness of their employers. Setting class against class! Why what we are trying to do by this resolution is to endeavour to have true democracy in this country. No one will tell me that knighthoods can be distributed except to those who have got the wealth to support them. Perhaps one of the least harmful features would be the granting of knighthoods to soldiers in the field; but you cannot knight generals unless you are prepared to knight colonels; you cannot knight colonels unless you are prepared to knight captains; you cannot knight captains unless you are prepared to knight lieutenants; you cannot knight lieutenants unless you are prepared to knight sergeants; and you cannot knight sergeants unless you are prepared to knight the rank and file. I say that as far as heroism and unselfish devotion to duty are concerned, that the rank and file will compare with those of any other branch of the Canadian or any other army. No, we are not attempting to set class against class, but we are attempting to do away with a system which we believe has no place in the free air of North America. Therefore, I give my most hearty, sympathetic, and warm support to the report which has been submitted by my gallant, brave and unselfish friend from Kingston.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with any purpose of dealing with this question on what one might call its merits; I think that is unnecessary after the very eloquent and able speech, from my point of view, of the hon. member from South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). I rise with a double purpose, Sir, in my mind: The first purpose I have is to give a slightly different view of what happened before the Committee than is given either in the report, or in the speech which we we have had to-day from my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle). I was a member of that Committee and I did not get the notice calling the final meeting for the adoption of the report until the meeting itself was breaking up. The reason for that was: The notices calling that meeting were not posted in the post office until nine o'clock the night before, and sometimes business is of such a nature that it does not detain members after that hour. I understand there was only a bare quorum

when the report was adopted. If I had been present I should have made it quite clear that I could not concur in the report as adopted because, to my mind, it is illogical, it leaves certain anomalies, and if we analyzed the report carefully, the House, by its adoption, would be going very far towards lending its countenance to the absurdity.

Now with regard to the question of hereditary titles. I do not think there is much difference of opinion in this House or in the country. The question of heredity is totally opposed to the question of the distinction conferred upon a man in his own lifetime—opposed in principle. A man who gets a distinction in his own lifetime, from a monarch or any one else, presumably has earned it.

But the man who only gets it from his father has inherited it, and has had nothing to do with the earning of it. I take it that this whole House would be opposed to any continuation of the hereditary principle.

But with regard to the other findings of the Committee, I can scarcely think that a majority of the House will support them when they understand exactly what the report recommends. It is said, for example, that we are to recommend His Majesty to insure the extinction of titular distinctions. The paragraph immediately succeeding that which makes this recommendation says that "a suggestion was made that the titles of 'Right Honourable' and 'Honourable' be discontinued, but the suggestion did not meet with the approval of the Committee." I submit to this House that the titles "Honourable" and "Right Honourable" are titular distinctions. As a matter of fact, what happened was that I had the duty of moving that those titles, if Parliament abolished all titles, must go likewise, because I wanted to be logical. That was voted down on the Committee by only six to three. There were only nine members at the moment taking sufficient interest in the proceedings of the Committee to give a vote on what I conceived to be a very important point.

We are asked by this report—in which I should have been very sorry to concur, because I cannot, the way my mind is trained, concur in anything which is the embodiment at once of democratic cant and illogical nonsense—in one paragraph to recommend His Majesty to abolish all titular distinctions in Canada, and we are asked in another paragraph—by a six to three vote of the same Committee—to retain the titles "Honourable" and "Right Honourable," which I contend, on any fair interpretation of the English language, are themselves titular distinctions. What is the difference between the "Sir" which goes with a knighthood and the "Right Honourable" which goes with a Privy Counsellorship? The one comes to a man because he is made a member of the Privy Council; the other is conferred directly by the Sovereign. The same applies to the term "Honourable" to this extent, that while the "Sir" is conferred directly by the Sovereign, the title "Honourable" comes under the provisions of the British North America Act, if I am not mistaken, to members of the Senate and to the members of provincial or Dominion Administrations. Well, with regard to the present occupants of portfolios, whether in the provincial governments or in the Dominion Government, I suppose we are all prepared to say, "Brutus is an honourable man; so are they all, all honourable men." But I am perfectly sure in regard to the history of some of the men who have held that title of honourable in the past, the title was very much needed, because a good many people would not have suspected the existence of what the title suggests.

Mr. NICKLE: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to show me where the word "abolish" appears in the report?

Mr. M. CLARK: "Extinction" is the word I used.

Mr. NICKLE: The hon. member used the word "abolish." I do not see it anywhere in the report.

Mr. M. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it is only a mind like that of the hon. member for Kingston that could see a difference between abolition and extinction. When I am extinguished I shall be pretty badly abolished. I do not want to dispute this point. I quoted the word "extinction," and if my hon. friend is out for literary accuracy in dealing with the report, why, Sir, he can have the word "extinction." Extinction is coming to us all, and when we are extinguished we shall be abolished.

Mr. NICKLE: May I have the privilege of asking a question?

Mr. M. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I shall really have to ask the hon. member for Kingston not to interrupt.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Red Deer has the floor.

Mr. NICKLE: Yes, unless he gives me the privilege of putting a question, and I think he should do so. May I have the privilege of putting this question? Then I will not

interrupt again. Does my hon. friend not see " to insure the extinction " applies only to hereditary titles?

Mr. M. CLARK: The point has the merit of a very slight distinction. What my hon. friend will admit is that the paragraph which asks for the extinction of hereditary titles asks for the discontinuance of the conferring of knighthoods.

Mr. NICKLE: It does nothing of the sort.

Mr. M. CLARK: Then I do not understand the report.

Mr. NICKLE: That is the difficulty.

Mr. M. CLARK: Then, Mr. Speaker, if a member of the Committee does not understand the report, I can only say that that would be a very good reason for the next Committee over which my hon. friend presides sending out notices for the final meeting rather more than twelve hours before the final meeting is called; and it would also be a very good reason for this House taking some considerable time to study the report before endorsing or amending it. I understood that we were to recommend His Majesty to confer no more titles of the knighthood order in Canada.

Mr. NICKLE: That is correct.

Mr. M. CLARK: That is what I said a minute ago. Then my hon. friend interjected that the report did nothing of the kind.

Mr. NICKLE: No.

Mr. M. CLARK: That is exactly what I said a minute ago, and I must say that my hon. friend has wrought himself up to such a pitch of excitement on this question that he forgets one moment afterwards what has been said one minute before.

Mr. NICKLE: Look at to-morrow's Hansard.

Mr. M. CLARK: I must return to my argument in spite of these interruptions, which are of a somewhat persistent and disorderly nature, Mr. Speaker. At the time when my hon. friend intervened to make a distinction without a difference I was pointing out that this report asked the House of Commons to recommend His Majesty to extinguish the custom of giving knighthoods, and in the next paragraph it says that it does not recommend His Majesty to interfere with the titles of "Honourable" or "Right Honourable." And I had arrived at the point in my remarks when comparing the title "Honourable"—which is a title that goes to hon. members of the Senate—with the title "Sir"—which is the prefix of knighthood,—

I was pointing out that what we would actually do if we adopted this report in its entirety would not be to abolish titular distinctions at all, but to abolish titular distinctions conferred by His Majesty, while we ourselves would continue those which come to our fellow citizens under the British North America Act. So that the report of the Committee brings us to this position: We have more respect for what was done in the British North America Act by the titled gentlemen who occupied the House of Lords fifty or sixty years ago and their comrades in the House of Commons, than we have for His Most Gracious Majesty at present occupying the throne of the British Empire. I contend that that is an absurd recommendation for any committee to make to this House, and that we should be illogical in the extreme if we adopted it.

Another reason why I would not have concurred in this report if I had been at the last meeting of the Committee is because of the recommendation in regard to foreign titles. Mr. Speaker, just think of what is actually recommended in that part of the report. It reads:

> Your committee further recommends that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to provide that hereafter no person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada shall accept, enjoy or use any title of honour or titular distinction hereafter conferred by a foreign ruler or government.

The House will observe that we cannot interfere with a foreign monarch. But the Committee recognized that it would be a great anomaly to recommend our own Sovereign to confer no titles upon people resident in Canada and yet to allow people in Canada to accept similar decorations from a foreign monarch. But the difficulty of the whole subject as it is dealt with in this report will at once be brought home to the mind of the House when we reflect that there had to be a recommendation that legislation be passed by this House to prevent our citizens from receiving titular distinctions from a foreign monarch. Now, legislation, to be effective, must carry with it a penal clause. Therefore, what is recommended by this report is that we should pass legislation with a penal clause, sentencing to fine or imprisonment men who have been so distinguished among their fellows that they have been picked out by monarchs of foreign countries to be the recipients of dis-

tinction. It is the thought of that condition that led me to say in the opening of my remarks that if we adopted this report in its entirety we should be passing very nearly into the realm of the absurd. That is a brief history of the arguments that came before the Committee as they appealed to at least a minority of the Committee, of which this report is not the unanimous finding.

The second purpose, Sir, for which I rose was to say that I thought the feelings and sentiments of the Canadian people would be met on this subject at the present time if they accepted the guidance which was to be had in the very sane, constitutional speech of my hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie). I think he indicated, without doing so specifically, the lines which would meet the average thought of a majority of the thinking people of this country. For the principle of heredity I do not think any one has any use. But I feel that what was in the mind of my hon. friend who leads the Opposition was that to go much further than a recommendation to governments that greater care should be taken in the conferring of distinctions would be going further than would be wise, having regard to all the circumstances.

I was very much impressed by the argument of my hon. friend by which he made it clear to the House, or clear to my mind anyhow, that in practice the King confers only those distinctions that are recommeded by governments. What I think my hon. friend wanted us to infer from that was that it would be a wise thing, it would be a temperate thing, to keep the King out of this thing altogether. If it is governments that do this, then let us, as a House of Commons, be reasonable and address ourselves to governments and tell them what we think is the average opinion of the people of Canada upon this subject. I am confident that the prevailing sentiment of this country is that the principle of hereditary titles is utterly bad and that there has been an abuse of the giving of titles; that titles have been conferred upon people that the majority of the Canadian people would not have honoured in that way. If these two points were brought clearly out in a recommendation to this Government, in conjunction with the Imperial Government, we should keep the monarch out of the matter; we should take a step in advance along the line of what those who feel keenly about it feel is the line of reform; and we should leave a large number of people with the satisfaction that they derive from the thought that constitutional proceedings which have come down through centuries should not be too lightly or too rudely interfered with at this particular period of our history.

The leader of the Opposition laid down an excellent principle when he said that he was for freedom in these matters—he added, I think, " in all matters." Well, I was particularly glad to hear him say that, because I at once added mentally that he is not only for free titles, but for free trade as well. I hope I did not misunderstand his generalization. If that is the state of his mind, it has come about suddenly; but after all, there have been sudden conversions in history that have been very beneficial to mankind and I should rejoice with unspeakable joy and without any reserve if the case of Saul of Damascus was repeated in the case of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I think that freedom might well be allowed to rule in this matter, for a time at any rate. I repeat that so far as I can interpret the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) he has, on this question anyhow, interpreted the mind of the country. The country would be very well satisfied at this time if the House could see its way to pass some resolution or to amend this recommendation so that we express ourselves strongly against hereditary titles and strongly in favour of more care being exercised in the conferring of any other titles.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough, West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this subject, because I believe it is of vast importance. Many things which appear to be trifling because they are splashy nevertheless hide a great deal of rottenness, and that is the case with the whole scheme of titular distinctions, without exception. The day has passed for the triumph of aristocracy.

We have reached the age of democracy, and it would be well for the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) and the hon. member for Toronto South (Mr. Sheard) to remember that fact. If hon. gentlemen fancy that they are not interpreting the wishes of their constituents by voting for the resolution and if they are in favour of the continuance of titles, let them go on and vote for titles they will find out what their constituents think about the matter the next time they go home or the next time they stand for election. I do not intend to debate this question at great length, as we have heard about it for years. I

brought up the subject in 1913-14, and I was knocked out by two heavy weights, the great and much lamented late leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). This seemed too much for me to go up against at the time, so I retired for a sponge-off and a glass of water. But there intervened a war, and it seemed to me that it was inadvisable, under all the circumstances, to interpose a row about titles in the much greater row that was going on in Europe. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), however, after consulting me about the matter, took up the question and has dealt with it with the object of stemming the tide of decorations which was about to flow in consequence of the war. He is no doubt well advised, and he had more courage than I, or perhaps more wisdom. I thought the day was coming when, undoubtedly, people in Canada as elsewhere in the world would insist that titular and class distinctions must disappear. We could well afford to wait. We have waited for hundreds of years for this consummation to be brought about, and surely, when we view the world over, we may well and confidently say that those who are in favour of class distinctions will disappear with the junkers of Germany and the aristocrats of Russia.

We find in the world to-day very little in support of the arguments of these hon. gentlemen. We find that the last desperate stand of aristocracy made in Europe as it has been, has been a signal failure, and the only reason that it has stands apparently solidly in Great Britain is that in that country it has been less abused than, perhaps, anywhere else in the world, and therefore, it has more apologists. But to argue, as has been argued here this afternoon, that because certain men like Joshua Reynolds were knighted, therefore, that knighthood, is a distinction conferred upon art, is to give the whole case away.

All I need to do is to refer, as I did in my interruption of the hon. member for Toronto South (Mr. Sheard), to the fact that all the greatest men with the exception of Sir Isaac Newton remained without titular distinctions. You have to begin if necessary with Homer, Buddha, Confucius, Thucydides, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, the Seven Wise Men of Greece, with all the historical characters of Europe, unless you appeal to the great rascals such as Nero, Commodus and the like. Surely hon. members do not think that Scipio Africanus required a title. Surely they do not think that our friend Julius Caesar was smaller for not having a title. And these hon. gentlemen show their ignorance of history when they say that these distinctions confer honour on the arts. What about Titian, Michael Angelo, Velasquez, Correggio, Rubens, Rembrandt, Raphael, Corot, and God knows what other great names. Do not entangle these great men with these little trappings of titles that hang like spit curls at the side of a woman's head, and that amount to nothing. These great men tower majestically over all these little things which arose from what? They arose from property owners, and not from the people. They were not recommendations of the people. They were what the aristocracy gave to themselves before the people had the right of franchise or had any liberty at all; but when the time came that the people rose strongly in their own might and shook off these things, they shook off class distinctions, and these hon. gentlemen here to-day who have spoken so strongly in favour of titles, so insidiously and in many ways, so cunningly, are compelled to acknowledge that the rottenest branch of the whole tree is hereditary titles, the greatest and highest of all. If it be the case that the topmost branch, the great culmination, the apotheosis of the whole titular business is absurd, it follows that the lesser is only less absurd, unless logically you choose to argue that it is more. I am not going to condescend to argue the question against titles. If hon. members are so ill-read in the history of class and class distinctions in the struggle of the people as to continue to wish that titles and class distinctions and all those abominations should be perpetuated, let them go on, but they will reckon with their people at home some day, and I am content to leave the matter to the great mass of the people of this country, if the members of the House do not wish to exterminate these titular distinctions to-day. We have been told—and I believe it is true—that the Government wants this to be a fight to a finish. We have been beaten several times; we have been more or less jockeyed—and I do not say that in any nasty sense. I brought a good deal of opprobrium last year upon my humble self by having endeavoured to find out from the late lamented leader of the Opposition if he intended to let the Opposition have a free-for-all. I found out that the Prime Minister regarded that as a constitutional mistake, and I retired under my bed, and I did so promptly, but I do not purpose getting under the bed any more. I do not mind being moderate nor endeavouring to be discreet; but

this question is one of great importance to the people, and if some of these gentlemen will go to Winnipeg or Toronto or to some other place where there are great gatherings of the masses of the people and deliver the speeches which they have delivered to-day, they will have a reception which will astonish them, or I am mistaken.

Brigadier-General GRIESBACH (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) that as regards Scipio Africanus, Scipio was the gentleman's name and "Africanus" was the title conferred upon him. The point to which I particularly desire to direct attention is the paragraph of the report which says:

> Your committee, however, do not recommend the discontinuance of the practice of awarding military or naval decorations, such as the Victoria Cross, Military Medal, Military Cross, Conspicuous Service Cross, and similar decorations to persons in military or naval services of Canada for exceptional valour and devotion to duty.

This paragraph must be construed, I take it, somewhat as a legal document, and inasmuch as certain decorations have been mentioned, it may be assumed that those which are not mentioned are thereby excepted. As I understand this paragraph and as it has been explained to me by the Chairman of the Committee, it would, if adopted, prevent recognition by the granting of an honour or an award to any officer in the Canadian service above the rank of captain.

That is what this proposal means. It excepts the D.S.O., the C.M.G., and the C.B. and the Distinguished Conduct Medal, for some reason unknown to me, although some 1,204 have been granted to Canadian soldiers in the war. The Victoria Cross, of which fifty-three only, although that is a large number, have been granted to Canadian soldiers, is a decoration which can really only be won by non-commissioned officers and junior officers. Only in very exceptional cases can it be won by officers above the rank of captain, because when officers are in their proper places and in the proper discharge of their duties, a major or lieutenant-colonel will be too far away from the scene of fierce activity to win this distinction. The Military Medal can only be won by non-commissioned officers and men and the Military Cross by warrant officers, lieutenants and captains. The Conspicuous Service Cross is unknown to me.

An hon. MEMBER: That is naval.

Brigadier-General GRIESBACH: I do not know what it is awarded for. Therefore, if this report means what it purports on the face of it, this House, by implication, is asked to say that decorations which have been won in the last four years, and which are being proudly worn by distinguished soldiers of the rank of major and upwards, and n.c.o's and men shall be barred in the future. For although these distinguished officers and men may wear these decorations, they will do so in face of the implied opinion of this House that they are unnecessary and do not stand for anything, and that the wearing of them is dangerous and pernicious. That is what this report virtually asks the House to declare in reference to the decorations worn by Canadian officers of the rank of major and upwards. I shall vote against the adoption of this report because of that aspect of it.

With regard to foreign decorations, Canadian soldiers are to-day wearing a considerable number of French orders and Belgian orders which have been awarded to them by the governments of those countries for services rendered by them in France and Belgium during the war, and the same observations apply to these decorations as to the British decorations. Those who have them at present may keep them, but they will not be permitted in the future, and I would direct attention to the situation that frequently arises, and will arise, in connection with rescues at sea by British ships. At the time of the earthquake in Italy British ships went into the harbour, and British sailors, displaying admirable courage, and at a serious risk to life and limb, rescued people who were buried beneath the ruins. What position would the Canadian sailor be placed in if, having performed such a splendid act and having been graciously offered some recognition of his service, he had perforce to decline the honour which a foreign government desired to bestow upon him? The question as to whether this country can legally make it impossible for citizens to receive these decorations is a matter for the legal gentlemen to consider; but I can conceive of no legislation short of a penal law that could prevent a man from accepting such a decoration if it were conferred upon him. The argument which may be urged against the decorations that are of the nature of orders is that such orders lead to knighthood. The report of the Committee

declares that there is an objection to the C.M.G. because it is the third class of the Order of St. Michael and St. George, and the C.B., because it carries membership in the Order of the Bath, and because in these orders there is promotion to knighthood. The Committee are objecting to the C.B. and the C.M.G., although in themselves they are not knighthoods. In themselves they are not titular distinctions or titles of honour, for you can hardly go around appending the phrase "Companion of the Bath" or "Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George" to a man's name when speaking of him, no matter how respectable his companions may be. The situation that would arise, then, assuming that this report is accepted, would be that in the future Canadians serving in co-operation with Australians, South Africans, New Zealanders or British troops, would be unable to accept such honours and awards as might be bestowed on officers of equal rank in the other forces. It may occur to some one, Mr. Speaker, as being a matter of very small moment; but I assure you, as a soldier, that it is, on the contrary, of considerable importance. A soldier does not ask very much; he does not get very much. But he does wear with proper pride the ribbons and the distinctions of the orders which he has gained. These distinctions cost the soldier a great deal, and are earned with a labour that is inconceivable to those who are not of his calling. It is almost futile to attempt to convey to the civilian mind all that they do mean to him. But let me assure the House, even if I repeat, that they mean a great deal. They round off his military career, and inform others exactly where he has been and what he has done; and if, without any endeavour to safeguard the well-earned and dearly-bought distinctions of these men, you indiscriminately abolish all these decorations, you are introducing, in my judgment, a very serious innovation. We find in the Army that these distinctions are necessary. Not only has this, during the past four years of fighting, been true in the British Army, where the full value of these rewards is recognized, but the Americans, who came into the war practically without any medals of any sort, found it necessary during the struggle to evolve a complete system of decorations. Before this Committee's report is adopted, I earnestly desire that every hon. member will seriously consider the position of our Army in the future when called upon to co-operate with other armies in the Empire; and I ask that the House will weigh well the feelings and sentiments of many gallant soldiers who are not able to speak for themselves here to-day, but who will, without doubt, feel keenly the effrontery and insult which this report, if adopted as it stands, will reflect upon them.

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I did not have the honour of being put upon this committee when it was appointed, but I had hoped that when this committee brought in its report the report would be in such a form that it would be accepted by the House practically without discussion and that probably, as soon as it had been accepted we would be able to get back to the discussion of some of the really practical things of life, such as the cost of living, and so perhaps the cutting down of some of the Bolshevism and revolutionary feeling in this country. However, as the report has come in and as I had nothing to do with framing it, I must say that it is not entirely satisfactory to my mind, therefore I should like to offer an amendment, if it is permitted, on the report of the committee. I do not know whether it will be in order or not. I did not intend to speak at this moment, but perhaps I might proceed with the discussion and leave the point of order to be considered afterwards. The part of the report that I do not wish to agree with was that which was taken up by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Griesbach) that refers to the cutting out such distinctions as C.B. or C.M.G., which do not carry any title. Therefore, I believe these distinctions need not have been cut out by the committee. I believe it was the feeling of this House last year, and that it was the feeling this year when the question was up for discussion, that hereditary titles and knighthoods, which give the titles of Sir and Lady, should be discontinued. I do not think that anybody in this country who has been bothering about this question really cares how many letters you place after a man's name, if you leave off the aristocratic touch of knighthood.

The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) made a very eloquent speech this afternoon, one of the most beautiful that I have ever heard him deliver, and I have heard him many times in the old days in Toronto. But, I believe that many of his points were beside the question. For example, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), and those who are supporting

the report, are not making any attack upon those who have been given knighthood. Nobody in this House has greater respect from me than the hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) who has a knighthood. Such distinguished people as Sir William Osler, Sir Joshua Reynolds and Sir James Simpson, the discoverer of chloroform, and the other distinguished men whom the hon. member for South Toronto mentioned, are not being attacked by those who are supporting this resolution. I should like to get the view of the House upon making a motion to do away with hereditary titles of all kinds, and knighthoods, in this country.

I understood the hon. member who has just taken his seat to desire that titles should be given to certain officers who have performed good service overseas. I understood from his remarks that he believes that knighthoods should be retained at least for certain officers, those in charge of divisions or brigades who have not been discriminated against, but who have more or less been forgotten up to date and who might be given knighthoods by the Crown. Am I right in that?

Brigadier-General GRIESBACH: I did not say anything about that at all. I hope the hon. gentleman will confine his remarks to what he himself thinks. I have said what I have said; I did not say anything about what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. MANION: That is quite possible. I do not wish to put any words into my hon. friend's mouth that he did not use, but I understood him to say that certain men who had served at the front if they were forgotten would feel that they had been insulted by this country. That is my understanding of what he referred to, but I do not know whether I am right in that or not. If I am not right I will be glad to be corrected.

Brigadier-General GRIESBACH: What I said—or what I meant to say—was that by accepting this report barring out C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., D.C.M., this House would be reflecting upon a number of gallant men who have gained these distinctions in the past I concluded by stating that it would appear that the framers of this report considered the granting of such distinctions to Canadians as unsound, dangerous, and pernicious.

Mr. MANION: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I, perhaps, have been carried away to a certain extent by the fact that I understood that he had made that statement to the committee, but I accept my hon. friend's statement absolutely. I agree with the hon. gentleman that such distinctions as C.M.G. and D.S.O. should be continued. But I certainly do not gather from the report of the committee that they should be discontinued. The report says:—

> Your committee however do not recommend the discontinuance of the practice of awarding military or naval decorations, such as the Victoria Cross, Military Medal, Military Cross, Conspicuous Service Cross, and similar decorations to persons in military or naval services of Canada for exceptional valour and devotion to duty.

I distinctly take that into account.

Brigadier-General GRIESBACH: I would suggest that the hon. gentleman ask the Chairman of the Committee to state what the Committee does say.

Mr. MANION: We will leave that question out for the present. I have just heard there is an amendment to be made by the hon. member for East Algoma which will cover the point that I wish to make in my amendment.

There is an objection to making a distinction between military men and others in regard to the conferring of knighthoods. In the first place, the war has been carried on for four years against the German military caste or aristocracy. I do not think that we wish in this country to establish any such military caste to take the place of the military caste that was destroyed in Germany. The second point I wish to make in regard to the conferring of distinctions upon military men is this: The real heroes of this war have not been Sir Arthur Currie, gallant soldier as he is, or the staff officers, or the commanders of divisions, brigades, battalions or the medical officers but they have been the ordinary private soldiers who went over the top. The private soldiers are the men who have endured the greatest hardships, who have faced the greatest dangers and who have displayed the greatest courage in this war and yet, not by any stretch of the imagination, would any of these private soldiers be given a knighthood. The greatest soldier of all, Ferdinand Foch, has no title except his military title of Marshal. I might go further to exemplify the point that a title is not necessary in order to enable any man to be great. On the contrary, three of the greatest men at the Peace Conference are plain Misters, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Georges Clemenceau and Mr. Woodrow Wilson, and they would not have been any greater if they had had titles.

I am not belittling the officers of the Canadian army, of whom my friend from Edmonton (Brigadier General Griesbach) is one of the most gallant, but I think there should be no distinction in the giving of titles, titles should be allowed to be given to all or none. The hon. member for South Toronto mentioned the discoverer of chloroform and a number of other discoveries in medicine. I think that if the day should come that some Canadian would discover a cure for tuberculosis he will have performed a greater service to humanity than any general or hero who has served at the front in this war and he would deserve a title. I do not like to see any distinction made by giving titles to one class and not to some other class. In other words, we should teach our youth to aspire to proficiency in the constructive arts of peace rather than in the destructive arts of war.

The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) as I understand it, is going to move an amendment along the lines that I suggest—that is that we do away with hereditary titles of all kinds, and do away with knighthoods in this country. That is the only point I wish to make; I think the rest of the report might easily be omitted.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): Mr. Speaker, I have two reasons for saying a word on the subject of the resolution: first, after the varied discussions that we have had last session and this on the subject of titles I do not care to take the responsibility of casting a silent vote; and, second, I wish to take issue squarely with some statements hon. members have made.

I would first reply to what has been said with regard to the feeling throughout the country on the subject of titles. I have not travelled all over the country—I have something else to do—but I have mingled with the people to a fair extent, and have had some experience with the working men. I represent a constituency in which 95 per cent of the adult manhood work with their hands and the remaining 5 p.c. work in some other way perhaps equally as hard. Yet it was not until I came into this House and listened to the cold, insistent logic of the hon. member for Kingston and to the burning eloquence of my hon. friend from Springfield that I had any notion whatsoever that the country was in the least disturbed on this subject. But, after listening for about six and a half hours during last session to those two hon. members I came to the conclusion that perhaps after all I was not in touch with the people among whom I mingle, and I made it my business to make some definite inquiries; and again after listening to the discusion this session and hearing what took place in the committee appointed to deal with this matter, I made it my business to get around among some of the bodies of organized labour to find out what they thought about it. I came to the conclusion that they are beginning to take an interest in this subject. I found that they were more or less agitated on what Parliament was doing, but not in the manner in which the hon. members who have spoken on this subject would indicate. They are not agitated because titles have been or may be granted, but they are agitated because Parliament instead of applying itself to a solution of the many problems that confront the country, is wasting its time discussing a subject in which the common people have no interest whatever. Last week-end I went up to the constituency of East Algoma, and I again made an effort to find out how the working men were feeling. Mr. Speaker, if I were to tell you in their own words what some of them said to me, I am confident you would rule that I was out of order in using unparliamentary language. The working men whom I met put it this way: that if ever there was an example of the old adage about Nero fiddling while Rome was burning, it has been given by Parliament spending its time in discussing this subject at this time. For that reason I am going to endeavour to be exceedingly brief.

Notwithstanding all that, if the report of the committee had been in any degree consistent, I perhaps might have constrained myself to support it. But if you analyze paragraph (a) I think you will find that it is the embodiment of inconsistency. It says that His Gracious Majesty shall be asked to refrain hereafter from conferring any title of honour or titular distinction upon any of his subjects domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada, save such appellations as are of a professional or vocational character. In other words, they say to His Majesty: "We do not want you to continue to exercise the only prerogative that you have and confer upon your subjects titles of honour; but we are willing to leave in your hands that which you have not the right to confer—titles of a pro-

fessional or vocational character." I do not think that the hon. member for Kingston would suggest that it is in the province of His Majesty to confer university degrees on a man after he has taken his professional course. Why do the advocates of this resolution go the length of abolishing distinctions of all descriptions whatsoever? Why do they say that professional and vocational distinctions shall remain? Why do they leave in the hands of the universities the right to confer titular distinctions?

We have heard a great deal with regard to the great democrats who have refused to accept titular distinctions. But would any hon. gentleman suggest, for instance, that the late Theodore Roosevelt was not a democrat because he accepted a titular distinction at the hands of the authorities of the University of Oxford? Would the hon. member for Kingston suggest that William Howard Taft is not a democrat because he accepted a title of honour at the hands of the authorities of the University of Toronto? Will any one suggest that the hon. member for Maisonneuve is not a democrat because he accepted the Legion of Honour at the hands of the President of France? Or that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada is not a democrat because, on the recommendation of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he accepted a knighthood? Or that Chief Justice Mulock, of the Supreme Court of Ontario, is not a democrat because, for the same reason, he accepted a knighthood? I say again, if hon. members supporting this resolution want to be consistent and to wipe out distinctions entirely, all right—some of us might be willing to follow them; but when they are willing only to cut off the prerogative of His Majesty the King, I, as a loyal British subject, am not prepared to follow them.

It has been intimated during this debate that members who are not willing to vote for this resolution may find when they go back to their constituents that they would have been doing good business politically if they had supported it. That may be so. But so far as I am concerned I am willing to abide by the traditions and institutions of the British Empire, and I believe that the constituents who sent me here are of the same opinion.

The point made by the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) in connection with hereditary titles is perfectly logical to all those who desire to leave in the hands of His Majesty the prerogative that we believe is his, but to provide that any distinctions should die with those upon whom they have been conferred. That is really the only question in connection with the matter of titles that can be said to be agitating the people of this country at the present time. That side of the question was fully covered in the Order in Council laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister last session. But in case there may be some doubt in regard to that, and in order that hon. gentlemen may have an opportunity of expressing their opinion on that phase of the subject and, possibly, going a little further in the whole matter of titles, I shall accept the implied suggestion thrown out by the leader of the Opposition this afternoon—that there should be freedom with regard to this whole question, but that care should be exercised; and that that is the will and the wish of the Parliament of Canada. Before I sit down I will move an amendment along the line suggested.

No man who is imbued with democratic principles and who, at the same time, wishes to abide by the constitution of the British Empire, can take exception to the position taken by the leader of the Opposition in this matter. I am not going to say anything in addition to what has been so well said by many with regard to the desirability of leaving something in our institutions that will make possible the recognition by the country of deeds of valour and acts of exceptional service to the State. I fully concur in what was said so eloquently and earnestly by the member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) this afternoon with regard to all that. If you canvass the subject in all its aspects I think you will find that no one disagrees with the conclusions which the hon. member reached. I believe that the amendment which I am about to submit will meet the situation and will give the House an opportunity to put itself on record with regard to the question of hereditary titles, as well as with regard to the manner in which the House thinks that titles of all classes should be conferred. With your permission, Sir, I will read the amendment:

That all the words after "that" of said motion be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

That only paragraph (b) respecting hereditary titles of the report of the sub-committee appointed to consider the question of conferring honours, etc., upon subjects of His Majesty resident in Canada be concurred in; but that this House is of the opinion that in making recommendations to His Majesty for the conferring of knighthoods or other titular distinctions upon persons domiciled or ordinarily resi-

dent in Canada, the greatest care should be exercised in the selection, and that special regard should be paid to the personal merit and distinguished services of the recipient thereof.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the limited opportunity I have had of looking into the wording of this motion, I am inclined to the opinion that it is not in order. When a motion is made for the adoption of the report of a committee, it is competent for the House to adopt it, to reject it, or to refer it back to the committee with or without instructions. Or, a motion may be made for the six month's hoist. I do not think it competent to move to amend the report of a committee.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Would I be in order, Sir, if I should ask to amend the motion so as to conform to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the circumstances, the hon. member should ask for leave to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: With the consent of the House I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member have leave to withdraw his amendment?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I will move an amendment in these words.

Mr. PROULX: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member still has the floor.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I move:

That the report of the committee be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend the same in the following manner:

That all the words after "that" of the said motion be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

That only paragraph (b) respecting hereditary titles of the report of the sub-committee appointed to consider the question of conferring honours, etc., upon subjects of His Majesty resident in Canada be concurred in; and that this House is of the opinion that in making recommendations to His Majesty for the conferring of knighthoods or other titular distinctions upon persons domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada, the greatest care should be exercised in the selection thereof, and special regard should be paid to the personal merit and distinguished services of the recipient thereof.

Mr. NICKLE: I rise to a point of order. There is no word "that" in the report following which everything else can be struck out. If hon. gentlemen are going to submit an amendment, may I suggest that they take time and draw it properly.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the motion as put by the member for Algoma East (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) is in order. The main motion is that the report of the special committee be concurred in. Mr. Nicholson moves, seconded by Mr. Sheard, that the report be referred back to the committee with instructions to amend the same "in the following manner." The question is on the amendment.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, as one of those who were charged with the duty of taking under consideration the matter of titles, I feel called upon to make just a few remarks on this occasion. The report, I may say, was satisfactory to scarcely any man on the committee, and I do not think I am giving away any secret when I make that statement. But that some of us pursued a logical course I think I shall be able to show the House, if hon. members will have the patience to follow what took place in the Committee. I have always endeavoured to be consistent in any matter that I have undertaken to do in the House or the country, and if I fail in that regard it is because my judgment is at fault and not because I wish to err. I have endeavoured in every respect to be absolutely consistent in dealing with the matter that was submitted to the Committee for report.

In the first place, the question of hereditary titles came up. It was assented to practically unanimously by the Committee—and I believe it is almost the unanimous opinion of this House, that the Committee was right in its decision—that all hereditary titles in Canada should be discontinued and that such as now exist should die out when the then present owner of any title dies, that is, that his title should not descend to his posterity, the belief being that posterity has done nothing to deserve it. I think that in that respect the Committee was a unit.

The next matter, and perhaps the most crucial, was with regard to knighthood or the title of "Sir," and the lesser titles that are said to be stepping stones to the title of knighthood. I am one of those who have always endeavoured to support the throne and dignity that surrounds it, and while there may be cosmopolitan members, such as the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) who do not see any use in "frills" and titles and so on, the average citizen is built on different lines, and he recognizes that in order that the best may

be made of this life there must be divisions as there always have been and as there always will continue to be in this world. They cannot be done without, as was shown very conclusively by the hon. member for Toronto South (Mr. Sheard) this afternoon. The matter of competition begins in the very earliest days of childhood. The child appeals to the approval of its parents or to the applause of the older or younger members of the family. That is recognized in human nature, and in spite of all the insistence of the hon. member for Brome and other extreme radicals, that can never be thoroughly eradicated from the human breast. I believe with others that His Majesty the King and the pillars of the Throne that surround him, be they who they may for the time being, are the best authorities in the British Empire to say whether or not a man should be distinguished amongst his fellows. If His Majesty who occupies the Throne of the Empire at the present moment, believes that during this war certain persons, be they soldiers or sailors or civilians, have done acts of valour and distinction and national service, in my opinion, it rests with him to say whether or not those gentlemen should be recognized on his part as those whom the King delights to honour. We have examples, from away back in ancient history right down to the present time, that these distinctions have always existed, and they always will exist in this world in spite of all the drastic proposals that have been made by some members of the committee, that we should do away forever with all titles, that we should throw them into the waste paper basket or the garbage can and get rid of them. That is not a wise conclusion, and when we undertake to address His Majesty as we do in this resolution, the least we can do is to talk with sense and dignity——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Hon. members should not say "hear, hear" too soon. I may have something to say a little later on to which they will not feel like saying "hear, hear." The least we can do is to talk with sense and dignity, and not to endeavour to approach His Majesty in any way that, at the present time, which is a very critical period in the history of this country, may lessen the hold that he has upon his faithful subjects. Whether I am alone in this or not, I do not know, but I see something beneath the surface in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). I have said so in the committee and I am not afraid to say so here, that I see something beneath the surface, and that I purpose letting the House know what I see in it. If hon. members do not think there is anything in it, that will be all right, but I shall feel that I have tried to do my duty according to my light and knowledge. There are but very few ties between the Dominion of Canada and the Empire at the present time, and they have been described on more than one occasion as being lighter than air, but strong as iron. The conferring of titles by His Majesty is one slender thread that has been recognized ever since we became a Dominion up to the present time as one of the prerogatives of the Throne and that we have allowed to go unchallenged until last year. Another is the appeal to the Privy Council, and it is rather strange to say that many of the same men who are at the present time bent upon destroying titles are also of opinion that in matters of litigation there should be no appeal beyond the high courts of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: This demonstration only goes to prove the truth of my words. Gentlemen sit upon the Opposition benches who would destroy appeals to the Privy Council. Let them wait until I cite the other two. There are many who have told me privately—I have not found one man who has got up on his feet on the floor of this House and stated that, but probably some one will do so before we are through.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, legs, if you please, then. I say that those two—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Am I in order, Mr. Speaker, or not in the words I used?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If hon. members have any point of order to raise, they should raise it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Probably I was not as dignified as a man who supports titles should be, and I will take it back to that extent, and I will endeavour to be more circumspect, because I believe we are all walking uprightly or trying to do so, and we are not using four legs to do it. I was only speaking figuratively. These same gentlemen who want to abolish titles want also to banish appeals to the Privy Council, and if one talks privately with many of them, one will find they will state that the Governor General of Canada

is a figurehead and costs a great deal of money to the country and ought to go. Time and again I have heard that stated, and it cannot be disputed, although some of them have not the courage to get up and say so. What other ties remain? We have simply the Crown and King left to bind us to the Motherland, and three legs having gone it will not be hard to knock out the fourth, and then we shall have the whole Empire tottering and coming down. In my judgment, every one of those ties, light as they are, is a silver thread that holds us to the Crown and to the Empire.

Believing that, I said in the committee, and I say here, that if any one is qualified to bestow distinctions and titles on soldier, sailor or civilian, it is His Majesty the King and his faithful advisers that surround the Throne. Having laid down that principle and having been defeated in the committee, I say I was perfectly consistent when I said, "If you do not take titles from His Majesty you shall not take them, with my consent, from any one else." We therefore moved—an extreme radical and myself working hand in hand—that "Honourable" and "Right Honourable," not having come from the Throne, should also be banished. Strange to say, the gentlemen that said "We are out to pull up all titles by the roots and to banish every distinction," voted in retention of the appellations "Honourable" and "Right Honourable," while we Imperialists voted for their abolition. Fine consistency, Mr. Speaker. Beautiful consistency. Surely the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) can see that even he was getting somewhat out of hand with himself when he had to support the retention of "Honourable" and "Right Honourable" and at the same time do away with all titles emanating from the King. Now, Mr. Speaker, seriously—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, if my hon. friends do not think I am speaking seriously they may say "hear, hear." I have the commendation of my own conscience in the matter and have better proof of the correctness of my position than the applause of hon. gentlemen opposite, because when they applaud me I always think I am going wrong. I say that "Honourable" and "Right Honourable" are the most disagreeable and most uncalled for of all the titles we have. Suppose you call me "Honourable" and I am not entitled to the term; I have to come back and say I am not honourable. Then you say: "You are in the dishonourable class," and rightly so. Therefore, I say that the man who presumes to be called "Honourable" arrogates to himself certain characteristics of mind which require that he shall deal truly with his neighbour, that he shall not oppress the poor, that he shall not wrong his neighbour to the extent of a single dollar, and that he shall live an absolutely circumspect life. If he does not fulfil these obligations, he does not deserve the title "Honourable," for it carries within itself elements of character which none of the others have. A man might be a blackguard for all his title of "Honourable;" but the man who deserves the title must live up to all the attributes it implies. Therefore I believe we were absolutely consistent when we moved that the titles "Honourable" and "Right Honourable" should be abolished. But that was not all. We have heard some criticism of the last clause, which is about the only one I may be said to have fathered, and I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. I think I was the mover of that in the Committee, and strange to say though I have been in a great minority most of the way through, even the Democrats swung round finally, when they were shamed into it, and voted for this. Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that we had gentlemen upon that committee who, having held that His Majesty the King and his advisers should not bestow titles upon Canadians, had the wonderful audacity to get up there and tell us that though we would not accept titles from our own King whose advisers had no right to send them to Canada, yet we would take them from every other nation in Europe. What do you think of that, Mr. Speaker? Can hon. members cheer at that, or at the action of those gentlemen on the committee who, having said that no titles should come from the King at the head of the British Empire, were prepared nevertheless to take them from every European country? What does that indicate?

An hon. MEMBER: Disloyalty.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes, disloyalty and worse than that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, my friends may think that I have nothing to support my arguments in this respect, but I have taken the precaution to fortify my position as to the consistency of the course that I have followed, and I have a document here that will prove to this House that I was absolutely consistent in what I did in this

matter. This is an order that I got this afternoon from the Department of External Affairs, from the hands of the titled gentleman whose honour is above reproach,—Sir Joseph Pope. It reads:

Regulations respecting Foreign Orders and Medals applicable to Persons in the Service of the Crown.

Orders.

1. It is the King's wish that no subject of His Majesty in the Service of the Crown shall accept and wear the Insignia of any Foreign Order without having previously obtained His Majesty's permission to do so, signified either:

(a) By Warrant under the Royal Sign-Manual, or

(b) By private permission conveyed through His Majesty's Private Secretary.

2. Permission given by Warrant under the Royal Sign-Manual will enable the Insignia of the Foreign Order to be worn at all times and without any restriction.

Private permission will only enable the Insignia to be worn on occasions specified in the terms of the letter from the King's Private Secretary conveying the Royal sanction.

3. Full and unrestricted permission by Warrant under the Royal Sign-Manual is contemplated in the following cases:—

For a Decoration conferred—

On an Officer in His Majesty's Naval or Military Forces lent to a Foreign Government; on an Officer in His Majesty's Naval or Military Forces attached by his Government to a Foreign Navy or Army during hostilities; or on any British Official lent to a Foreign Government and not in receipt of any emoluments from British public funds during the period of such loan.

In the case of decorations awarded in recognition of services under the Red Cross, permission will only be granted where such services have been rendered in a war in which the Empire has itself been engaged, and by persons serving under one of the officially recognised British voluntary aid societies or under similar societies of Allied States duly recognised by the Government of those States.

4. Private or restricted permission is contemplated for Decorations which have been conferred in recognition of personal attention to the Head of a Foreign State, and which are therefore of a more or less complimentary character, and will, as a rule, only be given on exceptional occasions when in the public interest and for political reasons it is deemed expedient that the acceptance of a Foreign Decoration should not be declined. Private permission will generally be given in the following cases:—

For a Decoration conferred—

(1) On British Ambassadors or Ministers abroad when the King pays a State visit to the country to which they are accredited;

(Note.—A State visit is defined as one on which the King is accompanied by a Minister or High Official in attendance.)

(2) On Members of Deputations of British Regiments to Foreign Heads of States;

(3) On Members of Special Missions when the King is represented at a Foreign Coronation, Wedding, or Funeral; or on any Diplomatic Representative when specially accredited to represent His Majesty on such occasions; and such Members of his Staff who actually attend the ceremonies in their official capacity;

(4) On Naval and Military Attachés only after completion of five years' service at the post to which they are appointed in that capacity.

(5) Private or restricted permission will not be given to—

(1) British Ambassadors or Ministers abroad when leaving;

(2) Members of British Missions announcing the Accession of a Sovereign;

(3 British Officers attending Foreign Manœuvres;

(4) Naval Officers of British Squadrons visiting Foreign Waters.

There is considerably more, but I think I have read enough to show that foreign titles are not to be recognized in this country without the permission of His Majesty, by special request. I see my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) smiles at this. He probably is wearing his decoration without that permission because it may have been bestowed before this order was made. But this document which I have just received from the Department of External Affairs absolutely defines the procedure, and I believe that the Privy Council has the right to decide, when a foreign title is bestowed upon any citizen of Canada, whether or not he shall wear it. If there were no such provision what would be the situation? We have been having a war, though, judging from the amount of attention we are devoting to such trivial matters as the question now under discussion, one would hardly credit the fact. These foreign titles are coming into Canada, and I as a Britisher was amazed to find that on that committee there were men who would support the practice of accepting foreign titles after having denied their own King the right to bestow British titles on Canadians. I was astounded at a proposition of that kind. The hon. member shakes his head, but what I say is quite true.

Mr. PELLETIER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is making remarks in reference to members who were appointed on the committee. That has absolutely nothing to do with the amendment, which is to refer the subject back to the committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have just taken the Chair this moment, and have been unable to follow the hon. gentleman's remarks. But I understand the hon. gentleman has the right not only to discuss the amendment but to discuss the main motion at the same time.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: When that interruption took place I was about to show the

position that we are going to get into if we allow these foreign titles to come in and be scattered broadcast through this country. Where would they come from? They would come from France, Belgium, Italy, Russia and, last and most serious, they would come from Germany itself. Does any hon. gentleman in this House tell me that we are going to allow Iron Crosses to come in from Germany because a man, during the war, has blown up a bridge of the Canadian Pacific or has despoiled His Majesty's possessions in this country? Will any man tell me we are going to allow titles to come in from foreign countries while we deny to His Majesty the right to send them in? That is what will happen if these foreign titles are not shut out. I say that the rein that is placed upon the bringing in of these foreign titles is a very wise provision, and I would be very much surprised if every hon. member does not say that I was absolutely consistent when we were discussing the abolition of titles to say that if any titles are going to be abolished the foreign titles should be the first to get out. I tried to give them a good hard kick in that direction and I think I was right. We would have these foreign titles streaming in here and I think this is a good reason why this committee and this House should take very careful note of what is going on in the country now.

The adoption of such a report as we have before us now would be a very dangerous and serious matter. If we take time, as we have had to take time, for the discussion of this question, I think the time will not be wasted if we come to a wise decision on the matter. I have my opinion of the intelligence and loyalty of any one who is not ashamed to send over such a pronouncement as appears in the Votes and Proceedings of the 14th May although I do not wonder so much at it. It was hard for one to hold himself in restraint while such democrats as the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) were overshooting the mark in their attack upon titles.

Mr. McMASTER: Did not the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) say that some of the recent appointments had enraged him?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Not in this debate, and I think the hon. gentleman is out of order in referring to that matter. I want to point out that these democrats who have overshot themselves in this case are absolutely up a tree to-night; there is not a bit of doubt about that. These democrats want to uproot and destroy everything that has been established throughout the ages, and they have put a proposition in that book that I do not believe ten members of this House would like to send to His Majesty, even although my hon. friends say that they approve of it.

In this case why not take the sensible method? The hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie)—and I am surprised at the loss of control of his followers that he exhibited this afternoon—spoke right on the lines that I am endeavouring to speak upon now. I dare say he did it a great deal better than I am doing it, but he spoke right along the same lines. He condemned the report practically from start to finish, but, strange to say, he wound up by saying that although it was a bad report he presumed that he would have to vote for it. I do not think there is any necessity for the leader of the Opposition stultifying himself in that regard. Let him bring before the House a resolution along the lines on which he spoke this afternoon and I will back him up. He made as strong a speech in that direction as I am making, and he was talking sense. He was talking by the book. Let the hon. gentlemen who have treated this subject with so much levity to-night read in to-morrow's Hansard what their own leader said to-day and they will not feel any very great satisfaction that they have succeeded in carrying such a report which, I say, is unworthy.

Let me point out to these democrats that there are other divisions in society than simply those of titles. Let me direct these hon. gentlemen's attention to the dress habit. I have heard parsons say that the terrible finery that goes into the church on a Sabbath Day is the cause of the absence of the workingman from the communion and from the service. Only yesterday I met a man in such a brilliant array that I had to remark upon it. He is a personal friend of mine, and I said to him: "What does all this gaiety mean?" In reply, this democrat of the democrats said that he had been at a wedding. The titled gentlemen are not squeezing workingmen out of the church. I believe they attend fairly regularly; and at least one or two of the members of this House do. If there is any member of this House more democratic, more good-natured, more gentle, than the two or three distinguished gentlemen that we have here, I would like to know where they are. I would rather serve under an autocrat, so-called,

with a title, such as we have in this House, than under some of these democrats. I would rather serve under the autocracy of a titled gentleman than I would under the democracy of a so-called democrat who rubs it in on every occasion, and who always insists on getting his own way. That is the kind of democrat we have in this country. Democracy is not advanced by shouting from the platform. It is living the life. Let me commend to these gentlemen who are now engaged in pulling up by the roots all that stands for sound democracy in this country that they should begin, not by the destruction of the things that work for edification and uplift, but that they should begin at the bottom and live the life. That is where the foundation should rest. I am tired of that democracy that is shouted from the platform—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Wait till I get through the sentence—that is shouted—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I will take my time. I say I am tired of that democracy which is shouted from the platform but is not ingrained in the life. That is the kind of democracy I do not like. They talk about titles and aristocracy as if they were something to be shunned, despised and kept out. Some of the gentlemen who hold the same opinion as I do are not ashamed of work. They know work, they were brought up to work, and although I am an older man than the hon. member for Kingston or the hon. member for Brome, let me tell them that I will meet them at the woodpile.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I was brought up to work and I am not ashamed of it. It has been one of my best assets all through life; and I have had to struggle for what I have saved. I have made my way like a man, and I am ready to do it both in peace and war.

I have tried to bring up my family in the same direction. I take no credit to myself, it was due to the soundness of my bringing up; I was fed on oatmeal porridge and the Bible, and in my early days I was brought up to work, and I worked as hard, I believe, as any man of my age in this House can say he worked at that time. Therefore, I knew the dignity of labour and I do not despise the workingman. I am a democrat of the democrats when it comes to meeting the workingman, and I am not ashamed to say it. If I can do anything, Mr. Speaker, to lighten the task of the workingman at the present time I am prepared to do it. I have tried to do it during my life. I have tried to carry out that principle when living among my fellowmen and among my workmen, a number of whom I am glad to say I represent here, although they may not all agree with me. I say that I have endeavoured to live that sort of life among them, and I challenge any man to impugn my honesty or my integrity when I say that I think this report should be thrown out—that it is unworthy of this House and unworthy of the committee that prepared it. I tell you, gentlemen, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that your duty to-night is to see to it that His Majesty the King is not insulted by any such rubbish as is contained in this report; and I hope you will send it back to the committee with instructions to amend it and to intimate to some of the democrats who sit in that committee that you expect, whether the report they bring in goes to the King or not, that such report shall be worthy of the dignity of a committee of this House and worthy of the subject they undertake to legislate upon, and not make—I was going to say foolish men of hon. members here who, I believe, have in them some wisdom as well. I hope that the course I am now advocating will be followed and that the men responsible for this report will be taught that this is not the kind of thing that will make for the dignity of this House or for the uplifting of the democracy of this country. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for East Algoma.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, in August, 1789, when the Three Estates met in Paris it was proposed by one of the members that the titles given to the French nobility and borne by them at that time should be abolished. One speaker got up and made a speech in support of titles, and the privileges of the French nobility, and was as eloquent and as vigorous as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I refer to L'Abbe Maury. He was then the man who sang in the French constituent assembly the swan song of the titles given to the nobility of France; and I think Mr. Speaker, that I can say to-night, without being mistaken, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) has sung the same song for titles in Canada. I admire the hon. gentleman; I admire the vigour with which he expresses

himself, and I admire the robustness of his Toryism; but unfortunately he represents a period which is passing. I was astonished to hear the hon. gentleman talk as he did about the hon. member for Kingston, and to hear him declare that the latter's motives may have been tainted with disloyalty. In making that statement I think the hon. gentleman was carried away by the warmth of his sentiments. He, surely, does not believe that any man in this House could be moved by feelings or sentiments of disloyalty.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) has mistaken my observations. If I applied any such words as he attributes to me to the member for Kingston, I beg to apologize to that hon. gentleman; I certainly had no such intention. I was making a general remark, and I applied it to nobody as far as I know.

Mr. CANNON: I was sure it was only necessary to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the expressions he used to elicit from him the apology that any gentleman would give to the House and to the hon. member referred to.

I was also surprised to notice that the hon. gentleman omitted from his speech a very important feature of this question, and failed to give us his views on it. What will become of the titles actually borne by the bishops of the Anglican church? According to this report, if I understand it correctly, the archbishops and the bishops of the Anglican church will be deprived of their titles if the report passes. Is that the intention of the gentlemen who composed the committee which sat on this question and made this report to the House? Before casting my vote I would like an answer on that point. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Anglican bishop of Toronto would be very much surprised if this report is adopted, to find himself debarred from using a title which gives him a distinction over a Methodist minister. I think this is a very important feature of the question and one which should be considered very seriously by the members of the House before they record their votes.

Both the hon. members for East Algoma and Brantford declared they were very much surprised to see that upon the conclusion of the war, when the people of Canada have serious problems to face, this Government has not brought forward enough legislation to keep members busy, and that the House has already discussed upon three occasions during the present session the very useless question of titles. Not very long ago, Mr. Speaker, a question of great moment to the people of Canada was introduced here, namely, the question of dealing with our Canadian railways. I can state without any fear of contradiction that the discussion on that question lasted not half as long as the discussion on the present subject, nevertheless, the Government, through the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) invoked the closure against the Opposition. Why should we be allowed to discuss matters of this kind and waste the time of the country while the Government sits there merely listening? I will tell you the reason: it is that the Government is not ready to undertake the problems that await a solution; the Government is not ready to bring down a solution of the reconstruction problems that is demanded; and it would rather have the House discuss questions of this kind than tell us what it intends doing to see that Canada is made a great and united country as it should be. I may be told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the discussion has been long because this question is a very difficult one to solve, and has many aspects and many sides. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to think that is true, judging by the many sides that several members opposite have taken on this question; and before I cast my vote I would like to be sure that the gentleman who moved the adoption of this report will not vote against it.

I wish to call the attention of the Government to another matter, Mr. Speaker. I think that the moment is ill chosen to ask the representatives of the people to discuss a question of this kind. To-day we know the situation all over Canada. We hear the cry of discontent coming from the Prairie Provinces; we know the situation that exists in Winnipeg; we know that Canada is on the brink of revolution—and the Government does nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. CANNON: And the Government asks us to discuss a question of this kind. Mr. Speaker, I think the sooner this Parliament gets down to real business the better, for discussions of the character we have had to-day tend to aggravate the people rather than to content them.

On the merits of this question: Am I in favour or against titles?—my answer is very simple. I am a plain, simple, ordinary Liberal, and I am against titles. I will tell you why.

I think that titles and distinctions in many cases have been nothing but a bait to the cupidity of people, a screen to their infamy at times, and a reward for their servility. The hon. member for Brantford has mentioned the situation which exists in England. I admire the British nobility. It has given throughout the centuries examples of devotion and of self-sacrifice that no other class of people have ever equalled. But, Mr. Speaker, I say that these English people have so borne themselves not because they are dukes, or earls or viscounts, but because they are British people and nothing else.

But if we study the history of the nobility all over Europe what do we find? Take, for example, the noble families of France. If you go back to the origin of many of those families you will find that their titles were obtained very often because the founder was nothing more than the illegitimate son of a king. Turning to England, take the great family of Churchill—a family of which every Britisher is proud. The founder of that family obtained his title on account of the infamy of his sister. Mr. Speaker, those are historical facts. Titles have been used in that way throughout the history of the world, and should we keep them here in Canada?

How and why are titles given here in Canada? The last Emperor of Brazil, Dom Pedro, was a very clever man. In his memoirs he tells us that he had to build a hospital in his capital of Rio, but the Government did not have the necessary funds, so he decided to try the following plan. He sent out a statement to the effect that people who subscribed a certain amount would have their names inscribed in letters of gold on the front wall of the hospital; that the people who subscribed a lesser amount would have their names inscribed in letters of silver; and that the people who subscribed a still lesser amount would have their names inscribed in letters of bronze. When the hospital was built through the money thus obtained, Dom Pedro had the names inscribed, and above he added this sentence: "This monument has been erected to charity through human vanity."

Well, we have before us to-night a monument erected by the Premier of this country, not through the charity of our country, but through the vanity of man. This monument, which we call the Borden Government, is a government that has been bought—that has been built through the vanity of its members. The builders who have contributed the bigger amounts of money will see on the front wall in letters of gold their names, such as those of Sir Joseph Flavelle and Sir Clifford Sifton; the names of people who have done less, but also have done quite a lot, will appear in letters of silver, such as those of Hon. Mr. Calder and Hon. Mr. Rowell; and in letters of brass will be seen the names of Hon. Mr. Blondin and Hon. Mr. Sevigny; and, Mr. Speaker, in letters of chalk, so that they may not remain very long, will be seen the names of Hon. Mr. Crerar and Hon. Mr. Carvell.

I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I admire the convictions of people like the hon. member for Brantford. They stand for the old institutions, for what was very noble. They stand, like the noble people in the French Constituent Assembly, who fought for their king although he was to die. But although we admire these people we have got to combat them, because their ideas are away behind the times. I am in favour of progress, I am in favour of Liberalism, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the abolition of titles will bring a better state of things in our Canada that we all love.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss this subject upon its merits. Having accepted the honour of a title, I feel debarred, as I stated when the matter was before the House on the last occasion, from taking any active part in the discussion. I desire, however, to state the position of the Government on the motion now before the House.

For two sessions this subject has engaged the attention of this Parliament. Prior to the assembling of this session the Prime Minister requested that the matter be referred to a special committee of the House so that a deliberate and reasoned judgment of the committee and of the House might be had. When the House met the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) placed his motion upon the Order Paper. I saw him about it, informed him of the request which the Prime Minister had made, and I asked if he would be willing that his motion should be referred to a special committee of the House in order that it might have full consideration, with a view later to discussion in the House, and such action as it might be thought desirable for the House to take. He stated that he would consult with some of those who were especially interested in the matter and inform me whether or not he would

agree. Later, after giving the matter consideration the hon. member consented to my suggestion, with the result that when his motion, which was that of a private member, was before the House I moved that it be referred to a special committee. I say that in explanation because some reflections have been without warrant cast upon the hon. member for Kingston by reason, as has been alleged, of his changing his vote. He did not change his vote, Mr. Speaker, he carried out honourably his undertaking with me. The disposition of the motion was entirely in accord with parliamentary practice, and it was perfectly open to my hon. friend to agree to it. I make that statement in justice to the hon. member for Kingston.

I desire to say this with regard to the position of the Government: This motion does not involve a question upon which the Government has any pronounced policy, as I stated when the matter was last before the House. The Government, therefore—I desire to make this perfectly clear—makes no request to any members supporting it with respect to the matter; it is perfectly open to each member here, so far as the Government is concerned, to vote as he may see fit. The same remark applies to members of the Government. This is a matter upon which members of the House, and members of the Government themselves, may hold different views, and as it is not a question of policy it is the desire of the Government that the House should express its view freely upon this question—which, notwithstanding what has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-day, is one of considerable importance. The member for Kingston has brought the question forward for two sessions. His speeches leave no room for doubt as to his earnestness in the matter. It is fairly before the House, and what the Government desires is a frank expression of opinion upon it.

The hon. member for Kingston stated this afternoon that I had requested him to have the report of the Committee submitted to the House at as early a date as possible. That is true, and the Government is willing to assume the responsibility of this matter now being before the House. It was my belief that it could best be dealt with in the first instance by a committee which would consider it in all its aspects. The Committee chosen was one which commanded the entire confidence of the House, and I feel that I should express to all the members of that Committee my thanks for the attention which they gave to the subject and for their promptness in bringing it down for final action.

I have stated that I feel rather debarred from discussing this matter upon its merits by reason of the fact that I have had the honour of having a title bestowed upon me. I feel very much disposed to agree with much of what the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) said this afternoon; there was a great deal of sound common sense in what he said. My own view is that this matter has assumed a disproportionate importance. It is an important question, but I do not believe it is so important, either intrinsically or in the eyes of the public, as the debates in this Parliament would indicate. However, each hon. member is to judge for himself as to that. The chances are that if the academic or abstract question was put to any body of citizens in Canada, or elsewhere for that matter: "Are you in favour of titular distinctions?" the answer would be "No." But I submit that is not a fair test. The question is, what would the answer be if the matter could be fully discussed and considered with and by those people? It seems to me that the real test that should be applied by the House of Commons is this: What is in the public interest? So far as individuals are concerned, they need not be considered. Whether this or that or the other citizen receives a title is of minor consequence; the true principle upon which this House should proceed is: What is in the national interest? Is it wise that titular distinctions and all that they imply should be abolished? My own view is that there is not and should not be objection to the principle of titular distinctions; but I do believe that the circumstances surrounding their bestowal are of utmost importance. I think that in all the British-speaking countries the bestowal has been on altogether too generous a scale and has not proceeded upon the principle that it should have proceeded. I believe that if the question of bestowal had received more careful consideration in the past by all Governments in Canada, this question would not be before us to-night.

I am not going over the ground which has been so ably traversed this afternoon with respect to the propriety and advantage of distinctions. But I submit this: There are men in this country, and in other countries of the Empire—in fact, in all the countries of the world—who give very distinguished and very valuable public service without reward, in the money sense, such as comes to those who attain success in other callings.

I do not say that to those men a knighthood would be an incentive. To the best of them, I do not believe it would; to some of them it might. I do not believe that men who serve the State put forth their effort with any idea that they are to be rewarded by a title. On the other hand, I do believe that men who have put forth effort of the greatest advantage to the public, who have served the State for long years—the Prime Ministers of this country, for example—should receive some distinction as a mark of the State's appreciation of their advices. Take the Prime Ministers of this country. Take Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and a Provincial Premier, such as Sir Oliver Mowat. If the question had been submitted to the people whether these men should be deprived of their titles, there would have been an overwhelming vote in favour of their being allowed to retain them; the people would say: These men are entitled to have their public services marked by the conferring of titular distinction upon them. Appreciation encourages men. I do not believe that men who serve the State—men such as those I have mentioned—are at all inspired to effort by any hope of titular distinction.

But I do believe they are encouraged to go on in their work by the conferring upon them of a distinction which marks the appreciation of their services to the State. After all, men are only boys grown up. As has been pointed out to-day, at school, and in college, and on the battlefield, and in campaigns, there is no doubt that prizes are looked upon as rewards and do stimulate to effort. More than that, they encourage further effort. Personally I fail to see the distinction which is made between the awarding of prizes, military medals or other decorations to soldiers and distinctions to men in public life or in some other walks to which I shall refer a little later on.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would ask the Acting Prime Minister if this does not involve the question of precedence and, therefore, become a class distinction and not a decoration.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to that just in a moment. Who will say that the Cross of the Legion of Honour has not always powerfully appealed to the French soldier, to inspire and to stimulate him to effort? Who will say that the Victoria Cross has not powerfully appealed to British and Canadian soldiers? The principle of conferring distinctions for action that is unselfish, that is altruistic, that is for the benefit of the people, is a sound one. I am the first to admit the very great difficulty in the matter of bestowal of titles and, as I stated before, I think it has been the unwise, too wide bestowal of titles and particularly the conferring of hereditary titles that has caused this question to be more or less of an issue in this House. But in public life, and also in the world of science, of literature, and of philanthropy, it is very much in the national interest that some means should be open to the Government—because the responsibility belongs to the Government—to mark the nation's sense of appreciation of distinguished service rendered in those fields, and if the bestowal of titles could be confined to that class, I do not believe the people would raise any objection. It has been put forward here that many distinguished citizens of Canada have been offered and have refused titles, but that does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that titles should not be granted. It is open to any citizen in this country to refuse any title offered to him. As the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) suggested this afternoon, it is a matter of the point of view, and I am sure many gentlemen who have refused titles would not necessarily take the view that the principle of the bestowal of titles is unsound.

With regard to hereditary titles, I have no hesitation whatever in saying that I concur in the report of the committee, but I have grave doubt whether, from the standpoint of national interest, this report as it stands to-day should be adopted by this House. I am speaking, not as leader of the House in the absence of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), but simply as a member of Parliament expressing my individual view, and I do not desire to be taken as speaking in any other capacity. My view is that the report of the committee as it stands is too sweeping, I think the Prime Minister of Canada advanced the matter as far as it should be advanced when he caused the Order in Council to be passed, which was brought down last session and which has been referred to in this debate. That is my individual view, and that is all I desire to say at the present time to the House

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this question before the vote is taken. Before, however, referring to the

question under consideration, I want to enter an emphatic protest against an expression used by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) who spoke before the acting Prime Minister. In referring to the troubles in Winnipeg and other parts of the country, he said that this Dominion was on the brink of revolution. That is going entirely too far, and I do not think the actual circumstances in any respect warrant such a statement as that. It is perfectly true that a very large body of men are on strike in the city of Winnipeg from which I come, and it is also true that some very unreliable, untruthful and improper reports have been sent from that city by way, I think, of the United States. Emphatic denials have come with regard to the reports, and we learn, from Government sources, that the situation is thoroughly in hand; that the constituted authorities are in command, and that the situation is steadily solving itself, so that I do not think the country need be unduly excited over the situation as it exists either in Winnipeg or in any other portions of the Dominion.

With regard to the subject under consideration, I think that too much emphasis has been laid upon the point that a great deal of the time of this Parliament has been consumed in the discussion of this question. It is perfectly true that last session we occupied considerable time in discussing the matter in Parliament, and during the present session we have also spent some time, but I dissent from the view that it was entirely misspent time. If the Prime Minister of this country had taken the position that the Acting Prime Minister has taken this session, the question would have been disposed of in perhaps two or three hours, and I believe it would have been satisfactorily disposed of, because the House was almost unanimously opposed to the granting of titles. But the Prime Minister who had the question under consideration with the home authorities staked the existence of the Government on the issue, and many of us on this side of the House, although we were very much in earnest in regard to the abolition of titles, felt it would be undesirable that the country should be plunged into a parliamentary crisis on a question of perhaps subordinate importance, at least, a question that could wait for solution until a later time. That was the reason why the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), myself and some others declined to take the responsibility of overthrowing the Government on the question of titles.

Then the question came up at the present session, and the resolution was again introduced by the hon. member for Kingston as it was introduced by the same hon. member last session. Last session I moved as an amendment to his resolution, which dealt only with hereditary titles, that all titles should be extinguished. At this session, when the hon. member for Kingston introduced his resolution, he adopted my amendment of last session which provided for the abolition of all titles, inclusive of hereditary titles. I had given some study to the question, and I came to the conclusion that there might be a constitutional difficulty so far as the British authorities were concerned if the few hereditary titles that exist in the Dominion at the present time were extinguished or if an attempt were made to extinguish them immediately.

So I conceived the idea of moving an amendment at the present session that these titles should expire with the death of the holders. That amendment has been implemented or embodied in the resolution of the committee that is before the House to-night, and that is the method that is being adopted. The Acting Prime Minister when he referred to the hon. member for Kingston as having agreed to allow his motion this session to stand until the matter might be inquired into by a committee, might also have stated, had he thought of it, that he discussed the matter with myself before the vote was taken and indicated to me the course that he, as Acting Prime Minister, purposed to take. The hon. Acting Prime Minister nods his head, in acknowledgment of the accuracy of my statement. I decided to follow the lead of the hon. member for Kingston, and naturally came in for a considerable amount of criticism from a few of my "friends"—if I may be permitted to put the word in quotation marks—and when I rose to vote in the House I was jeered at by certain members of the Opposition. However, on the principle that he laughs best who laughs last, I felt I could afford to endure the contemptable sneers from a few insignificant characters, if in the end the object that we who are opposed to titles had in view, was attained. I could not help feeling that although the matter could have been summarily disposed of, the fact that it should be referred to a special committee which would make a thorough inquiry, might, after all, furnish a stronger reason in the minds of the masses for the adoption of such a

report as is embodied in that before the House to-night. I have no particular reason to change my view in regard to that.

I want for a moment to call attention to the report itself, because there are some members of this House who some days or weeks ago were in favour of abolishing all titles, and in two or three cases they have now expressed some doubt because they were persuaded by the eloquence of our good friend the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard?. En passant I must say how greatly I enjoyed the oration which he delivered this afternoon. It was wonderfully dramatic and in some respects moving, but it had, in my judgment, very little bearing upon the real issue. He tells of certain worthy people who received distinction at the hand of the King—if you call it a distinction—by being knighted. But the point that we who are opposing titles in this House have in mind is that while it might, as the hon. leader of the Government said, be excused in certain cases, it has been so scandalously misused in Canada as to become an offence in the nostrils of the people. And I want to say to any of my good friends who may think of voting against this report of the committee, that they had better pause and consider the effect of their vote, not necessarily on their political position, but on the country at large. The country on the whole is deeply disturbed, and perhaps that is quite natural following so great a war as we have just passed through. But times have changed, in my judgment; and however much the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) or other hon. members may deplore the fact, a change has come over the spirit of the dreams of the people of this Dominion, and the democracy is not only being ushered in, but it is in fact ushered in. And in my opinion such a step as we propose to-night could not fail to be effective in appeasing this uneasy public opinion. The abolition of these social distinctions could not fail to have a beneficial effect. Now, let me for a moment, for the purpose of putting the question fairly before any weak brethren—if I may be allowed to use that expression—read what the report actually says, because I think there may be a misapprehension on the part of some members, who, as I said, were probably over-persuaded by the eloquence of the hon. member for South Toronto. Paragraph (a) reads:

(a) To refrain hereafter from conferring any title of honour or titular distinction upon any of your subjects domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada, save such appellations as are of a professional or vocational character or which appertain to an office.

That paragraph means the extinction of knighthoods, C.M.G.'s, and C.B.'s. C.M.G.'s and C.B.'s are merely steps in the ladder to knighthood, and in coming to the decision which it reached, the committee only aimed at extinguishing such titles as placed a prefix to the name of the recipient, and we felt that if we voted against the conferring of knighthoods we ought also to abolish C.M.G.'s and C.B.'s, and made a clean job of it. That is the object of that paragraph. I need not discuss the paragraph with regard to the abolition of hereditary titles, because the House seems to be unanimously agreed that they must go. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) waxed, I think, unduly eloquent, or perhaps unduly warm would be a more accurate description. They indulged in statements of much more warmth than one would expect from either of them with regard to the alleged titles of "Right Honourable" and "Honourable," and the statement was made that the members of the committee were to be censured for not recommending the abolition of those two distinctions.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON: My hon. friend from Brantford says, "Hear, hear," so he agrees with my statement of the case. According to my recollection of the situation—and I would like hon. gentlemen to particularly note the point—the reason we did not touch the distinctions "Honourable" and "Right Honourable" was that these are authorized by the British North America Act, and are conferred by virtue of a provision in that Act. So that the committee, and indeed this Parliament, would have no power to deal with them, and the House will agree with me that it was particularly desirable that we should refrain from recommending the abolition of these two particular appellations. Paragraph (4) says:

Your committee, however, do not recommend the discontinuance of the practice of awarding military or naval decorations, such as the Victoria Cross, Military Medal, Military Cross, Conspicuous Service Cross, and similar decorations to persons in military or naval services of Canada for exceptional valour and devotion to duty.

I want the House to be particularly clear with regard to the position of the committee in this connection. We refrained absolutely from interfering in shape, form or manner with military distinctions and

decorations which might be conferred for valour upon the field. We had before us the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Griesbach) who gave the committee very valuable information. He addressed the House this afternoon and it is possible that he left the impression that the committee had not been as fair with the military profession as it should have been. However, I want to assure the House that the committee was scrupulously careful not to interfere in the slightest degree with the conferring of distinctions upon naval and military men. That will relieve the committee from any blame or censure in this respect. I want to deal with the question of foreign titles, to which my friend the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) referred to a few moments ago, I shall not say with eloquence, but rather with undue heat, and I believe that even he will agree with me, as I am sure the members of the House will, that he did not present the case with perfect accuracy, when I state the facts as they are. Let me first read the clause of the report dealing with that matter.

Your committee further recommends that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to provide that hereafter no person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada shall accept, enjoy or use any title of honour or titular distinction hereafter conferred by a foreign ruler or government.

I may explain how that came about. The committee had no warrant to deal with the matter of foreign titles. It had come before the Cabinet in a certain manner and they referred the question to our committee for a decision. There were a number of members of the committee who, like myself, felt that inasmuch as the reference of the particular questions to the committee did not embody that point the committee should not deal with it. I was one that took that ground, and after some discussion the matter was ruled upon by the chairman of the committee. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) thought it came within the jurisdiction of a committee appointed to make a general finding and be so ruled.

The hon. member for Brantford indicated with great warmth that the members of the Committee were actually in favour of foreign titles being received by Canadians. I want to absolutely dissent from that statement, and I think in doing so I shall be borne out by all the members of the Committee. Excepting himself, there was not, according to my recollection, one single member—I see the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) agrees with me—of that Committee who took the view that foreign titles should be received into this country. It was merely a question as to whether or not we should deal with the matter. The position taken by the hon. member for Brantford entirely falls in that regard.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: There was an amendment moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and afterwards we were asked to get together, which we did, and we framed the resolution which was passed.

Mr. LEVI THOMPSON: I want to say that the statement made by the hon. member for Springfield is absolutely correct—that there was no member of the Committee expressed himself as in favour of continuing foreign titles.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: You moved an amendment.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I did.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not wish to suggest that the hon. member for Brantford desired to deliberately misrepresent the case, but he got carried away with the sound of his own voice and the enthusiasm of the moment, and I think he consequently misrepresented the position of the committee. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) will make a statement later and I am sure he will endorse my description of what happened at the committee. The hon. member for Brantford told us here with great enthusiasm that he had got from the Under Secretary of State this afternoon a statement that Parliament had nothing to do with foreign titles, anyway, and that no one in Canada could receive or wear a foreign title without the permission of the King. If that be so there can be no possible objection to that particular clause in the report being adopted. Anyway, it leaves the matter to the Government to deal with in some proper manner later on. If the permission of the King must be received to accept or wear a foreign title, we need not worry very much about the existence of that clause in the report.

What I want to impress upon hon. members is that the report embodies nothing but what has been generally accepted at one time or another by the majority of the members of this House since the question was brought before it last session, and during the present session. Under the report hereditary titles are to be extinguished on the death of the holders and knighthoods are to cease from the present time.

The hon. member for Brantford spoke of the insult that was offered to the King by addressing him in the manner proposed in the report. As a matter of fact, the King has really no responsibility, although he finally "does the trick," in connection with these titles. The recommendations for titles are made by the Prime Minister of the day. No doubt the whips and the corporations may have considerable influence on the Government of the day in reference to the conferring of titles. But the King should not be charged with the responsibility. This is the only way that this House has of putting an end to what we regard as an improper practice, as a practice which has led to very much heartburning throughout the country and which, I believe, is not in the general interest of the public, a belief which I am convinced is shared by the great mass of the people of the country. The members of the House should have clearly in their minds the point upon which they are voting when they come to record their votes in a few minutes. Members need not worry at all about foreign titles when the King is the supreme authority in that regard. The committee only made a finding in regard to it because the matter was referred to it by the Government. We have absolutely guarded the military ranks in this country. The two things we have done are, first, to recommend the ending of hereditary titles and, second, to recommend the ending of knighthoods. That is practically all that the members are asked to vote upon.

I think that this country owes a considerable debt to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) for his courage and pluck in bringing this question before Parliament and for the ability and care which he has displayed in presenting the case on the different occasions that it has been brought up in this House. I resent the reflection of the hon. member for Brantford, although he has explained it, in saying that there was something disloyal behind this attempt to wipe out titles in this country. Doubtless there are many little cross-currents in evidence, but I do not think there is anything sinister behind this movement against titles; I am quite sure that the hon. member for Kingston, who sent two of as brave boys as this country has produced overseas to fight the battles of Canada in the great war, is not influenced by any sinister or improper motives. On the contrary, I think the hon. gentleman interprets the feeling of the country very clearly with regard to this question. It may be that many members think that we have devoted too much time to its consideration, to the exclusion of other matters which they regard as of greater importance. I repeat, however, that it is a question that means a great deal to the people of this country, and in the long run I believe that if titles are abolished, as this report proposes, we shall have done a good day's work for Canada, and the time which has been devoted to it will not have been spent in vain.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the position of the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), who said that members who regard this question lightly will probably discover that they have made a great mistake when they come to discuss it with their constituents, and when they find what the real feeling actually is throughout the country with regard to it. I believe that is a fair statement of the situation. While the people are not perhaps especially excited, still I believe that if this issue could be referred by a plebiscite, uninfluenced by other considerations, to the entire population of Canada, it would be carried by the enormous majority of twenty, thirty, or fifty to one, because people generally, I reiterate, are sick of the institution of titles and the manner in which they have been misused by the governments of the day since Confederation.

There is one other point to which I wish to refer before resuming my seat. I read a letter in the press the other day, and I want to give a brief extract from it to the House. The writer says:

> What chance is there outside of an aristocracy for the development of the following virtues: Modesty, truthfulness, sincerity, regard for the feelings of other people, genuineness—what chance has any one of them in the fierce competitive struggle of democracy? Not the smallest. They get choked out—stifled in the crowd, killed.
>
> Proof—take our Toronto or Montreal crowds—a necessity. We Canadians-born believe that a nation—not a mob, but a nation—should have one part of its population in which such things can be preserved.

I shall not enumerate the list, but I invite the House to recall and scrutinize the galaxy which holds the doubtful honour. I would not like to be understood as saying an offensive word against the gentlemen as a class who enjoy the doubtful distinction, as there are undoubtedly some excellent and deserving men upon the list. Hon. gentlemen, however, no doubt recall the reasons for which many of the decorations were conferred by the governments of the day.

If the virtues of modesty, truth, sincerity and tenderness are to be found only in the ranks of our belted knights, and especially if these virtues which should be universal are mostly confined to that limited and interesting collection of citizens, then I think, with all earnestness, we should invite you, Mr. Speaker, when at the opening of each session, you invoke the Almighty to save the King, to also implore the Deity to include the country as well.

In Canada titles have not been generally distributed because of the possession of the qualities of genius, or because of any distinguished service to the country but largely because of political services rendered to this or that party or corporation, whose conduct may have been glaringly inimical to the best interests of the people.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I shall not occupy more than one or two minutes in discussing this matter, and I would not take that much time were it not for the fact that it so happened I was not present when the debate occurred last year on this matter, nor was I in attendance when the debate took place on a former occasion during the present session. The hon. members for Springfield and Brome paid very high tributes to the hon. member for Kingston for his courage in bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I would not for one moment wish to be understood as reflecting in any way on the courage of that hon. gentleman; but if the statements made by the three hon. gentlemen referred to are correct, that eighty or ninety per cent of public sentiment is in favour of the motion moved by the hon. member for Kingston, the thought occurs to me that it requires little courage to move such a motion, but it does require some courage to express opposition to it. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) in the course of his remarks intimated that it would be a grave mistake for this House not to pass this report because of the effect it might have on the prevailing situation as indicated, for instance, in the city of Winnipeg, and that it would add if anything to the unrest which is exhibited in that city at the present time. I happen to have in my hand a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press. That clipping gives an account of a meeting held by the Great War Veterans in Winnipeg, and I quote in answer to the statement made by the hon. member for Springfield, an expression of opinion by one of the Veterans, named Captain Wheeler, who said in reference to titles:

> "What do we care about titles," declared the speaker, "what we want is a chance to live properly and to know that we can be able to buy food for our wives and children at the lowest possible price."

Apparently, if we are to take the words of that gentleman as any guide, the people of Winnipeg are not very much concerned about the question of titles. Furthermore, I express my own opinion, which, of course, may be wrong, when I say that I think there is very little concern in the country with regard to this whole matter; I think the people generally are very little concerned about the question of titles.

I do believe that opinion throughout the country as in this House is practically unanimous in regard to hereditary titles; but I do think there is a difference of opinion in regard to the granting of other titles. Personally, I do not believe in the granting of these titles at all, and in so far as Canada is concerned, I think we can get along very well without them. But they have been conferred upon men in this country,—some of whom have been mentioned by previous speakers, and I rather incline to the view that the public generally were pleased rather than otherwise, not that the title of "Sir" was conferred upon John A. Macdonald or Wilfrid Laurier, but that the head of the British Empire took a means of signifying his appreciation of the services of men of that type. But titles have been conferred rather promiscuously, and I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the wealth of the individual apparently has had a good deal to do with the matter, although there are notable instances in this country of titles having been conferred on men who are not by any means wealthy.

I think the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) expressed the situation very well indeed; at least, my view coincides with his. It has been stated, and this is one of the things that appeals to me, that the King does not confer these Canadian titles except on the recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada. If that is true, why not address the opinion of this House to the Government of this country? Why address it in the form of a demand to be placed before the King? Is it that the House believes that an expression of opinion addressed to the Prime Minister would be ignored by him? I do not believe for one moment that the Prime Minister would ignore the opinion of this

House addressed to him in the words of the motion asking for the adoption of this report; and if he did not ignore such expression of opinion, there would be no recommendations made to the King asking for titles to be conferred on Canadians resident in Canada, and consequently no titles would be conferred.

After all, there are two parties to this question; there is the party here in Canada, and the party over in the Old Country. There are different sentiments in the two countries. I feel inclined to respect the sentiments of the people in the Old Country, although I do not agree with their views in regard to titles. But, while I am willing to vote for any resolution expressing the opinion of this House as against the granting of hereditary titles or titles of knighthood, I do not think we should go beyond that and place our opinions in the form of a demand that the King should take this or that action. I have the greatest respect for those who hold a different view in regard to the matter. If it comes to a vote I am going to vote against the adoption of the report for the reason I have stated. My opinion may be misrepresented, and there may be some who will say that I am in favour of the continuance of titles in this country. Very well; I am willing to take my chances in regard to that, notwithstanding the remarks of some hon. members that it was as much as one's political life was worth to take that course.

I repeat, Sir, that in my view we should be perfectly within our rights in expressing the opinion of this House that it was in conformity with the sentiments of the people of Canada that hereditary titles should not continue to be conferred on Canadians resident in Canada. I believe that such an expression of opinion would get us just as much as we would obtain by placing a demand before the King and saying: "We want you to do thus and so." That seems to me to be a rather harsh way of treating the matter.

Distinctions have been made even in the resolution. I know, of course, that many object that it is undemocratic to have certain men in this country who are known as "Sir This" or "Sir That." I do not approve of it myself. But if they want to play with that sort of a trinket, why, all right; I do not think the public cares very much about it one way or the other. But if it is improper and undemocratic that I should address a gentleman in this country—who has had a knighthood conferred upon him—as Sir,—and really I cannot treat him courteously unless I so address him—then is it democratic for my friends, the hon. member for Kingston and the hon. member for Brome—both lawyers—when they go into the court room bowing and scraping to the gentleman on the bench to say, "May it please you lordship" or "Your worship this" or "Your worship that," or "Your honour this" or "Your honour that?" Of course, to suggest that that is undemocratic, or that it is undemocratic to refer to the dignitaries of some churches as "My Lord Bishop," I suppose, would be carrying democracy a little bit too far. But to be perfectly consistent, I cannot see why one should object to my speaking to John Jones—if he has been knighted—as "Sir John," if it is proper to refer to a judge on the bench as "Your lordship."

Nor do I think that it is altogether consistent that we should make no effort to do away with the titles of "Honourable" and "Right Honourable." Of course, it is true that those are titles which may come to some honourable gentlemen in this House, if they reach the height of their ambitions, —and no doubt they are worthy of holding those titles—and we would be lacking in courtesy if we did not address them as "Honourable" or "Right Honourable."

I repeat, Sir, that I believe the sentiment of Canada is opposed to the granting of titles; but I think we will be going as far as we should go in taking action on this matter in this House if we give expression to that opinion and carry our request to the Prime Minister or to the Government.

Hon. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I have not much sympathy with the contention, which has been made a number of times this evening, that time has been wasted in the discussion of this matter in the House. I have always had the idea that the people elect representatives to come to Parliament and to take whatever time may be necessary for the discussion of matters that come before them. If the Government was criticised during the last session of Parliament for one thing more than another, it was on the ground that sufficient time was not given for the discussion of matters which many members wanted to discuss. I took the ground this year that Parliament should be called as early as possible and should sit as long as members wanted to sit and should discuss matters of public interest affecting the people.

I am rather inclined to agree with the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that there is not the demand for the abolition

of titles in Canada that some people think there is; still, I do believe that if the proposal were put to a vote it would carry by a large majority. I believe that the sentiment of Canada is against the conferring or retention of these titles. I am opposed to them—not, perhaps, from the standpoint taken by some hon. members, but as a matter of principle. I do not believe that the aristocracy of Great Britain during the last thousand years has been the advantage to the country that some people have tried to make it out to have been. One had only to go to Great Britain before the war—and the condition would be much exaggerated since the war—to see the great gulf that existed between the classes and the masses. What has been the origin of all the social revolutions that have taken place in Great Britain since the repeal of the Corn Laws if it has not been the fight between the classes and the masses; if it has not been the fact that the aristocracy were arrogating to themselves rights and powers and privileges which were considered by the common people as inimical to their best interests, and taking to themselves rights which the common people believed they were being deprived of? The principle upon which I shall vote on this question is this: I do not want to see that condition of affairs built up in Canada. It has been admitted here by all sides—I am not blaming one political party more than another—it has been admitted by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), that there has been an abuse in connection with the granting of these titles during recent years. Many men have received them who, perhaps, are not entitled to them; and were it not for that abuse, I assume that this matter would not be under discussion to-night. Personally, I have no objection to a man receiving a distinction from his sovereign who had become a great inventor or a great scientist, had contributed something to the uplifting of the world, had been honoured by being made Prime Minister of his country, or something of that kind, because in nearly all these cases the distinction would be actually conferred by the sovereign or by the ruling power as a reward for what the recipients of the honours had done. But we might as well get down to the ordinary condition of affairs and realize that where there was one of that class there would be a dozen whom the King did not know at all and about whom he cared nothing. The King has nothing to say about it, except in these few outstanding cases. People are made knights because they want to be made knights; because they have sufficient influence with their political friends, or in some other way. After all, Mr. Speaker, the recommendation for the creation of a knighthood in Canada comes from the Prime Minister, from the Government.

Mr. MARCIL: In all cases?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, I think in all cases, although there may be some outstanding exceptions. I have no doubt that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the present Prime Minister, after being elevated to the Premiership, received their titles direct from the King. But in the great majority of cases it is the building up of an aristocracy because people want to become the aristocracy; and that is the principle I am opposed to.

In a sense, I am sorry to see the matter before the House in the shape it is. It has created a good deal of feeling; there has been a good deal of discussion about it. I was afraid, on coming into the Chamber just before six o'clock—I had not been able to listen to all the debate—that in some way the report of the special committee, if adopted, would ask the King to refrain from granting military distinctions. I listened to the member for Edmonton, and immediately got a copy of the report and read it over; but I saw nothing in it to bear out that contention. Evidently the committee deliberately avoided expressing any opinion derogatory to the granting of military decorations; and that is as it should be. They have asked the King—and that is only the manner of asking, because really the request goes to the Government of Canada; they have asked the powers that have the right to recommend these distinctions to refrain from granting hereditary titles. That everybody agrees with. Secondly, they have asked them to refrain from granting ordinary knighthoods—about that there seems to be some difference of opinion. I have no feeling against any gentlemen who have accepted titles in the past, or who might accept them in the future, because that is largely a matter of individual opinion. But holding the views that I do, believing that the creation of a privileged class is not in the best interests of a country like Canada, and having regard to the fact that the question is before Parliament for the expression of its opinion, I intend to vote against the amendment and for the adoption of the report of the Special Committee.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken up any

of the time of the House had it not been for the rather serious reflections and insinuations made by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) against the other members of the Special Committee. I felt, as the hon. member was speaking, that he was rather telling tales out of school that might better have been kept quiet. However, I would not have minded had the statements been correct. In referring to other members of the Committee and to those who were opposed to him, the hon. gentleman used the term " disloyalty " over and over again. He apologized so far as the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) was concerned, but he evidently still considers the rest of us as disloyal—and every other person who opposes him on the question.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not think the hon. gentleman is justified in making that statement. I pointed out that there were four threads that held us to the Empire and that the cutting of those was an element of disloyalty. If the hon. gentleman did not cut any of the threads he certainly does not come in that class.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: The hon. gentleman has no right whatever to impute disloyalty to me, even if I did believe in all the things he says—which I do not. He has no more right to impute disloyalty to me than I have to impute disloyalty to him because he holds an opposite opinion. This talk about disloyalty is getting threadbare; it is a shame that that cry should be used in this House in connection with the discussion of any question that comes before it. Any cause which has to be supported by talk about disloyalty is a pretty weak cause; it is only because of the weakness of the cause my hon. friend supports to-night that he uses that cry.

The hon. gentleman tried to leave the impression with the House that the members of the Committee who were opposed to him on most questions that came before the Committee were in favour of those foreign titles being received. Not a word was said in the Committee that would justify that statement. In support of his statement, he says that I moved an amendment. I did move an amendment, which the hon. gentleman himself accepted and put into his motion. If you saw his motion here you would consider it unworkable—a rather strange looking motion. I do not think he would care very much to quote it himself.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Has the hon. member got it?

Mr. L. THOMSON: My hon. friend was very willing to accept it. We were told that this resolution which we proposed to submit was an insult to His Majesty. It was a resolution addressed to His Majesty asking him to refrain hereafter from conferring any title of honour or titular distinction and so on, but my hon. friend says he supports the amendment which provides that we ask His Majesty or demand of His Majesty:

> To provide that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to ensure the extinction of an hereditary title of honour or titular distinction, dignity or title, as a peer of the realm, on the death of a person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada at present in enjoyment of an hereditary title of honour or titular distinction, dignity or title as a peer of the realm, and that thereafter no such title of honour, titular distinction, dignity or title as a peer of the realm, shall be accepted, enjoyed or used by any person—

and so on. It is a tremendous insult to His Majesty to say: We do not want you to confer knighthoods, but it is all right to say: You must not confer peerages on Canadian citizens. It just shows how hopeless a case my hon. friend has when he brings forward such absurd arguments. One thing is undignified and insulting, while another thing, absolutely the same, if not a little worse, is all right. I do not propose discussing this question, because it has been pretty fully discussed. Like the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) I do not know that there is a tremendous agitation in regard to this matter, but notwithstanding that, I believe the general public think that we should act. I am not saying that I believe a lot of time has been wasted in this House, and I do not purpose wasting any time myself, although I have noticed that the members who spoke most about wasting time took up a good deal more of the time of the House than they needed to do, and I do not intend following their example. I am following rather along the line of what the Minister of Public Works said, and the reasons given by him are my reasons, and for those reasons, I purpose voting against the amendment and for the resolution.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Council): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make just one or two observations before the vote is taken. The question of hereditary titles is not open for discussion at the present time; that question was settled more than a year ago. The Order in Council which was passed by the Government and submitted to the House expressly set forth that no hereditary title of honour

shall hereafter be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada, and further provides that:

> Appropriate action shall be taken, whether by legislation or otherwise, to provide that after a prescribed period no title of honour held by a subject of His Majesty now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canada shall be recognised as having hereditary effect.

That Order in Council sets forth the most advanced position which any Government in this country had, up to that time, taken on the question of titles in Canada. Those provisions were approved by the House, and that decision has been communicated to the Imperial Government, so that both Government and Parliament are committed to that policy in relation to hereditary titles, and I am sure that appeals to the judgment of the people of Canada.

Referring to the question of knighthoods, while there may not be the same unanimity as there is on the question of hereditary titles, I believe the overwhelming mass of the people of Canada have reached the conclusion that it is not in the interest of the country as a whole that further titles of knighthood should be conferred. I think they have reached that conclusion on very sound grounds. The Minister of Public Works and other hon. members have already spoken on the subject, and I shall not repeat their arguments. I do not believe it is consistent with the democratic conditions prevailing in a country like Canada that we should continue to mark in this way certain men, no matter how honourable, no matter what distinguished service they render; for experience has shown us that we cannot limit it to the few men whom every one would recognize as properly entitled to be so marked. From our experience, I believe we must reach the conclusion that it would be wise to discontinue that policy in the future. I listened with great interest to the hon. member for Edmonton West, and if I understood him aright he pointed out that under the report as printed it would interfere with the conferring of military distinction. If that is true, I should like to see the report amended so that it would not interfere with conferring any distinctions, decorations or titles upon men who had served in the present war, my reason being that large numbers have already been so recognized, and further, I know of some who have been recommended for recognition. The matter came before the Government some time ago, before this House met, and the Government wisely and properly declined to take action until this question had been considered by a Committee of the Whole House. Personally, I cannot see why military men who have already received recognition should stand in a better position than those who have earned but have not yet received such recognition. Some may say: No military men should receive recognition. All I am suggesting is that they should all receive the same consideration. I must vote against the amendment because it says that we should continue to confer knighthoods on citizens of this country. I should be glad to vote for an amendment that would refer the report back to the committee to amend it so as to make it clear that it would not interfere with recognizing men who have served in this war and would put those men in the same position as those who have already received recognition, but if no such amendment is proposed I shall vote for the report.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few words, not of argument, but rather of explanation. I was a member of the committee appointed to consider this question, and as I was not able to concur in the report, perhaps it is not objectionable that I should offer a few words of explanation why I was not able to agree with my colleagues. On the question of hereditary titles there is practically no difference between us, and I take it to be the view of this country and of this House that, neither on the recommendation of the Government or without it, and neither on the recommendation of the Prime Minister or without it, so far as this House has any influence, shall any hereditary title be given in Canada hereafter. I take that to be the meaning of the report, and on that I presume there is no difference of opinion.

Coming now to the question of titles generally, I have assented to the views of the majority on that question, but not without some hesitation and reluctance. I do not concur in the views of my hon. friends who claim that as a matter of principle the granting of these titles is wrong. In the earlier years of Confederation, in the years before Confederation, when honours of this character were granted but seldom, and always granted to men of undoubted distinction, there was no public opinion against them. Nobody found fault with the conferring of honour, say for example, on Sir John A. Macdonald or Sir George Etienne Cartier, although I believe in the beginning there was a little cause for

jealousy and trouble. It is historically known that when Mr. John A. Macdonald received his knighthood Mr. George Etienne Cartier was offered a minor honour, and that this caused trouble and jealousy and an uncomfortable situation. Mr. Cartier resented it and Mr. Cartier's friends resented it more freely. In the end Mr. Cartier received a consolation of a higher prize, in the form of a baronetcy, than that received by Mr. Macdonald. The authorities had ascertained that Mr. Cartier was not blessed with a son and that, therefore, the title would not last long. Beyond a little jealousy of that character I do not think there was any manifestation of public opinion against the granting of these honours so long as they were granted rarely and for services of undoubted merit.

It is only when in later years—and I am not speaking now of one party or the other—these honours were offered in greater abundance that any question began to arise concerning them. I think if we look over the list from A to Z, of the men who have been honoured with knighthood there will be found the names of a great many gentlemen of eminence and of long public service, men of distinction, with the recognition of whose merits no one can find fault. Indeed, nearly all on the list will be found to be honourable and estimable men. But when you ask yourself the question, why was this or the other particular man honoured, you find yourself in a quandary. True, some one who is honoured may be an honourable man; but there are thousands of honourable men all around him in the community. True, he is estimable, but there are estimable men in his neighbourhood in the same line of business, and of equal distinction, who receive no honour. As time went on and these conditions continued, there began to develop an opinion against knighthoods. It will be said with some force that the abuse of anything is no valid reason why you should abolish it; but the opponents of knighthood have argued with equally great force that if the system should continue the evils will coexist with it; because if the appointments are made by the Government or on the recommendations of the government of the day it is inevitable that they will be characterized by favouritism of some kind, political or personal. These considerations, I think, have led to a considerable volume of public opinion against these honours. I do not think the country is at all excited about the matter, as some hon. gentlemen seem to think, but there is considerable public opinion against it, and for that reason, with some reluctance, and not as a matter of principle, I have concurred in the view that, as respects knighthoods,—an adverse recommendation should be made. If I could have an opportunity of voting on these matters separately, if there were submitted a question concerning hereditary titles, I should undoubtedly vote against such titles, but I shall not have that opportunity. And if I could have the opportunity of voting distinctly on the question as it relates to ordinary knighthoods, I should with some reluctance vote against those titles. But I shall not have that opportunity either. Now, why did I differ from the committee? I thought that whatever public opinion there was in the country—and I am not magnifying it—had relation to hereditary honour and what is called ordinary knighthood. Public opinion did not concern itself with anything beyond that; why then should we do so? Why should we worry over C.M.G.'s, C.B.'s, and I.S.O.'s, which no one in the world except very few knows the meaning of? I doubt whether very many ordinary men know the significance of "C.M.G." It is a badge of honour and distinction, but five out of six men in the street, generally speaking, could not tell you what C.M.G. and C.B. meant. And if it pleased His Majesty in the ordinary course to make somebody a C.M.G. or a C.B. I see no reason why we should break our hearts over the fact. It may be that these two honours, C.M.G. and C.B. are steps in the order of knighthood, one in the Order of the Bath, and the other in the Order of St. Michael and St. George, and I suppose that if these orders generally were marked with disapproval, these minor honours would also be regarded with disfavour. But I do not see why we should worry about it. Then there is the I.S.O.—The Imperial Service Order—given sometimes to old public servants. I could not tell you all who have it in Ottawa, but it never hurt any one. I do not see why minor honours should have entered into consideration at all.

Now we come to foreign titles and decorations. I was not present in the committee during all the proceedings, and during my absence some resolutions were reached which I did not concur in. But very naturally and properly they were carried into the report of the committee. If it suits any foreign authority to grant a mark of distinction to any citizen of Canada, which distinction does not carry with it the title

of knighthood, I do not see why in the world we need object. These honours come seldom, being most frequent in the case of the French Republic, and a number of our fellow-citizens have had conferred upon them the Legion of Honour. I do not think we should seek to prevent any one from receiving such an honour if it pleases the French authorities to offer it and the recipient to accept it. Whatever public opinion there was on the subject was confined to hereditary titles and knighthoods, which involved the prefix, "Sir." Beyond that I do not see that there was any demand, and I do not think there was any need for the committee to present to the House a report concerning these things. The committee reported according to their judgment, and I am not finding fault with them. I am merely stating my own views. And inasmuch as I believe that there was no need for a consideration of these minor honours, I cannot agree in that, and I dissent from their report.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I was a member of that committee and voted in support of the various resolutions which form the report now before the House. I have not changed my mind and shall vote in favour of the adoption of the report. It is not the time or the place to split hairs, Mr. Speaker. The committee by a very large majority adopted the report. I think there were only three members opposed to the broad principle embodied in it, and the last speaker was not one of them. The committee adopted the report after a full discussion on the matter, and the principle which was at stake was whether or not in Canada we should put an end for the future to any class distinctions. The committee almost unanimously decided that we should do away with all attempts at maintaining in this country any class distinction whatever. Sir, we are not living in Great Britain. If we were, I would understand that perhaps members of the House might have some diffidence in the matter. There they have a different civilization and a different tradition as regards these distinctions. For my part, I wish to pay my respects to the British nobility. I know what has been the role of that nobility in history and how well it has behaved during the recent war. But, as I say, we are not in Britain; we live in Canada, in a democracy, and at the present hour, in view of what is taking place in the country, I do not know that Parliament could do better than abolish all class distinction. Some hon. gentlemen have spoken about military decorations.

I am not opposed, Mr. Speaker, to military distinctions, such as the V.C., D.S.O., or the Military Cross, but I am of the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) that if you are going to give decorations to the higher officer you are creating again an invidious distinction between that officer and the modest, unassuming private who went over the top. The private is as much entitled in this war to any decorations, any distinctions as the higher officer.

Mr. MANION: I never said a word about decorations; I said knighthoods.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Sir, in this war the private was a knight, in my judgment, as much as a colonel, the major, or the general. They were all knights and if you make a distinction, I say that the greatest knights of all are the dead. Where are the decorations for the dead? Wooden crosses! Reference has been made by the hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and he made it with that chivalrous spirit which generally inspires his thoughts and actions in this House and outside of it. As a matter of history, it is well that we should know how it came that my late leader became Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It is of record that in the campaign which preceded the election of 1896, at a meeting held in Ontario, Sir Wilfrid Laurier made the famous declaration; "I am a democrat to the hilt." After he became Prime Minister, the Queen's Jubilee took place in England and he was deputed as the representative of Canada on that occasion. He had not altered his views; he had not changed; he was, as ever, a democrat to the hilt. But how could he refuse the honour, the distinction, when, without being consulted, on taking his seat at Windsor Castle, as one of His Majesty's Privy Councillors he found his title in front of him. That is the history of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's knighthood. If he had been consulted he never would have accepted it, but if on the other hand he had refused on that occasion it would have been looked upon as a lack of courtesy on his part. But, as we all know, he was a grand gentleman. The manner in which the honour was conferred upon him on that occasion reflected his modesty, his true chivalry, and at the same time his devotion to the interests of Canada. But let me give here another instance from

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's career. It may throw light on what took place on the occasion to which I have just referred. It will show, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier always was a democrat to the hilt in the sense he meant when he made that declaration prior to 1896. It is not known to the members of this House, it is not known to the public, but in the history of Sir Wilfrid Laurier which is being written at the present time, it will be made public. On one occasion, perhaps on two, but certainly on one, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was offered a peerage and he declined it. That was the spirit of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The true democrats of this country can well look up to him as a guide.

I do not intend to say anything more on the subject. The problems that confront us are very serious indeed. I do not know that it is wise policy on the part of this or any Government to make a last-ditch fight for the maintenance of those titles which in the past have been so lavishly distributed. I have in my mind some titles which were given not very long ago and which shocked the public conscience, titles given to men who had no right and no claim to them. I am positive they were given without His Majesty knowing anything about them. They were the gift of the whips of the parties; that is all. They were given to these men because of some consideration. It has been stated publicly in England over the signature of responsible parties that titles were offered before general elections for a consideration. Why should we perpetuate that system in this young country of ours? Public opinion is absolutely opposed to any class distinctions in Canada, and the people will hail the result of the vote that we take on this question to-night.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I submitted was drafted hurriedly. I have another here the phraseology of which is a little better. I do not know whether I will be permitted to substitute it. It does not change the principle of the amendment in any sense.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is an amendment before the House and it is technically in order. What the hon. member asks is that he may put the same substance in better form. That can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House. I will read the altered form of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East Algoma:

That the report be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the Special Committee with instructions to amend the same by striking out paragraph (a) of the proposed Address to His Majesty, and by striking out all the paragraphs after the said proposed address, and by adding the following paragraph to the report of the said Special Committee:—

"That in making recommendations to His Majesty for the conferring of knighthoods or other titular distinctions upon persons domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada the greatest care should be exercised in the selection of the persons recommended, and that special regard should be paid to the personal merit and the distinguished services of the said person."

Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member shall have permission to substitute this for the amendment proposed?

Mr. NICKLE: If no other hon. member desires to speak, I should like to exercise my privilege of closing the debate. I may say that this afternoon I have found myself in the position in which Mr. Storey, later Judge Storey, found himself after he had been appointed to the Supreme Court bench. In his earlier years he had drafted an Act of Congress that was considered by him as a model of perfection. He felt assured that no matter what attacks were made upon it, it was impossible that ambiguity would arise in reference to the legislation of which he had been the author. But in later years when he had risen to the Supreme Court Bench, cunning lawyers, in arguing certain questions before him as being applicable to the Act that he had drafted, so confused him that he said that he hardly understood what his own legislation meant, and he found himself almost unable to interpret it. That is very much the position in which I would find myself to-day if I were to lend myself to the cunning arguments which have been submitted against the report. They have attacked it from every point, from the point of view of logic in this way, from the point of view of logic in another way; they have criticised it on the ground of loyalty and they have criticised it on the ground of inconsistency.

I would not care at this late hour to say very much in reference to the attacks that have been made, but I do not think, in justice to myself, that I can allow a personal remark which was made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) to pass unnoticed. It was a remark that cast the imputation upon me of having been inconsistent in my conduct and vote in this House on the 14th of last month.

The hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) has certainly been most courteous in giving to this House an explanation of what occurred, and I may say that the explanation given by him is correct in every detail. When I introduced

the resolution into the House at the first of the session it remained on the Order Paper for a somewhat protracted period until my attention was drawn to it by the Government. A few weeks prior to the discussion, the acting leader of the Government asked me if I would be prepared to take a fair, non-partisan and representative committee which would consider and discuss in a judicial manner the involved and difficult points covered by the resolution. I told him that such a committee would be acceptable to me. I explained the position to those who were supporting my motion and I had their concurrence in the arrangement.

I was amazed the night the debate took place on the 14th of April, when suddenly a political situation developed, and I found myself confronted with this difficulty: I had to take a position that certainly would be construed by the country as being inconsistent, or I had to break my word to the leader of the Government; and there are some things that a man of honour, even when faced with the likelihood of severe criticism, must consider, more particularly when the breaking of his word would mean the breaking of a Government. I had pledged my word, and those who were behind me had pledged their word, that we would accept that committee. Men had left this House and gone to their homes for their vacation—the Easter vacation I think it was—believing that a committee was to be accepted; and it would have been the rankest perfidy, the rankest treachery on my part, if, when I found the Government of this country in a precarious position, I had not kept my word to a man whom I had known for twenty years and who in all that time never in the slightest tittle deviated from that which he had promised me. That is my explanation of the vote I gave that night. I used the wrong word in saying the word "explanation." It is not an explanation; it is a reason for the vote I gave that night. I had told the right hon. leader of the Government that I would accept that committee, and I had told many men who spoke to me in reference to the matter and had asked me if there would be a vote, that the matter would be referred to a committee, and would finally be discussed in this House free from being considered as a party question.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would like to know why it was, under those circumstances, that the resolution was introduced in the way it was, and why in it the committee was not recommended?

[Mr. Nickle.]

Mr. NICKLE: The resolution had been on the Order Paper for some seven or eight weeks. That length of time elapsed, if hon. gentlemen will remember, before the resolution was debated. I had simply to take it as it was, before I was permitted to know what the conclusion of the Government was. Then the offer of a committee was extended to me and I accepted it as a fair solution of the difficulty. It may have been badly managed, I am not making any defence in regard to that; I am simply endeavouring to make it clear to the House that the Acting Prime Minister kept his faith with me, and I kept my faith with him.

Mr. CAMPBELL: You did not intimate in any way that there was such an arrangement.

Mr. NICKLE: I am not saying for one moment that certain gentlemen did not find themselves in an awkward position; not for one moment am I arguing that.

An hon. MEMBER: You did not care.

Mr. NICKLE: Yes, I did care. I do not know what riding the hon. gentleman represents who said I did not care. I cared more than most men think, and I would never have spoken if the matter had not been brought up in this House to-day—my lips would have been sealed.

Now, Sir, I want to direct the attention of the House not to a personal matter, but to the issue which is before us. The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) spoke this afternoon with marked eloquence—an eloquence which shook the House, and shook the argument that I had advanced in favour of the resolution that I had introduced. It was a remarkable effort. But was the hon. gentleman consistent? He waxed most eloquent in criticising the language in which the report was drafted. He said the language was an insult to His Majesty. He shook with vigour, and with feeling, as he denounced the arrogance, if I might use the word, that prompted the Committee to say that His Majesty should be approached to provide that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise, to ensure the extinction of titles. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) shook with similar indignation this afternoon when he approached the subject in the same way; and the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) trembled with indignation as he approached the matter from the same point of view. In imagination I could see His Majesty

shrinking back as this terrific and terrifying resolution was presented to him for consideration, and I said to myself as these gentlemen spoke; "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel." Because I remembered that in 1918, on May 21st, the right hon. leader of the Government moved his amendment to my then resolution and the very gentlemen, who shook with indignation this afternoon and evening, voted for exactly the same language that the Prime Minister put in his motion as the language that I put in the resolution which I submitted this afternoon. The resolution of the Prime Minister which carried in this House in 1918 read thus :

> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly petition Your Majesty, praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any titles upon your subjects domiciled or living in Canada.

And so on, and so on. The division took place on that resolution, and is recorded at page 2448 of Hansard, and among the names recorded in favour of that resolution I see the names of Edwards, Cockshutt, and Sheard. When I drafted this report—because my hand was known in the drafting of it—I used the very language that the Prime Minister used so that an imputation could not be cast upon me in this House that I had acted in a disloyal manner. Because I have heard, not only in this House but outside, that there was an element of disloyalty in approaching His Majesty and asking that a certain concession be made that the Canadian people wanted. Where is the disloyalty in making any such approach? Is the monarchial institution so weak that it cannot stand by virtue of its worth? Do the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this House want the House and the country to understand that the attachment between Canada and the Empire is so weak that it cannot be preserved except by the maintenance of titles of distinction? I do not believe it. I do not think this country believes it, and I do not think the members of this House believe it. Five hundred thousand men did not go to the Front and sixty thousand of them do not lie in Flanders fields because they hoped to win distinction; they went to the war because they were moved by patriotism; they went to the war called by a sense of duty. And I say it is an insult to the memory of those men to say that titular distinctions is the tie that binds the Dominion to Great Britain. Titular distinctions probably have no effect in binding the Dominions to the Motherland; but it is that warm bond of sympathy, the sentimental tie, that unites the Empire that covers all the seas and has made it so strong in the face of a mighty foe.

I want to say a word or two more. I want to say a word or two in reference to something the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said this afternoon. He is a magnificent debater. The flow of his language, the vigour of his intellect, the rhythm of his sentences, carries you along in a majestic flow. But what did he say this afternoon in the House? Not content with his marked abilities, not content with being the premier debater of this House, he used this afternoon in reference to me these words, and I did not rise to my feet at that time because I could hardly believe my senses when I heard the member for Red Deer speak as he did.

He said:

> I cannot, the way my mind is framed, concur in anything which is the embodiment at once of democratic cant and illogical nonsense. We are asked to concur in this report and recommend in one paragraph His Majesty to abolish all titular distinctions in Canada and retain the titles Honourable and Right Honourable, which I contend by any fair interpretation of the English language are themselves titular distinctions.

"Democratic cant"! Am I not to be regarded as being as sincere in advocating the abolition of titles as the hon. member for Red Deer is to be thought sincere in maintaining the position that free trade would be a sound economic principle for this country to adopt? If I cannot get all I want in one bite, am I to be thought any more insincere than he because the Government may give him something, but possibly not all he wants? Does he not realize that no well-matured policy, no great advance in public affairs is made by jumps? Progress is made little by little in any great reform; and I say to the members of the House to-night who are asked to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for East Algoma that a subterfuge is being cast about the issue. It is not a question of whether this thing or that thing, in reference to logic, shall be the determining factor. The question is, shall this House or shall it not stand for what the people of this country want? The people of this country do not want titles continued. The hon. member for Frontenac has said that they do not want them continued, yet he shrinks back in horror from the vote. Why?

Because he thinks His Majesty may be insulted. And yet last year he voted for a resolution couched in exactly the same terms. The member for Red Deer says that it is illogical nonsense. There never was a more logical committee than the committee that sat to deal with titles, honours and distinctions. Let us draw the veil aside and see what happened. The committee met and there was no question as to hereditary titles and their extinction; on that we were agreed. The next point was in reference to knighthood; on that the vote was 17 to 3, if I remember correctly. The next vote was on the minor classes of orders, and there the difference in the vote was not quite so marked—I do not know exactly what the vote was. The committee adjourned, and at the next meeting the hon. member for Red Deer raised the question that the titles "Honourable" and "Right Honourable" should go if we were to be consistent. I said to him, "If you believe that, put it in the form of a resolution, and submit it to the committee, and let the committee vote upon it." The hon. member for Red Deer did put it in writing, and this is his resolution:

Mr. Clark moved: That this committee is of opinion that in case Parliament finds it expedient to abolish titles in Canada, steps must necessarily be taken to see that no citizen of Canada resident in Canada wears henceforth the prefix 'Honourable" or "Right Honourable."

What happened? If the committee had accepted that they might have gone outside the reference, for the reason that the prefixes "Honourable" and "Right Honourable" did not form part of the subject matters that had been particularly discussed in the House. But if the committee had accepted that amendment I have no doubt whatever that the members who were opposed to the action the committee had taken on knighthood and the orders would have steadily pressed, and pressed, and pressed, one resolution after the other until they had reduced the whole thing to an absurdity. It would not have made any difference where you drew the line. No matter where it was drawn, imputations of being illogical and absurd would have been cast upon the committee. The committee were extremely logical. They said: "The subject matters that were before the House and the country were hereditary titles, knighthoods and the various classes of the Orders, and that is as far as we are going to go in the matter. And there they stopped. Therefore I submit, Sir, to you and to this House that there was nothing illogical in the action

of the Committee in voting on the question of the titles of "Honourable" and "Right Honourable."

Mr. M. CLARK: Will my hon. friend permit me to ask a simple question? Is the term "Right Honourable" before a man's name a title?

Mr. NICKLE: I should certainly consider it a title. Now, another question has been raised, and by the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), who was also a member of the Committee. I must admit that I am a little lost in following his argument. He starts out with a burst of eloquence, stating that the King confers titles, and yet last year, at the instance of the Prime Minister, he voted for a resolution ratifying an Order in Council that distinctly and emphatically declared that the King no longer should confer honours except on the advice of his ministers. In other words—

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Might I correct my hon. friend? I said "the King surrounded by his constitutional advisers," and I do not want those words left out.

Mr. NICKLE: It makes very little difference which way the hon. gentleman puts it. I am quite willing to take it as he now expresses it. If he puts it that way the loyalty cry is exploded and gone.

Now I come to the question of foreign titles, which came before the Committee in this way. I, as Chairman of the Committee, received from the President of the Privy Council this letter:—

Dear Mr. Nickle,—

By direction of Council I enclose herewith a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State with certain enclosures relating to titles. It raises the question of residents in Canada accepting titles from other sovereigns.

There was also enclosed another letter from the Under Secretary of State to the President of the Privy Council, directing the attention of the President of the Privy Council to the fact that a foreign dignitary had offered a title to a Canadian citizen, and the opinion of the committee was requested in reference to the matter. Now, what happened was this. One of the members raised a point of order, that consideration of that question was out of order. But the fact that the matter had been referred to the committee by the President of the Privy Council, and that the reference read this way, made the chairman reach the conclusion that the matter was not out of order. Here was the reference:

It referred to the committee various things, together with the question of conferring hon-

ours, titular distinctions and decorations upon subjects of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada, including those who had performed overseas, in Canada or elsewhere naval, military and civilian services in connection with the war.

In the resolution there was no limitation as to the conferring of titles being restricted to British titles, and it was therefore ruled that the matter could be discussed by the committee. What was the result?

On motion of Mr. Cockshutt it was resolved that inasmuch as this committee has decided to recommend that no further titles or orders be conferred by His Majesty the King on Canadians, the committee is opposed to the acceptance by Canadians of titles or orders from foreign rulers or governments.

And yet the member for Brantford stands in his place to-night and says that he is prepared to vote for an amendment that negatives the very resolution that he prepared in the committee. O! consistency, thou art a jewel.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go for it.

Mr. NICKLE: And the member for Brantford jocularly spoke of the wedding guest clothed in luxuriant wedding attire. But I wish to draw attention to the fact that the gentleman who was clothed in wedding attire always wears his attire on State occasions while the member for Brantford appears similarly attired on all occasions.

Now, Sir, I want to go further—and I must speak quickly because it is getting late.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go for it.

Mr. NICKLE: The member for Algoma directed my attention to a few things, particularly to the irregularity, as he saw it, of the words, "professional or vocational character or which appertain to an office," being used in subclause (a) of the first paragraph of the report. Let us see what is meant and decide if this report is or is not regular. Does the member for Algoma know that when a lieutenancy is given to a man and he gets his commission, it is issued in His Majesty's name? Does he know that when a man is appointed a notary public for the purpose of taking oaths his commission is issued under the name of His Majesty? Does he know that when a man is appointed to any judicial position his commission is issued under His Majesty's name? In the name of common sense how are you going to make an exception unless you use language to express your idea? The committee was perfectly consistent in the report. Let me read it to the House. I leave out the preamble:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty—

And in passing may I suggest to you, Sir, that I do not see anything in the nature of a demand when you say that you humbly approach His Majesty.

—praying that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased:—

(a) To refrain hereafter from conferring any title of honour or titular distinction upon any of your subjects domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada, save such appellations as are of a professional or vocational character or which appertain to an office.

What does that mean in plain language? It simply means that the committee recommended to this House to pass an Address asking His Majesty to refrain from conferring titular distinctions on his subjects domiciled or living in Canada, but that that should not stop His Majesty from issuing commissions appertaining to such appointments as a lieutenancy, a notary public, or a judgeship. There is nothing out of the way in the reference; it is a sound and proper expression of an idea, and I am rather surprised that the member for East Algoma took the position that he did to-night.

I wish to revert for a moment to the member for Brantford; I cannot leave him altogether without a few remarks. He professes to speak for his constituency, and, if I understood him aright, he endeavoured to lead the House to the conclusion that his people were not interested. I hold in my hand a telegram addressed to the Chairman of the Titles Committee, Ottawa; as follows:

Resolved that this Brantford trades and labour council strongly resent the attitude of W. F. Cockshutt in the granting of Imperial titles to Canadian citizens and repudiate the insinuation that Brantford workingmen were not opposed to the same. The above council represents 1,487 Unionists.

A. G. Brown,
President.

I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House to decide just who speaks for the riding of Brantford.

When my attention was first directed to what I considered a wrong in this country, I determined, if my weak efforts would bring about a reformation, to do what I could to secure a reform. I brought the question into the House last year in reference to hereditary titles. I stated at that time that if an amendment were moved

and if I thought the sentiment of the people warranted it, I would support a resolution to do away with all titular distinctions. The Prime Minister took the position last year that as the Government had stated its policy in an Order in Council, he was not prepared to go further than the Order in Council went; and the inevitable happened—the House sustained the Prime Minister. This year I again introduced the subject; and I told you at the beginning of my few remarks just what happened when the matter was discussed in this House on the 14th of April. I said that evening that I had approached this matter with sincerity; that I wanted results, not notoriety. I am just as sincere in the advocacy of the principles that I am enunciating here as other men are in their advocacy of principles on the floor of this House, and I expect from them exactly what I am prepared to accord to them—recognition of my good faith, and of my desire at least to carry out a reform as I see it. As I have said, a gulf lies between the position taken by myself and those who support me and the position taken by the member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). I believe that the granting of these titular distinctions is pernicious, and that it has a bad national effect. The member for South Toronto says: You are wrong; the principle is all right; it is the method employed in granting these distinctions that has brought about the grievance you decry. This House to-night has to decide which way it is going. It has to make a decision that will probably regulate and influence our national life for the next fifty years, because if the House decides in accordance with the amendment moved by the member for East Algoma, the probabilities are that there will be such a flood of titles that the flood-gates, once opened, cannot be closed for years. There is no use in trying to camouflage the issue; it is clear-cut and well defined. The issue before the House and the country to-night is this: Is the Parliament of Canada in favour of titles and titular distinctions being granted to Canadians? You cannot hide this thing any longer under a veil of mystery. The question that has to be decided is this: Are you in favour of giving to any Government the right to denominate who shall have titular distinction? If you are, vote for the amendment submitted by the member for East Algoma. If, on the other hand, the members of this House are consistent in standing by the principles that they have enunciated in times past, then I ask them to stand by the report of the Committee. In my judgment, that report honestly expresses the intention of the Committee, honestly expresses the wishes of the people; and its adoption will be not only a step forward, but also the attainment of a goal in doing away once and for all with a pernicious principle in this country. If this report is adopted Canada will take the position she should take—that, being a true democracy, she is opposed to priorities and personal recognitions and declare that all men are equal and that what is good enough for one man is good enough for all.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nickle) sits down, I wish to ask him a question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: With the consent of the member for Kingston.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Does the member for Kingston permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. NICKLE: Yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Why did the member for Kingston, as chairman of that committee, carry that telegram in his pocket for two weeks, and not produce it before the committee instead of before this House? He informed me that it was going to be filed with the documents; I want to know why he did not produce it before the committee.

Mr. NICKLE: That is a very fair question, and deserves a straight answer. I showed the telegram to the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) within half an hour of receiving it. At a meeting of the committee I directed the attention of the committee to the fact that I had received the telegram; but my practice in life has been never to go gunning except when the game is in sight.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Nicholson (Algoma East), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Ames (Sir Herbert),	Burrell,
Anderson,	Chaplin,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Clark (Bruce),
Ball,	Clark (Red Deer),
Best,	Clarke (Wellington),
Bowman,	Clements,
Boyce,	Cockshutt,

Cooper,	Merner,
Crothers,	Mewburn,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Rich.),	Mowat,
Edwards,	Munson,
Elkin,	Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Finley,	Nicholson (Algoma),
Fraser,	Sheard,
Green,	Simpson,
Griesbach,	Smith,
Hocken,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Stewart (Lanark),
Kay,	Tolmie,
Keefer,	White (Sir Thomas),
Loggie,	Wigmore.—43.
McIsaac,	

NAYS.

Messrs.

Andrews,	Lavigueur,
Archambault,	Lemieux,
Argue,	Lesage,
Baldwin,	Long,
Béland,	Mackie (Edmonton),
Blair,	Mackie (Renfrew),
Blake,	MacNutt,
Boivin,	McCoig,
Bolton,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Buchanan,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Burnham,	McKenzie,
Cahill,	McMaster,
Campbell,	Manion,
Cannon,	Marcile (Bagot),
Cardin,	Mayrand,
Carvell,	Michaud,
Casselman,	Molloy,
Chisholm,	Morphy,
Crerar,	Nickle,
Crowe,	Pacaud,
Cruise,	Papineau,
d'Anjou,	Parent,
Davis,	Pedlow,
Déchêne,	Pelletier,
Delisle,	Prevost,
Demers,	Proulx,
Desaulniers,	Redman,
Deslauriers,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Douglas (Strathcona),	Richardson,
Duff,	Robb,
Ethier,	Rowell,
Euler,	Savard,
Fielding,	Seguin,
Fontaine,	Sexsmith,
Foster (York),	Shaw,
Fournier,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysborough),
Gervais,	Sutherland,
Gladu,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Halladay,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Harold,	Tobin,
Hay,	Trahan,
Hunt,	Turgeon,
Jacobs,	Verville,
Johnston,	Vien,
Knox,	White (Victoria),
Lafortune,	Wilson (Wentworth),
Lang,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Wright.—96.

Motion (Mr. Nickle) that the report be concurred in carried on division.

Mr. NICKLE: I move:

That the said Address be engrossed.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is not worth while engrossing it and we should not spend the money on it. I suggest that it be not engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. NICKLE: I move:

That an Address be forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to transmit the foregoing address of this House to His Majesty the King, in such manner as to His Excellency may seem fit, in order that the same may be laid at the foot of the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. NICKLE: I move:

That the said Address be engrossed, and presented to His Excellency the Governor in Council by such members of the House as are of the Honourable the Privy Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not altogether sure as to whether the motion previously passed that the address be engrossed is not sufficient——

Mr. NICKLE: May I explain the position? The first address that has to be engrossed is the address——

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will permit me to conclude my remarks. I submit the motion because I believe the hon. member is following the usual form.

Sir SAM HUGHES: As I am a member of the Privy Council I must respectfully decline to have the House or any other body dictate to me what I shall do with any address.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Does the hon. member want to be a pallbearer?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I respectfully refuse to have my name put on any such address.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisk).

EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What Senators and Members of Commons went overseas in 1917 as representatives of the Canadian Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association?

2. Were the Senators and Members of the Commons who made the trip selected by a vote of the members of the association? If not, how was selection made?

3. Were any of the expenses of these gentlemen paid by the Canadian Government? If so, what was the amount paid in each case?

4. What was the total cost to Canada of the trip?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government has not this information, but I understand the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Her-

bert Ames), who is chairman of executive of the Empire Parliamentary Association, will be able to supply it.

Sir HERBERT AMES: As chairman of the executive of the Empire Parliamentary Association, I may perhaps give the House the information that is called for by this question. The Empire Parliamentary Association is a voluntary body composed of members of the Senate and of the House of Commons of Canada. Every member of both Houses is eligible for membership, the main idea being the entertaining of visiting members of Parliament and other governing bodies from other parts of the British Dominions. The delegation that went over in 1917 was composed of ten members, of whom four were senators and six were members of the House of Commons. The four senators were Hon. Mr. Landry, Hon. Mr. Dennis, Hon. Mr. Belcourt, and Hon. Mr. Ross. The six members of the House of Commons were Sir George Foster, Mr. J. E. Armstrong (East Lambton), Mr. W. F. Nickle, Mr. E. N. Rhodes, Mr. W. E. Knowles, and Mr. F. H. Shepard. These members were selected at two meetings of the Empire Parliamentary Association at which it was first decided that there should be four members from the Senate and six from the House of Commons.

The four senators then chose their members and the members of the House of Commons chose theirs. They were chosen with geographical representation in view, three from Ontario, three from Quebec, and three from the Central and Western Provinces. One minister was invited to go as chairman. Sir George Foster was supposed to represent the Dominion as a whole. That constituted the ten. The three from the Western Provinces were Mr. Shepard, K.C., British Columbia; Mr. W. E. Knowles, Saskatchewan, and Senator Ross. The members were the guests of the British Empire Parliamentary Association of Great Britain and their expenses, from the time they left Canada until they returned, were paid through the courtesy of the British Empire Parliamentary Association. No expenditure whatever was made by the Canadian Government in respect of this trip.

CANADA FOOD BOARD FISH SECTION.

Mr. STEELE:

1. Is there now, or has there been a fish section of the Canada Food Board?

2. If so, what have been, or what are its purposes, objects, and functions?

[Sir Thomas White.]

3. Who have been the principal executive and administrative officers of such Fish Section of the Canada Food Board?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. There has been. Work of this section of the Canada Food Board ceased April 1.

2. Its purpose, object and function was to increase the use of fish in Canada as a substitute for meat, to help secure supplies for overseas shipment, and to generally stimulate fish production and sale.

3. Capt. F. W. Wallace, Mr. E. O. Sawyer.

MARKETING CANADIAN FISH OVERSEAS.

Mr. STEELE:

1. Has the Canada Food Board rendered any assistance in the marketing of Canadian fish overseas?

2. Did the Canada Food Board place any orders in Canada for the purchase of fish?

3. If so, with what companies were such orders placed and what are the total values of any such orders placed with each company?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Yes. The Canada Food Board co-operated with the War Purchasing Commission and the British Ministry of Food in securing supplies for overseas.

2. No.

3. Answered by question No. 2.

TORONTO, MONTREAL AND WINNIPEG POST OFFICES.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What is the gross revenue of Toronto post office for the fiscal year 1918-19?

2. What is the gross revenue of Montreal post office for the fiscal year 1918-19?

3. What is the gross revenue of Winnipeg post office for the fiscal year 1918-19?

4. How many employees are there on the present pay sheets of the above offices respectively?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. $4,431,977.42.

2. $2,400,565.98.

3. $2,317,091.31.

4. Toronto, 1,542; Montreal, 1,304; Winnipeg, 553. These figures include the men away on military service and also their substitutes.

QUEBEC AND HAMILTON POST OFFICES.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What is the revenue of the Quebec post office for fiscal year 1918-1919?

2. What is the revenue of Hamilton post office for fiscal year 1918-1919?

3. What did it cost in salaries to run the Quebec post office for above period?

4. What did it cost to run the Hamilton post office during the same period?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. $342,179.14.

2 $470,955.84.

3. $328,310.06.
4. $274,083.09.

POST OFFICES IN QUEBEC.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many post offices are established in the city of Quebec within the corporate limits of that city? (a) Head office. (b) Postal stations. (c) Independent post offices at which postmasters are in charge. (d) Sub-post offices. (e) On any other basis?
2. What salaries are paid postmasters in each case, what allowances are made, and what are the reasons for such allowance and salaries being paid?
3. Why is the postmaster at Candiac, Quebec, paid $1,431 salary and allowances of $175 for rent, heat, light, etc., as a sub-post office?
4. Is letter carrier delivery established in the district in which this office is situated, and is this office within the corporate limits of Quebec City?
5. Is Faubourg St. Baptiste, Quebec, a sub-post office of Quebec City? If not, why?
6. Why is the postmaster paid $800 salary and $400 for rent, heat, light, etc?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. (a) Head office, 1; (b) postal stations, 5; (c) independent offices, 0; (d) sub-post offices, 5; (e) on any other basis, 2.

2. (a) Head office, salary $4,000, the amount he is entitled to under schedule "B" to the Civil Service Act.

(b) Postal station "B" is run by a staff of five clerks and one porter from the Quebec Post Office and an appointed postmaster whose salary is at the rate of $1,400 a year. By order of the Postmaster General in 1912. The post office is a Government building.

St. Roch Post Office is run by a staff of seven clerks and one porter from the Quebec Post Office and an appointed postmaster whose salary is at the rate of $1,200 a year. By order of the Postmaster General, 20th October, 1911. The post office is a Government building.

Faubourg St. Jean Baptiste Post Office is run by a staff of three clerks from the Quebec Post Office and an appointed postmaster whose salary is at the rate of $800 a year. By order of the private secretary to the Postmaster General, 23rd November, 1914.

St. Sauveur de Quebec Post Office is run by a staff of two clerks and one porter from the Quebec Post Office and an appointed postmaster with salary at the rate of $1,000 a year. By order of the Postmaster General, 1st June, 1898. The post office is a Government building.

Candiac Post Office is run by a staff of two clerks from the Quebec Post Office and an appointed postmaster with salary at the rate of $1,413 and rent allowance of $175 a year, the amount the revenue of the office entitles him to in each case under the scale of payment.

(d) Sub-post offices: Two at salary of $200 each; three at salary of $100 each, the amounts the revenue of the office entitles them to under the scale of payment.

(e) Limoilou, salary $300. By order of the Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, 19th December, 1916.

Sans Bruit, salary $500. By order of the Postmaster General.

3. The postmaster at Candiac is paid by percentage on revenue, with the usual allowance for rent, light and heat. The office is not a sub-post office.

4. Yes.

5. No. By order of the private secretary to the Postmaster General.

6. The office is not on the sub-post office basis, and the postmaster is paid a special salary. By order of private secretary of Postmaster General, 17th November, 1914. This department has paid no rent since 1917.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. Is Rue St. Joseph a sub-post office in Quebec City? If not, why?
2. Is this office situated within the corporate limits of Quebec City?
3. What amount is paid the postmaster at St. Roch de Quebec?
4. Why is he paid that amount?
5. Is St. Roch's a separate post office, or is it a postal station under the control of the postmaster Quebec? Why is it so carried on?
6. How far is this office from the General Post Office, Quebec?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. $1,200 a year.
4. By order of the Postmaster General.
5. St. Roch post office is run by a staff of seven clerks and one porter from the Quebec post office, and an appointed postmaster. By order of the Postmaster General.
6. One mile.

WOMEN IN CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. COOPER:

1. What is the policy of the Civil Service Commission regarding the employment of (a) Married women whose husbands are living; and (b) Daughters of people who are well able to support them?
2. Is it the intention of the Civil Service Commission to dispense with the large number of Civil Servants who are now employed throughout the Dominion and replace them by women who have to earn their livelihood of necessity?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. (a) Married women whose husbands are in a position to earn a livelihood are

not to be employed in future. (b) Single women who qualify by passing the Civil Service examinations are, under the Civil Service Act, 1918, entitled to positions after soldiers who have qualified have been placed.

2. The Civil Service Commission has no jurisdiction in the matter of removals from the service. That rests with the Governor in Council with regard to the permanent service, and with the departments with regard to temporary employees.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. STEELE:

1. Were any orders for the purchase of fish for shipment overseas placed with any companies in Canada by the Canadian Government, or any department thereof, or the War Purchasing Commission, in the years 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919?

2. If so, what are the names of the companies, and the value of the orders placed with each?

THE WINNIPEG STRIKE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: (Maisonneuve): Has the Acting Prime Minister had any further news in regard to the situation at Winnipeg?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The situation remains unchanged. There is no disorder, and the reports we have are more favourable for settlement.

DATE OF THE BUDGET.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Before the Orders of the Day are called, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister when we may expect the Budget?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think I can say definitely week after next. I shall endeavour to give a week's notice.

PROHIBITION.

BILL TO CONFIRM ORDERS IN COUNCIL PROHIBITING IMPORTATION, MANUFACTURE AND TRANSPORTATION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister), Bill No. 107, to confirm the Order in Council of the 24th day of February, 1919, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and transportation of intoxicating liquors, and the Order in Council of 12th day of April, 1919, in amendment thereof, was read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Burrell.]

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Newton W. Rowell (President of the Privy Council), Bill No. 116, to amend the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act, was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 12 midnight.

Friday, May 23, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

THE DEBATE ON TITLES.

PRIVILEGE—MR. EDWARDS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, during my temporary absence from the Chamber last evening the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) stated as a fact something which was not a fact, which seriously reflects on me, and which I desire to correct. During the course of the few remarks I made last night I stated that I would not have taken any of the time of the House had it not been for the fact that I was absent last year when this question came up for discussion and that I was not here this session when the debate took place. In his speech the member for Kingston said—I shall quote, of course, only those remarks which refer to myself:

> The member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) trembled with indignation when he approached the matter from the same point of view.

I pass from the matter of trembling "with indignation;" that is not worth paying attention to. He said further:

> "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel." Because I remembered that in 1918, on May 21st, the right hon. leader of the Government moved his amendment to my then resolution and the very gentlemen, who shook with indignation this afternoon and evening, voted for exactly the same language that the Prime Minister put in his motion as the language that I put in the resolution which I submitted this afternoon.

The hon. gentleman, to make assurance doubly sure, referred to the page of Hansard on which the division is reported. He said:

> The division took place on that resolution, and is recorded at page 2448 of Hansard, and among the names recorded in favour of that resolution I see the names of Edwards, Cockshutt, and Sheard.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I was not in Ottawa on May 21, 1918; that my vote is not recorded in any division that

occurred in the House on that date, and that my name is not in the division list to which the hon. member refers. I may add that at the foot of the list is this statement with regard to pairs:

> The Chief Whips announce that there are no pairs on the foregoing division.

So that the statement made by the member for Kingston with regard to my voting on this subject is absolutely incorrect. I regret that under the rules concerning privilege I am not permitted to go further and say what I would like to say.

THE WINNIPEG STRIKE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the Acting Prime Minister any news from Winnipeg?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Minister of Labour and the Minister of the Interior arrived at Winnipeg the night before last, and yesterday were in conference with the authorities and the several parties concerned. I have no report from them to-day with respect to which I could make an announcement to the House. I understand that the situation is as it was so far as order is concerned; and we have gathered that there is reason to be hopeful of an early settlement.

Mr. CAHILL: There was an item in yesterday morning's Citizen concerning the Winnipeg strike, dated at Fort William, May 21, which said:

> Last night it was announced that General Ketchen has decided that when the moment had come for a show-down, he would send out the street cars through the city under armed guards with instructions that any attempt at interference was to be met with rifle and machine-gun fire.

Has the Government any knowledge of such instructions being issued to General Ketchen? Is this cold-blooded murder being planned——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CAHILL: ——with the knowledge of the Government?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): I can say quite sincerely that no such instructions have been issued to General Ketchen, and that no such information has been given out by him. General Ketchen is in command of the Winnipeg Military District, of which Fort William forms a part. His instructions are very minute and very definite; I have been in daily communication with him. I am glad to say that the militia units in Winnipeg—— the 90th Regiment, the 79th Regiment, the 100th Grenadiers, the 106th Regiment, the Fort Garry Horse, and the 13th Battery are completely filled up with volunteers, with plenty of reserves available in case of trouble. In addition to that, the Royal Northwest Mounted Police are on duty in Winnipeg. The troops in Winnipeg have not been called out, but they are available, and if they are used in case of riot they will act entirely in conformity with the Militia Act, in aid of the civil power. General Ketchen is on the job and ready for any emergency. Specific instructions have been given to him, and he is perfectly well aware that troops will not be, as they never have been, used as strike-breakers.

IMPERIAL GUARDS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I have noticed that in the press a rumour is gaining ground of late that a new military force is to be created under the name of the Imperial Guards, in which units from the various Dominions will be included. Is the Canadian Government in accord with that policy? Is the Department of Militia taking part in the movement?

Major-General MEWBURN: The Government have no official knowledge of the matter referred to; all I am aware of is what I have seen in the press. A Commission has been sitting in the War Office regarding the post bellum reorganization of the British army, to which I referred when the Main Estimates were under consideration. There has been a suggestion, though it has never come to us officially, that in the reorganization of the Imperial army a Guards division might be formed, to include battalions representing some of the overseas dominions. If such a military force were organized the men would be voluntarily enlisted in the Imperial service. I have asked for some information regarding the article I saw in the public press.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If there is to be any such organization I suppose the Canadian Parliament will hear of it, and it will be the subject of legislation?

Major-General MEWBURN: The moment I have any information I shall be very glad to give it to the House.

MILITIA PENSION ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Major-General Mewburn (Minister of Militia), Bill No. 118, to amend

the Militia Pension Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—"rank" made to include temporary brigadiers and honorary rank in case of non-combatant.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister give a general outline of the purport of the Bill?

Major-General MEWBURN: I referred to this matter on the resolution the other night. This Bill is really in conformity with the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Pension Act. We found it necessary to make one or two amendments to the Militia Pension Act in order to take care of conditions that have arisen on account of the war. Under the present Militia Pension Act, officers and non-commissioned officers could be pensioned compulsorily only after twenty years service. During the war we have obtained through promotion from the ranks from 117 to 120 commissioned officers, and in the reorganization of the permanent force, there are more officers than there is room for in the establishment. A large number of officers have served over twenty years and some over thirty-five years, and the object is to permit the pensioning of officers and non-commissioned officers after ten years' service. This also brings the rank and file into conformity with the officers, permitting the rank and file to retire voluntarily, but officers can only be retired compulsorily. That is, an officer cannot retire voluntarily if his services are required. This is to enable us to pension a number of senior officers so as to make room for a number of men who have obtained their commissions overseas.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—period of service during war to be counted for pension purposes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not have this clause read so that every year served in the war shall count the same as two years in time of peace?

Major-General MEWBURN: I would certainly have no objection to that. As I explained the other night, the present Pension Act provides only for officers seconded in the public service of Canada, and it was doubtful whether officers of the permanent force who had been given leave of absence in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, as that force was simply a temporary extension of the active militia, could come under this. In the former Act provision was made for men who had served in the South African War, or the Yukon, that the time they had served there would count for pension. This is simply to say that men who have served in this war shall receive the benefits of the Pension Act. It has been suggested that men who have served in the present war should be allowed to count double time for their service. It is for the Committee to say whether the service given by these men in the present war should count double time for pension or not. If that were done, it would mean that section 4, which refers to the officers, and section 7, which refers to non-commissioned officers and men, would have to be amended by inserting the word "double" in each section.

Mr. REDMAN: I think the point just discussed by the minister is very well taken. It may be doubtful whether recruits will be immediately obtained for the permanent force in the numbers required unless some inducement is provided, and the very best class of recruits that can be secured for that force will be those who have had some years of active service overseas. With that in view, as well as the idea of doing justice to those particular members of the permanent force who have done service overseas, I move to insert the word "double" before the words "the time" in the first line of paragraph (f) of clause 4 and also in the first line in paragraph (f) of clause 7.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment in regard to clause 7 will have to stand until we reach that clause.

Mr. FIELDING: I would suggest that if the substance of the hon. gentleman's amendment is approved, the drafting be committed to the law officers of the Crown, because I do not think the form in which he has put it will effectively serve his purpose. There is, in connection with that, this thought: Have we not already passed legislation of this character in regard to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and I also think some other branches of the Military Service? We had before us one or two Bills of this character. I am merely suggesting that what is done in the one case, it is probably desired to do in the others.

Mr. ROWELL: The Bill which has already passed relating to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police provided that time served overseas should count as time in computing the pension.

Mr. COOPER: Do I understand that this clause will refer only to active service in this war and not to future wars of the Empire, and also that it applies only to

doubling the time officers, non-commissioned officers and men actually served in the field?

Major-General MEWBURN: The section referred to in the original Act stated the period of time for the purposes of the Act, and then it went on to describe what the service was, including the South African war, the South African Constabulary, the time served in taking over the fortifications in Halifax and the Yukon Field Force.

Mr. EDWARDS: What is the object and what was the effect of this? Is the idea to increase service so as to enable these men of the permanent force to be sooner retired?

Major-General MEWBURN: The object of the general amendment is, as I have already explained, that under the present Pension Act officers, non-commissioned officers and men could retire only after twenty years' service. Owing to the war, from 117 to 120 non-commissioned officers and men have been given commissions in the field, and in the re-organization of the force, it is an utter impossibility to take care of all these officers. The result was that we considered it advisable, in the interest of the country and the public at large, that we should be enabled to retire some of the officers after ten years' service.

They are all paying into the pension fund and can receive pension only on the ratio of the number of years of service. This will enable us to carry that proposal into effect; otherwise those non-commissioned officers and men who got commissions on the field on returning would have to revert to the non-commissioned rank, which would be unfair. The question is whether a man who has served in the war for two years or four years as the case may be, should count double time, and if a man who had never been in the permanent force but has now joined it should have the benefit of the time he had served in the war in the computation of his pension. It is now suggested by the amendment that service in the war should count double time.

Mr. CROTHERS: What are the officers, who are now part of the permanent force, entitled to by way of pension under the Pensions Act? I understand that these are officers that are employed in the city of Ottawa.

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Mr. CROTHERS: It does not include them?

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think there are more than five. They get one-fiftieth for the actual number of years served. All these officers pay into the pension fund 5 per cent of their pay and are now entitled, under the present terms of the Act, to 1-50th per annum for each year's service, but can only be retired after twenty years. The point is, shall those who retire after ten or twelve years' service do so on the ratio of the number of years they have served?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The statement was made some time ago that this concerned only the permanent force. As I understand it, time will be doubled for the man who is not of the permanent force as well as the man of the permanent force.

Major-General MEWBURN: If he joins the permanent force.

Mr. NICKLE: I think the Committee should approach this matter with considerable deliberation and not be stampeded.

Mr. CARVELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: I may be wrong, but if I understand the principle of the Pension Act, 5 per cent is supposed to be paid in by the officer towards a certain fund and when he has served in the permanent force for twenty years he is entitled to 20-50ths of the pay he was receiving on his retirement. If he continues for twenty-five years and is promoted he gets 25-50ths of the amount, and so on, up to but not exceeding 35-50ths of the salary to which he was entitled at the time he should be retired. Let us see for a moment what the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary signifies. In the first place, I submit that it is out of order, because I have a distinct recollection of a similar motion having been ruled out of order when moved to a Bill as it would increase the public expenditure. If I remember correctly, there is a provision in the British North America Act or in the Rules that all Bills for the expenditure of public money must emanate from the Government and that it is not competent for any private member to move an amendment to such a Bill, if the result of the amendment will be an increase and not a decrease of expenditure. Certainly the effect of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary would be to increase the expenditure. If double time is to be given to each man for the time he served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, the pensions would be increased. That would in-

volve an increased expenditure and therefore the motion is out of order.

But let us look more carefully at the matter. I think that under Order in Council No. 1595—it may be No. 1596, I am not just sure of the exact number—all members of the permanent force were to be incorporated, so to speak, in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, with the result that every member of the Canadian Permanent Force affected by that Order in Council became, ipso facto, a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The net result of the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary will be that every single member of the permanent force, whether he went overseas or not, will count double the number of years he actually was in the force overseas in the computation of his pension. Let us view it from another standpoint. I, on another occasion, already drew attention to the fact that a great many men in the permanent force had received rapid promotion during the war and that this country did not begrudge them such promotion nor the remuneration they were receiving. But since the war began there has not only been rapid promotion but, unless my memory fails me, there has been a very radical increase in the remuneration paid members of the permanent force. The principle on which these pensions were to be paid was based on the argument that 5 per cent should be taken from the man's pay from year to year and that at the expiration of 20 years he should receive 20-50th of the amount of his salary at that time. Add to that the second principle that you are going to add one, two, three or four years, as the case may be, and then double it for every man who was a member of the permanent force; and then add further that you are going to determine this matter not on the salaries that were paid at the time war broke out but on the remuneration now paid and on the further consideration that promotions will be taken into account in giving these pensions, and the result will be a vast outlay of money. I do not think there is any member who objects to the principle of the Bill as enunciated by the minister, that is, that unnecessary officers should be given a pension and allowed to retire after having been in the service ten years. But I do not believe that the country will view with favour a large pension list being created on the principles and in accordance with the arguments I have just advanced. We want to be fair and generous, but there is such a thing as acting reasonably, and I do not think the Government would be acting reasonably in adopting the suggestions of the hon. member for Calgary.

Major-General MEWBURN: The hon. member for Kingston is perfectly right. The question of double time did come up when this Bill was drafted. I did not personally think it wise to include that at the time, but certainly I do not want to oppose it, because I think these men are entitled to consideration. These men cannot retire voluntarily; their retirement is compulsory. The services of many of them are required and they may have to remain in the force for twenty years. But the question is whether the time served during the war should count as double time. I did not deem it wise to include it in the Bill. The amendment is not mine, but if the committee feel that double time should count I do not wish to oppose it.

Mr. CARVELL: I feel, notwithstanding the fact that my colleague expresses an agreement with this, that I should say something about it. I am heartily in accord with the attitude taken by the hon. member for Kingston. I have no hesitation in saying that this matter was discussed a great many times and the Bill was brought down after mature consideration by the Government. If there is a class of men in the Canadian army who are not entitled to such special privilege as this I think they are the men of the permanent force. They voluntarily joined the Canadian army and became professional soldiers. They were paid for their service and were maintained for years doing nothing, this, of course, being through no fault of their own. When the war broke out they were the first men in Canada who logically should go to the war. They did go, but in doing so they were only performing their duty. They did not do more than, and, indeed, not half as much as, hundreds of thousands who volunteered and went to the war. Now the war is over and they are coming back. This proposal means that you are going to give to the men who belonged to the permanent force the right to retire, and you will add to their period of service double the time which they served at the front. If a man was transferred to the Canadian Expeditionary Force and stayed in Ottawa, as many did who never got out of the city—

An hon. MEMBER: Active service?

Mr. CARVELL: Many men in Ottawa never got out of the city. They belonged

to the Canadian Expeditionary Force and their wives had the separation allowance. I know what I am talking about. You are simply handing to these men double pay in the form of pensions. The principle is not only wrong but it is vicious and I hope this Committee will not back it up.

Mr. FIELDING: In order that we may prevent any further disagreement among our friends of the Cabinet, I would ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on the point raised by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), that this involves an increase of the public expenditure and can only originate on a motion from the Crown.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no doubt that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Kingston is well taken and that the amendment is not in order.

Section agreed to.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Reference has been made by the Minister of Public Works to the fact that a number of officers and men remained in Ottawa. A great many officers remained in Ottawa very much against their own will, but they rendered just as good service in Ottawa as any man who stood in the trenches at the front. Take Colonel Emmett Clark, Colonel Charlie Winter, Colonel Deroche, Brigadier General Helmer, Brigadier General Jos. Langton, Colonel Burritt, and the deputy minister himself, General Fiset. I could name a score of officers here who begged and pleaded to go to the front, but who could not be spared and were not allowed to go. They did necessary, faithful and efficient work here and they are entitled to just as much consideration as the boys who went and did their duty so fearlessly in the trenches.

Mr. CARVELL: Are they entitled to greater consideration than the men who went to the front?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Officers, non-commissioned officers and men who remained here and did good service are more entitled to consideration than those officers who did not go to the front but remained in England holding down soft jobs.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—service for pension reduced from fifteen to ten years and to be based on allowance as well as pay:

Mr. NICKLE: What does that mean?

Major-General MEWBURN: This makes the pension of the men calculable by reference to the allowance as well as the pay. That has always been the case with officers. This is to make the calculation with reference to the men the same as it is with reference to the officers.

Mr. NICKLE: What is involved in the term "allowances"?

Major-General MEWBURN: Officers and non-commissioned officers get a field allowance; a married man gets a lodging and fuel allowance if these are not found for him.

Mr. NICKLE: Does it include separation allowance?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, that goes to the wife.

Mr. COOPER: Have pensions been paid on lodging, fuel and light allowance?

Major-General MEWBURN: There is, in the Permanent Force, a lodging and fuel allowance for married men. The difficulty we are under to-day in reference to the Permanent Force is that we have not sufficient barrack accommodation for them.

Mr. NESBITT: Are these allowances over and above the pension proposed in the former clauses; or is this the total, including housing, fuel, light and all that sort of thing?

Major-General MEWBURN: Officers have always got their pensions on pay and allowances and it is proposed to make the man the same as the officer in that respect.

Mr. NICKLE: I have still not got the information I want. How much does this allowance amount to? In the case of a private, what would this allowance come to per month?

Major-General MEWBURN: About $1.80 per diem including subsistence allowance.

Mr. NICKLE: Do I understand that a man who has served twenty-five years is going to have added to his pension ninety cents per day?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, he gets a proportionate fiftieth for every year of his service.

Mr. NICKLE: Suppose he has been in the service for twenty-five years?

Major-General MEWBURN: A non-commissioned officer on his pay and allowances would get a pension, based on twenty-five years' service of about $739.

Mr. NICKLE: For life?

Major-General MEWBURN: For life—after twenty-five years' service.

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to suggest to the minister that when bringing in Bills of this kind, instead of substituting "ten" for "fifteen" and making changes of that kind in the old Act, if he would print the sections as they will read with these changes made and show what the provisions of the old Act are we could discuss these things much more intelligently.

Motion agreed to.

On section 7—period of service during war to be counted for pension purposes:

Mr. McKENZIE: Could the minister give us any fair idea of what amount is involved in putting this Bill into operation and how much it will increase the yearly outlay?

Major-General MEWBURN: It will be impossible to give the actual amount involved, but I think there will be a tremendous saving to the country because we will not have to give them their full pay for twenty years, after which time they would get the benefit of the pension system anyway. This makes provision whereby these men can be pensioned after ten years' service. They will only get ten-fiftieths of their pay and allowance, whereas if they had served twenty years they would get twenty-fiftieths. It will be a net saving to the country rather than an increase.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is taking for granted that we are obliged to keep these officers on at full pay?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes. In the British army they have a different arrangement. Some of these officers come back from the front and they cannot find employment. Until they have employment they are given half pay. We have no such arrangement in Canada.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—pension to widows, compassionate allowance to children:

Mr. POWER: Is there anything in the law in reference to pensions for the widows of non-commissioned officers and men under similar circumstances?

Major-General MEWBURN: This provision conforms identically with that of the Northwest Mounted Police Pension Act.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—widow's pension increased to one-half of what husband's pension was or might have been at death:

Mr. NICKLE: What was it before?

Major-General MEWBURN: The pensions of widows were as follows:

Widow of a	Colonel	$500
"	" Lieut.-Colonel	450
"	" Major	350
"	" Captain	250
"	" Lieutenant or 2nd Lieutenant	200
"	" Warrant Officer	100

Mr. NICKLE: Under the new scheme what will it be?

Major-General MEWBURN: This gives them one-half of the actual pension the officer was drawing at the time of his death.

Mr. NICKLE: What would the figure be for a colonel.?

Major-General MEWBURN: After thirty-five years' service, the maximum pension for his widow would be about $1,400.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think this is a very humane provision. In one case that I know of the widow of a general was receiving as pension the small pittance of $500 a year until her son, her only support, was killed in action on the battlefield. On account of the death of her son, who was a lieutenant, she was entitled to a further pension of $800, but instead of her pension having been increased by reason of the death of her son it has been reduced. I think Canada is in honour bound to do the right thing for the general's widow who has lost her son, her sole support.

Mr. EDWARDS: Suppose it could be shown that this widow was in receipt of an income from other sources to an amount greater than the military pension; say the military pension is $1,400, and the income from other sources $1,450 or $1,500; would this income in any way affect her pension? The reason I ask is this: A case came under my notice where a bank clerk in Ottawa, who was the main, if not the sole, support of his mother, enlisted, and was killed overseas. His mother had two other sons and three daughters, I believe, but they were all married and living in different places, and did not contribute to the mother's support. While her son was overseas she received the usual separation allowance, and on his death she received a pension. I think it amounted to $40 a month, and she undertook to supplement that by keeping a boarding house. Later it was ascertained that her income from the boarding house exceeded the amount of the pension, and the pension was discontinued. The reason given was that her income from the boarding house exceeded the amount of the pension.

Major-General MEWBURN: The Pension Act provides:—

Such pension or compassionate allowance shall not be granted if the applicant is in the opinion of the minister unworthy, or if the applicant is already in the opinion of the minister wealthy.

My hon. friend has cited the case of a disability pension. I do not know just what the new Bill provides in such a case.

Mr. NICKLE: "Wealthy" is a very elastic word. May I ask if section 25 as drafted will give the widow of an officer the right to a pension and the right also to a disability pension under the Pensions Act?

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Mr. NICKLE: Why not?

Major-General MEWBURN: It was a case of that sort that my hon. friend from Maisonneuve cited just now. In that case, after the husband had served thirty-five years in the permanent corps, the widow was granted only the small pittance of $500. This unfortunate lady had no other means, and because she was drawing this pension she was not entitled to a further amount when her son was killed.

Mr. NICKLE: I am sorry to correct the minister, but his facts are wrong. In the case he refers to, the widow of a deceased officer made a claim in respect of her son who was killed in this war. She as the widow of a deceased officer of the permanent corps was drawing a pension of $500 under section 25. She was entitled on the death of her son to a pension, to be exact, of $720, but the Canadian Expeditionary Force Pension Commissioners gave a ruling, which is in accordance with the regulations, that the $720 should have deducted from it the $500 paid under section 25. But that is the case of a woman drawing a pension first under the Military Pensions Act in respect of her husband, and secondly in respect of her son killed in this war. The case I am putting to the minister is this: If the widow was entitled to a pension under section 25 on account of the length of service of her husband, and entitled also to a pension under the Canadian Expeditionary Forces pension scheme, could she draw the two pensions? The Canadian Expeditionary Forces pension scheme establishes as a principle that a wife is entitled to a pension regardless of any other sources of revenue, beyond the Canadian Expeditionary Forces pension. This section 25 says clearly "The pension of a widow shall be as follows." It certainly should be made clear that in the event of a woman's husband having gone overseas and been killed, he having been a member of the permanent corps, the widow should not be entitled to draw let us say $1,400 under the Military Pensions Act, and $1,500 or $1,600 under the Canadian Expeditionary Forces pension scheme. Both pension schemes are based upon a reasonable allowance being given, and if there is any possibility of a duplication of pension, it seems to me the minister should make it abundantly clear that no such thing will take place.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I fear that the practice of searching for other sources of income may sometimes be carried too far. A case was drawn to my attention recently of an old gentleman living in a poor settlement in the province of Nova Scotia who lost his two sons in the war. He himself was almost blind, and was utterly unable to carry on the work of his farm. His wife was living on the farm, but he had no other help whatever. He was getting a pension of $480, and an agent of the departmeent was sent to investigate into his other sources of income. This agent reported that he found this poor man on his farm with a horse, two cows, twelve hens, and twelve apple trees, and he estimated the revenue from these sources to be half the amount of the pension. He recommended that the department therefore cut the pension in two, giving the man $240 instead of $480. This recommendation was carried out by the department. It strikes me that that is going altogether too far. Any one who knows anything about a farm knows that unless the man was able to work the farm he would get very little profit indeed from twelve hens, twelve apple trees, two cows and a horse. I just want to mention these to the minister so that in administering the pension fund the rules be not allowed to bear too strictly on poor people, because it strikes me that at the present time they are a little too stringent.

Major-General MEWBURN: I think the hon. gentleman is confusing this particular Bill with the Pension Bill on which a Special Committee of the House is sitting at the present time. Those are matters that will be covered by pensions for disability or death. What we are now considering is the old Pension Act dealing with the permanent service.

Mr. NICKLE: Have I the assurance of the minister that there is not to be this duality of pensions?

Major-General MEWBURN: I certainly agree with the hon. member. I think the Disability Pensions Act should provide for that. If an officer of the permanent corps was killed in action, his widow would probably get the disability pension; she certainly should not get both.

Mr. MANION: I have a case which I should like to bring to the notice of the minister, somewhat similar to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Antigonish.

Mr. NESBITT: Why not leave it until the other Bill comes before the House?

Mr. MANION: Is it out of order?

The CHAIRMAN: It would be out of order to discuss pensions not covered by this Bill.

Mr. MANION: I have taken this case up for six months, and have not been able to get justice for this man—John Taylor by name—and I thought perhaps it would be a good time to have the Government stir up the Pension Commissioners to act a little more rapidly. I will discuss the case when the report of the board comes up, but that will mean a delay of two months in securing justice for this man.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should not say that the rules of the House preclude him from discussing the matter and securing justice. He can bring it up and discuss it on any Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday, when the House is moved into Committee of Supply. He would be in order in doing that, but he is not in order on the consideration of this Bill in Committee.

Mr. NICKLE: I would suggest that the section might be amended in this way:

Provided, however, that where a widow is entitled to a pension as the widow of a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and under this Act, she shall elect which pension she will accept.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have no objection to that. She must elect between the two. That is, if her husband in the permanent force was killed at the front she must elect which pension she will take, whether the disability pension or the pension under this Bill.

Mr. NICKLE: I am very glad that the minister appreciates the point. The Order in Council I referred to is No. 1569, and as the minister will remember, by that Order in Council:—

All officers and men from time to time in pay in Canada during the present war or during demobilization thereafter who belong to the permanent active militia or who are attached to the headquarters staff or to the staff of a military district, shall be officers and men of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and shall be continuously subject to military law. They shall, while their services continue to be required in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, hold therein temporarily as from the date of last appointment or promotion the ranks which they now have or may from time to time be granted therein, and except as hereinafter provided, the regulations for the pay, allowances and pensions for the Canadian Expeditionary Force shall be applicable and shall govern any claims for pension not heretofore disposed of.

Major-General MEWBURN: If an officer were killed at the front his widow would get a disability pension under the C.E.F. rates.

Mr. NICKLE: If during service a member of the permanent militia, who was made a member of the C.E.F., remained in Canada and died of influenza, his widow would be entitled also to the C.E.F. pension, and the question of election might come up.

Major-General MEWBURN: Do you think it wise to provide for that?

Mr. NICKLE: I think it should be provided for.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member repeat his amendment?

Mr. NICKLE: It is:—

Provided, however, that where a widow is entitled to a pension as the widow of a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and under this Act, she shall elect which pension she will accept.

Mr. COOPER: The hon. member for Kingston cites a Canadian officer as having a choice between two pensions. What would happen in the case of a Canadian officer in the British service, and the British service paying better rates of pension than we do here? Would he have the choice of taking the British pension?

Major-General MEWBURN: We have many officers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who have been loaned to the Imperial Forces but are still under Canadian rates of pay. If a Canadian officer was a member of the Imperial Forces he would only get the pension provided by the Imperial Government, he would have nothing to do with our pension.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 10—Widow's pensions may be revised but not payments made before this Act:

An hon. MEMBER: What is the effect of that?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is just the case we have been speaking of.

Mr. HERBERT J. MACKIE: If I am in order, I would like to refer to a grave injustice that a number of permanent officers feel have been done to their brother officer; I refer to the case of Colonel G. Hunter Ogilvie, of Kingston. Colonel
4 p.m. Ogilvie, like all other permanent officers, was very desirous of completing his thirty-five years' service. It has been the practice in most other departments that the last six months of a man's service is given on leave, but for some reason Colonel Ogilvie was chopped off the last three months that would entitle him to his thirty-five years' service. He served thirty-four years and three months, and was then granted six months' leave of absence, making his service thirty-four years and nine months, thereby missing three months of completing his thirty-five years' service. I submit that if Colonel Ogilvie was worthy of being retained in the service for thirty-four years and three months, he should have been retained for thirty-four years and six months. Colonel Ogilvie towards the end of his term was not as effective an officer as the department would like to have had, and they replaced him by a younger and more active man. But even so, I contend it would have been only just to Colonel Ogilvie, and to other officers similarly situated, that he should have been retained the extra three months, which would have enabled him to retire with thirty-five years' service to his credit.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a thought that may find expression in connection with this Bill. It is not a new matter, it is one that has existed for quite a long time. We are not only providing for war pensions, as to which there is no question, but we are providing for peace pensions to two branches of our public service: the Perman-Force and the Northwest Mounted Police. I need not say that I am not objecting to that at all. But we are doing nothing for the great body of the Civil Servants of Canada.

I want to keep in the public mind and in the mind of hon. members that what we are doing for the permanent force, for the militia force and for the Royal Northwest Mounted Police is creating a distinction. Something was said in a recent debate about class distinctions; we are having class distinctions here. We are providing that a man who serves in the Royal Northwest Mounted Police or in the permanent force in ordinary times of peace is eligible for a pension; but the man who has the misfortune to serve in any of the other branches of the public service, which comprise probably ninety per cent of the whole, will have no pension.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment salaries, including Deputy Minister at $6,000, Assistant Deputy Minister and Secretary at $4,000, Solicitor at $4,000, Superintendent of Expenditure at $3,500, Assistant Secretary at $2,525 and Accountant at $2,500, $71,200; contingencies $25,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister give an outline of the work of this department?

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL: The work of the department, broadly speaking, is divided into three branches: the medical treatment of returned men who are so injured or physically unfit that there is no hope of their early permanent recovery; the re-training of injured or disabled returned men to fit them for useful occupations, and the re-establishment in civil life of those who return from overseas and are desirous of securing employment or occupation here. The department also provides for the free medical treatment for a year after their discharge of all who have served overseas and are suffering from any kind of disability. It has established an artificial limb factory where artificial limbs are provided for those who have lost limbs in the war; and these are kept in a proper condition of repair.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many hospitals are there under this department and where are they located?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that question is in order. Under item 331 this same discussion may be revived this evening by other members who are not present now. It is absolutely unfair that the discussion should be repeated.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I beg to take exception, Mr. Chairman, to your statement that it is unfair. It may be out of order; and if you say so, I will resume my seat. But to say that it is unfair that I should seek information is rather hard on an old member like me. I understand that the hospitals which were formerly under the Militia Depart-

ment are now administered by this new department?

Mr. ROWELL: All hospitals except those for soldiers whose recovery is hoped for at an early date. Soldiers whose early recovery is hoped for are not discharged from the army; their treatment is continued in the hospitals which are under the direction of the Army Medical Service Branch of the Militia Department. But if cases are likely to be incurable or to require very lengthy treatment, the men are discharged from the army and placed under the care of this department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to prolong the discussion if it is out of order, but as we are discussing a vote on a new department, I thought the minister could give an outline of its work. But if you, Sir, insist that I am out of order, I will abide by your decision. Is this going to be a permanent department?

Mr. ROWELL: It is desirable that the bulk of the work of this department should be done in the next two years; it has hardly yet reached the maximum of its work, which will be reached when all our soldiers return from overseas. Perhaps it would be better if on this particular item questions were asked which I might answer, and then when we come to the other Estimate, which deals with each branch of the work, I shall be glad to give all information about each branch as we take up the various items.

Mr. MORPHY: The item says: "Including deputy minister at $6,000, solicitor at $4,000." Who is the deputy minister, and what are his qualifications? Who is the solicitor, and where does he come from?

Mr. ROWELL: No solicitor has been appointed, and the minister hopes it will not prove necessary to appoint one. The department has got along so far without one, and it hopes to continue to do so. But many questions come up and the minister thought it was desirable to have provision for the appointment of a solicitor in case it became necessary to appoint one.

The deputy minister has been in the department since its organization and was with the Military Hospitals Commission before that. He was executive officer of the Military Hospitals Commission, in which capacity he was brought into contact with all phases of the work of the department. Previous to that he was engaged in executive direction of a commercial enterprise. He has had large practical experience in organization work, and, as my hon. friend will recognize, when we get into the details of the department, the number of hospitals and educational institutions under its charge, how important it is to have an efficient officer with good organizing power and executive ability in charge of this large administrative work.

Mr. MORPHY: What was his salary before when he was engaged in the Governmental service, and why is the salary now $6,000? I thought $5,000 was a sort of standard salary for deputy ministers.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is quite correct that $5,000 was the general standard for deputy ministers, and that was the salary of the deputy in this department; but in the Estimates of this year, salaries of all deputy ministers have been raised to $6,000.

Mr. MORPHY: I want to reiterate what I have said in this House many times before, namely, that a wrong principle is applied all through, and I wish to make another statement in favour of the underdog. The lower branches of all Government departments are absolutely underpaid, and this seems like a free opportunity for the big fellows to get the high jump without a by-your-leave or a word of protest. I protest against the ease with which the high salaried men can secure an increase, when it is so difficult for the lower paid men, such as messengers, packers and so on, to get one.

Mr. ROWELL: I would sympathize with that view very largely if legislation were not to be brought down this session to deal with the matter. I understand the acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. A. K. Maclean) will, on Monday, introduce a Bill relating to the reclassification of the service, and that will indicate the scale of salaries in all branches of the service. There will then be full opportunity for discussing the point raised by my hon. friend, and I hope he will consider that what the Government proposes in the matter is reasonable and satisfactory.

Mr. MORPHY: The minister has not given me quite a definite answer as to what deputy minister, whose name I do not know, was getting before in the Government service.

Mr. ROWELL: The deputy was drawing $4,500 in the Military Hospitals Commission as assistant to the director. When he became director he got the salary which

the former director was drawing, namely, $5,000.

Mr. MORPHY: Then this is an increase in salary of $1,000 in a new department of Government?

Mr. ROWELL: It is an increase of $1,000, just as in every other department of Government. I am free to admit there may be a difference of opinion whether all deputy ministers should draw the same salary, and I think we shall find when the reclassification comes down, there will be some recommendations on that point, but for many years it has been a settled policy that all deputies should receive the same salaries, and this department is simply carrying out that policy.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: Will that same principle be carried into effect as regards ministers?

Mr. MORPHY: If some of the really executive departments of the Government have their deputy ministers' salaries raised to $6,000, will not that necessarily carry with it the principle of giving a similar increase to $6,000 to heads of more or less non-executive departments of Government, although the work may not be half as great?

Mr. ROWELL: I should say not, unless, as is the case in certain positions, they have the rank of deputy minister. A certain number of positions have been created in the service where in the Statute it is provided that the official holds the rank of deputy minister. I know there are several, and in those cases, I assume the principle would apply. In fact, I think the Estimates this year contain the same amount for those who are so declared in the Statute.

Mr. NESBITT: The work of deputy ministers varies greatly, and some should have higher salaries than others. I am not quarrelling with the salary of this deputy. Why is a solicitor required in this department? If any little legal question comes up, surely advice can be secured from some law officer in Ottawa. It is absurd to have a solicitor for this department.

Mr. ROWELL: As already stated, I understand from the minister that he did not expect to require a solicitor, but he thought it expedient to provide for the appointment of one. As I understand, a solicitor will not likely be required, I have no objection to the item with regard to the solicitor being stricken out.

Mr. NESBITT: I know one or two men in the department who are quite capable of giving advice on any ordinary point. They are sitting here now, and I do not see why the item should not be stricken out.

Mr. ROWELL: I will drop it.

Mr. MORPHY: It is a temptation to have it in the Estimates, and it should be stricken out.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: In connection with the item $3,500 for a superintendent of expenditure, I would like to know if such an officer has been appointed, and if so, what his duties are? Is there any necessity for a superintendent of expenditure when you have a minister, a deputy minister and a secretary?

Mr. MORPHY: And an assistant secretary, and accountant?

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: I need not mention any more officers, but I think we might have some explanation as to the necessity for this office.

Mr. ROWELL: The superintendent of expenditure might be known by some other name, perhaps chief accountant. He is the executive head of the Accounting Branch and supervises the policy and staff necessary to control all expenditures. I think it is very desirable that there should be such an office, because it is a new department, which is spending very large sums of money, amounting to millions of dollars. The Committee will see that already the estimate is over $20,000,000, and there will have to be supplementaries. It requires the most careful supervision of all expenditures in administering this department in order to conserve the public interest, and I think that any money wisely spent in supervising expenditures will bring a large return in the way of curtailing what otherwise might be a great increase in public expenditure.

Mr. NESBITT: I absolutely agree with the minister, but I think that as titles were voted out last night we should call this official chief accountant.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member for North Oxford has raised a point which is worth considering. There is a provision for a superintendent at $3,500, one accountant at $2,500, and four at $2,100, practically six accountants for this department. You might, as the hon. member for North Oxford says, call the official chief accountant, and in addition to this accountant you have five others. Surely with six accountants in the branch there is going to be very little for each to do. I appreciate in a sense the enormity of the work, but I begin to be

staggered when I see so many accountants on a new board. I would like to have some explanation of this, as there seems to be something funny about it.

Mr. ROWELL: All soldiers who are either receiving treatment in the hospitals or are being trained in the vocational institutions are drawing pay and allowances. At present there are as many as 15,284 ex-members of the Forces drawing pay and allowance, either in connection with medical treatment or taking vocational training. The accounting is a very important phase of the work of this department and it is essential that they should have an efficient first-class man, the best they can get, to supervise this very large expenditure. I do not know of any department where expenses may run up more rapidly unless carefully supervised than in a new department which is expanding to meet the increasing demands being made for the benefits it administers to returned soldiers. The suggestion of the hon. member for North Oxford is perfectly acceptable. I do not see why the official should not be called "Chief Accountant."

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: I think that "Superintendent of Expenditure" is a misnomer. I happen to know the deputy minister and the assistant deputy minister of the department and I can testify to the ability of each. I quite agree with the minister that it is necessary to have some one charged with the oversight of these expenditures, but I do not think that "Superintendent of Expenditure" is quite appropriate, and the minister might accept the suggestion of the hon. member for North Oxford.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: There are companies divided into several units and a great deal of expenditure is being incurred in the different units. It will be necessary for the Superintendent of Expenditure to visit these units and supervise the expenditure at each headquarters. I therefore think the term "Superintendent of Expenditure" is better than "Chief Accountant."

Mr. HUGH CLARK: The Superintendent of Expenditure will be charged with the supervision of the expenditure of considerable sums of money and probably "Chief Accountant" may not be a dignified enough title for him to maintain the authority necessary to discharge his important duties.

Mr. ROWELL: I move that item No. 29 be amended by striking out the words "Solicitor at $4,000" and by reducing the total amount from $71,200 to $67,200.

Motion agreed to.

Buildings, Hospitals, Sanatoria, Soldiers' Homes, Vocational Training Centres, etc., $1,300,000.

Mr. ROWELL: The expenditure under this head for 1918 amounted to $1,700,000 and this Estimate is $400,000 less. The expenditure covers hospitals for general purposes, sanatoria for the treating of tuberculosis, homes for incurables, and buildings for vocational training. The department is now erecting new buildings in almost all the provinces. There is one at Tranquille, British Columbia, where the department, in co-operation with the British Columbia Anti-tuberculosis Society is erecting an extension for the housing of 130 patients, together with dining room and kitchen accommodation. In Alberta the department with the co-operation of the provincial government is erecting a building to accommodate 175 beds for the treatment of tuberculosis.

Mr. PARENT: What is the expenditure?

Mr. ROWELL: I can only give an estimate. It is probably very near $300,000. In Manitoba the department is contributing towards the accommodation for the treatment of tuberculosis in the provincial sanatorium at Ninette. The Manitoba Anti-tuberculosis Society is setting aside sufficient accommodation for the exclusive use of this department. In most cases the department has made arrangements with the provincial governments or some recognized institution whereby the department provides for the extension of the existing institutions in order to care for the patients. As a result of experience, the department has reached the conclusion that that means in the long run a substantial saving to the Federal Government.

In Quebec, with the co-operation of the provincial government the department is erecting 200 beds for the treatment of tubercular patients at the Laurentian Sanatorium.

In New Brunswick, the department has recently assumed the administration of Jordan Memorial Sanatorium at River Glade, N.B., and is making provision for extra accommodation at this institution.

In Nova Scotia, through the co-operation of the Nova Scotia government, the department is completing certain buildings at the Nova Scotia Sanatorium.

In Halifax, in order to provide for active treatment cases, the department, through

the Public Works Department, is erecting a 50-bed active treatment hospital.

In Prince Edward Island, the accommodation is being completed at Dalton Sanatorium, for the treatment of tuberculous patients.

Over and above the foregoing, the department, in operating the large number of institutions coming under its control, must of necessity provide funds for the maintenance and upkeep of various buildings. The members of the committee will see that we must meet the demands made upon this department to care for all returned soldiers suffering from tuberculosis. The cases that come under its charge are not those in which an immediate recovery is expected. They are discharged from the military forces as soon as this disease is diagnosed and are passed into the hands of this department. I am sure all will agree that the country should do everything in its power to provide the best possible treatment for ex-members of the forces who are suffering from tuberculosis. These expenditures are necessary in order to provide sanatoria where they can be treated. This is usually accomplished by an extension to an existing institution thus saving the cost of erecting a new building.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the dental corps been transferred from the Militia department to this new department?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that a decision had been arrived at some time ago.

Mr. ROWELL: The Militia department has not transferred the Dental Corps to the Soldiers Civil Re-Establishment department. The Militia department is treating the returned soldiers who require dental treatment immediately upon discharge, but the Soldiers Civil Re-Establishment department must necessarily provide dental treatment for those who come under its charge and establish its own branch for this particular work.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: In connection with the programme outlined by the minister, I think the department is taking the right line in co-operating with the provincial authorities, in using sanatoria and other hospital accommodation in the different provinces and assisting in putting up buildings that will be of some value to the country after the work of reconstruction is completed. In my experience of the working of the Militia Department and the Military Hospitals Commission, prior to the Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Department being established, there never has been a more wasteful expenditure of public money than that which took place as between these two departments. Buildings have been erected for hospital purposes of a semi-permanent character which, now that the war is over, appear to be absolutely useless and the money is thrown away. I do not know whether the minister of this new department intends to use these hospitals which have been built in almost every province in Canada. If nothing can be done to utilize these buildings on which millions of dollars have been expended, it will be a great loss to the taxpayers of this country. I am pleased to learn that the department proposes to take over and assist existing institutions which, in any event, will be of some value to the people after the war. I would suggest to the minister in charge of the department in this House that he bring to the attention of the responsible minister the fact that thousands of dollars have been wasted between the Militia Department and the old Military Hospitals Commission; whether through jealousy or lack of co-operation, I do not know. The fact remains that in every town in Canada almost the same condition has prevailed, money being wasted by one department or another that might have been used to better advantage had there been proper co-operation between these two departments.

Mr. ARGUE: Is there any provision for hospital accommodation for invalided soldiers who never left Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: They stand on the same basis as those invalided from overseas.

Mr. ARGUE: I am glad to hear that because I have been fighting a case now for pretty nearly a year and a half. In 1916 we had a man in Swift Current, Mr. McIntosh by name, who enlisted in the 209th Battalion. He is a married man, 39 years of age, has a wife and five children and is a machinist by trade. He was examined by the battalion medical officer and taken on the strength as medically fit. He went to Camp Hughes and put in the summer there. He broke down under the training and when the battalion left he remained in Camp Hughes, was discharged as medically unfit and went home. Since that day the city of Swift Current has kept him and his wife and family. The returned soldiers pay the rent of the house for the family, which amounts to $15 a month; the town of Swift Current pays $80 per month to keep the family, and it sent him to the Mayo hospital for

treatment. The hospital sent him back and said he had broken down under army training and probably would never be much better. I brought the matter to the attention of one department after another, and let me tell you they are past masters at passing the buck. They sent me from one department to another. They sent me to the Pension Department, and the Pension Department told me that there was no provision at all for a case of that kind, that it was a recurrence of a former disability. There ought to be responsibility somewhere, and somebody has to assume it. The Militia Department took that man on the strength as medically fit on their own doctor's certificate, and I am going to stay with the job until the thing is straightened out. Up to date the town of Swift Current has paid $1,500 to maintain that family ever since the man was discharged, and I want to know who is going to reimburse the town.

Mr. ROWELL: I can understand the action of the Pension Board in saying that it was a recurrence of a disability. What is the other department to which my hon. friend presented the case?

Mr. ARGUE: The Invalided Soldiers Commission, and then the Pension Board. The Pension Board said that they had no jurisdiction over the case at all, and that there was no provision to meet it. I do not know how it will end, but I am going to keep on pressing the case.

Mr. ROWELL: I should think it would be a case for consideration by the Soldiers Civil Re-Establishment Department. The deputy minister will look into the matter and take it up if my hon. friend will give him the facts. I think the Pension Board is correct in saying that it did not come properly before it.

Mr. ARGUE: I want to assure the minister that I have given them the facts more than once.

Major-General MEWBURN: Has he been discharged from the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

Mr. ARGUE: Yes, as medically unfit for military service. He was given his ticket, sent home, and that was the last of it.

Mr. ROWELL: The deputy minister will take the matter up and look into it. If the facts are as stated by my hon. friend, I should think that it was a case for treatment in one of the institutions of the department.

Mr. ARGUE: We have tried several times to get them to take him back and give him treatment, or put him under observation. I have done my best to see if something could not be done, but up to date I have not been able to get any action.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: Will the hon. gentleman give the name?

Mr. ARGUE: I will give you the name and all the particulars.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: How many tubercular soldiers are at present in sanatoria throughout Canada, and how many beds are there for tubercular soldiers?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that question would be more in order under item 334.

Mr. COWAN: Do I understand that the cost of dental services is provided for under this vote?

Mr. ROWELL: No, this relates only to buildings. I just want to make one observation to prevent a misunderstanding, with respect to the remarks of my hon. friend from Strathcona, and I do so because I think the Minister of Militia was not in the House when my hon. friend spoke. If either of the two departments had known that the war would come to an end when it did, much less accommodation might have served, and much less building would have been gone on with; but as the situation looked last summer almost right up to October, until September, anyway—and I recall this matter having been repeatedly presented to Council—owing to the severe casualties sustained in the August drive and the casualties which it was expected would be sustained during the year, it became necessary to evacuate as many hospital cases to Canada as possible. Men were coming back to Canada, and the complaint constantly made to the Department of Militia and Defence was that there was not sufficient hospital accommodation for them in the principal military centres of Canada, and it was urged that additional accommodation be provided. The department, therefore, in their view of the case, were unable to turn over these institutions to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment because they were being used for men who came under the Department of Militia and Defence. Now that peace has come, just as soon as the Department of Militia and Defence is prepared to surrender one of these institutions it is being surrendered, if suitable, to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment for their work. I happen to have personal knowledge of quite a number of hospitals which have been turned over in that

way recently. I think that, in a measure, will explain what my hon. friend has referred to.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: I give a clear case of lack of co-operation between the two departments in my own constituency. The Military Hospitals Commission rented from the Alberta College a building for, I think, $11,000 a year, on the understanding that the building was to be returned in the same condition in which it was received. Last year the Military Hospitals Commission expended something like $50,000 on this building for new plumbing, baths, and work of that kind. The equipment had all been put in, with the exception of the boilers required to make the baths available, when the armistice was signed. The result is that the entire expenditure is wasted; the equipment has never been used, and if the Commission turns the building over in the condition in which it was received it will have to take out every part of that equipment. Again, the city of Edmonton offered to the Militia Department the use of one of the best hospitals in Western Canada free of charge; it had all the necessary facilities and accommodation for 180 patients, but through lack of co-operation between Military District No. 13 and possibly the Military Hospitals Commission, this hospital was caring for only twenty or twenty-five patients instead of one hundred and eighty. What I am complaining of is the lack of co-operation between the two departments, which has resulted in an expenditure of money which can never be justified.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: What is the policy of the department with regard to epileptics and tubercular cases? Is it still the policy to unload them on the civilian institutions, as was done a year ago?

Mr. ROWELL: I am not aware that that was the policy, and so I am advised by officers of the department. The policy is to take care of these men until they have recovered, and that is the object of these various institutions for which I am asking this vote.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: My point is this: Instead of the Government taking care of these cases in their own institutions and with their own doctors, they were turned over to civilian institutions at a cost of so much per day or per month. Is that still the policy?

Mr. ROWELL: No. The policy is for the department itself to care for these patients in these institutions for which we are asking this money.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I am very pleased to hear that statement. I raised this question a year ago, but I did not get much consideration. I trust that more accommodation will be provided in the future than in the past. I have visited many of the civilian institutions from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and I did not find one where I thought the men were getting sufficient care and treatment. I am very glad to know there has been a change.

Mr. ROWELL: I am glad to say that the results of the treatment have been very satisfactory. About seventy-five per cent of the men treated have been able to resume work in gainful occupations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: At what centres is vocational training being given in connection with the hospitals, and is there any arrangement with the provinces to assist in providing buildings for this purpose? About what proportion of this vote of $1,300,000 will be devoted to vocational training?

Mr. ROWELL: There are some twelve centres in which vocational training is being given at the present time—Montreal, Ottawa, Halifax, Kingston, Toronto, London, Winnipeg, Calgary, Guelph, Regina, Victoria and Fredericton. Besides the departmental training centres there are outside schools to which the pupils are sent. A number of men are also under training in industrial establishments under actual working conditions. In the Quebec district, last year there were 3 schools carried on by the department directly, and 4 this year; Nova Scotia, 2 last year, and 3 this year; Central Ontario, 3 last year, and 2 this year. Central Ontario, 8 last year, 8 this year; Western Ontario, 3 last year, 2 this year; Manitoba, 1 last year, 2 this year; Saskatchewan, 3 last year, 3 this year; Alberta, 3 last year, 2 this year; British Columbia, 3 last year, 5 this year; New Brunswick, 1 last year and 1 this year. The total number last year was 30, this year 32. The principal increase has not been in the schools under the direct charge of the department, but in other schools with which the department has made arrangements—institutions of the provinces, universities, and other schools. The total number of those last year was thirty-seven; this year one hundred and twenty-seven. So that the department has, during the year, been carrying out the policy of co-operating as far as practicable with the various provincial gov-

ernments and the educational organizations of the provinces in order to utilize those schools for vocational work as indicated by the increase and so reduce capital expenditure.

One of the most important features of the retraining is in connection with the men working with independent firms. In fact, the war veterans have impressed very strongly upon the department that the men should have their practical training by working under ordinary business conditions. The number of firms in which soldiers are engaged in that way has increased from fifty-seven in March, 1918, to nine hundred and ninety-three in 1919.

Mr. ARTHURS: I notice you stated that Calgary had three schools last year and it now has two. Is one of those schools located in Edmonton?

Mr. ROWELL: There is one in each place.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: Is any provision made for getting this vocational training at night, or is it all during the day?

Mr. ROWELL: The department has not made any provision for training at night. Soldiers who are taking this retraining are disabled, and night classes would impair their physical well-being. As they receive pay and allowances when receiving retraining there is no hardship entailed.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: The reason I ask the question is that I have been approached by a number of men who are in employment part of the day, and who would like to have the privilege of attending some classes at night in order to make themselves more proficient.

Mr. ROWELL: As I understand my hon. friend's question, he is referring, not to disabled men, but to soldiers who are physically fit and who would like to qualify themselves more effectively for their particular work.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: Not exactly what you might call totally disabled. They are able to carry on, and they have employment which they are not exactly satisfied with, and they would like to qualify themselves for something better.

Mr. ROWELL: The question my hon. friend raises is one deserving careful consideration, and I will commend it to the officers of the department. So far the department only deals with disabled men, that is, men who are so disabled that they cannot carry on their pre-war occupations. The department grants them pay and allowances while undergoing re-training.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is the department doing anything towards the education of a number of these men in agriculture; and, if so, what buildings are being used for the purpose in connection with some of the agricultural colleges and experimental farms?

Mr. ROWELL: Generally speaking, so far as training in agriculture is concerned for men who wish to engage in farming, that is under the Soldiers' Settlement Board. The Department of Soldiers Re-Establishment do a certain amount of retraining of disabled men who were formerly general farmers. These men are trained in specific branches of farming pursuits such as market gardening, poultry raising, operation of tractors, gas engines and farm machinery. It is only to that extent that they provide training in agricultural matters.

5 p.m.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I understand that in addition to those men who are partially or totally disabled, there is a class now being educated composed of young men who went overseas when under eighteen years of age. Has the minister ever considered extending that class to include young students over eighteen who on their return at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three are unable to carry on without some help? They are very desirous of continuing their educational studies. While over eighteen and not suffering from any disability, yet they are unable to go on with their studies for various reasons. I think those men should have consideration.

Mr. ROWELL: With reference to those men who enlisted under military age, the Government has decided that some provision should be made for their re-training regardless of whether they have suffered disability or not. That was discussed in the House earlier in the session. I am sure that decision will be sustained by the judgment of the House and of the country: that the boys who were under eighteen years of age at the time of their enlistment, and who were under no compulsion to go overseas, but voluntarily left to serve their country, should be afforded an opportunity of completing their studies.

Mr. NESBITT: Why should a boy of twenty not get the same accommodation when he comes back as the boy under eighteen? The boy under eighteen at the time of enlistment has a better chance than

the boy of twenty-one, because when the latter comes back it will take him longer to finish his course. The boy under eighteen is discommoded less than the boy under twenty-one who left his studies and voluntarily enlisted.

Mr. ROWELL: The man who enlisted when seventeen years of age in the early days of the war is now going on to twenty-two. He has been away from Canada during the period when, if he were here, he would have proceeded with his education or would have learned a trade. He comes back to Canada at the age of twenty-one or twenty-two without a trade and with his education unfinished, and it has been represented to the Government, and strongly urged in the House, that if some provision be not made for those boys they would drift into the class of common labourers. Those boys were not under obligation to render military service, but they volunteered and went overseas. Therefore the Government decided to deal with those under eighteen years of age. So far the Government has not seen its way clear to help those over eighteen years of age.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Exactly the same argument would apply, so far as I can see, to students over eighteen and under nineteen. They were under no obligation to go overseas, and, as the member for Oxford North well said, they are suffering greater disability than boys of sixteen or seventeen. They now come back men, and many of them are desirous of going on with their studies if they can get help. I understand that the Government was considering the education of men who were two years in the university, leaving out matriculants, for whom no provision is made in any way.

Mr. NESBITT: The only argument the minister advances in favour of the idea that boys under eighteen should be considered is that they did not have to go. Well, others who were over eighteen—nineteen and twenty—did not have to go; they enlisted before the Conscription Bill was passed. But the soldier who comes back twenty-five or twenty-six years of age is at a greater disadvantage than the one who comes back under twenty-two.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think a distinction should be made between the boy under eighteen who volunteered, say, a year before the war ended, and gave only one year's service, and the boy who enlisted in the early days of the war and gave four or five years' service.

Mr. ROWELL: All that has been decided so far is that some provision should be made for all those who enlisted under eighteen years of age; the extent of that provision or the manner of its administration have not yet been settled. The point that my hon. friend makes, however, can be considered when the regulations are being worked out.

Mr. WIGMORE: I suggest that the age in respect of which this provision is to be made be extended from eighteen to twenty. I know the case of a young man nineteen years of age who had been preparing for the matriculation examination. He enlisted and recently returned after having been overseas three and a half years. When the matter is being dealt with I hope that this suggestion will be considered.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The moment you endeavour to divide men up into classes you get on dangerous ground. The case of six young men who enlisted has come under my personal observation. Two of them, under eighteen years of age, enlisted practically as school boys. One was nineteen just starting at the university, and the other three who were from twenty-one to twenty-four years of age, had completed their education and established themselves in business. Those who had finished their education and had put everything they had in the world into their business felt the call, gave up everything and went to the war; they come back twenty-six, twenty-seven or twenty-eight years of age and have to make an entirely new start. The boy who was sixteen or seventeen when he enlisted has the advantage of years over these men, and if you compensate the soldier only if he was a certain age when he enlisted, you will get into endless difficulties. It is not practicable to make a dividing line; if you do, there will be overlapping and consequent dissatisfaction. If the department will confine its energies in this regard to the education of men who come back disabled or are unable to provide for themselves, they will be on much safer ground.

Mr. PARENT: Some time ago the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) inquired of the Government whether it was true that the late Gustave Stuart, K.C., of Quebec, had bequeathed his beautiful estate to the country for the purpose of establishing thereon a soldiers' home or a sanatorium. To that question the Secretary of State answered "No" and the Department of Militia "Yes." We have been trying to

find out whether the department, or whatever department the matter may come under, has taken any steps to do something with that property, which is very valuable and surely ought to be taken advantage of.

Mr. ROWELL: It is correct that that beautiful property was presented to the Government. It is now being put into shape by this department for the re-training of ex-members of the forces in certain phases of agriculture.

Mr. POWER: I asked a question early in the session with regard to this matter, and the answer of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment was to the effect that plans were being prepared for the utilization of the property. We have been spending thousands of dollars all over the country in the purchase of properties for the establishment of sanitaria, agricultural farms, and so on. But here is a property, the best located in that part of Quebec, which has been in the possession of the Government for a considerable time; and we are now told that preparations are being made for its use in the re-training of soldiers in some "phases" of agriculture. May I ask in what phases of agriculture? In what way is the department going to use it, and why was it not used before?

Mr. ROWELL: At the time it was given the only use the department had for it was to turn it into a hospital, but it was not considered desirable or in the public interest that that should be done at that time, not only because of the character of the place, but because of its situation. There were not the necessary transportation facilities to reach it conveniently, and the necessary water supply for hospital purposes was not available. A considerable expenditure of money would have been necessary to provide an adequate water supply. But the property is well suited for the purpose to which it is now being devoted. I understand that some thirty-five soldiers will shortly be there receiving training in poultry farming, truck gardening, dairying, and activities of that kind in which the soldier who is more or less disabled can engage with advantage to himself and country.

Mr. POWER: Is it the intention of the Government only to train soldiers in poultry raising or truck gardening on that or any other farm, or will financial arrangements be made to enable returned soldiers to purchase small lots of land in the vicinity of cities for the purpose of carrying on such work?

[Mr. Parent.]

Mr. ROWELL: That is a matter which comes under the Soldier Settlement Board. A Bill is now before the House to deal with that and other aspects of the matter. I do not know its express terms, but, generally speaking, the Government is making provision under that Bill to assist returned soldiers to acquire property for the carrying on of agricultural pursuits. When the Bill comes up, the whole matter of its scope and the character of the property to be purchased may be discussed.

Mr. PARENT: I should not like the minister to be under the impression that water cannot be obtained on the St. Louis road property. It is next the yards occupied by the Transcontinental railway and Government locomotives go there for water many times a year. In the same parish in which this is situated, a tuberculosis hospital has just been erected by private subscription, and water has also been obtained there. If private citizens have been able to secure water for a private hospital, surely the Government can afford to go to the expense of obtaining water on property which has been granted to them gratuitously.

Maintenance of patients, $3,000,000.

Mr. ROWELL: At present 7,800 patients are in the hospitals of the department, 1,800 are being treated in specially designed and equipped sanatoria for the treatment of tuberculosis, 600 suffering from mental disabilities are under the care of specialists in the treatment of mental diseases, 5,400 are receiving intermittent general treatment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The purchases for this equipment, medicine, food, and all that is required for maintenance are, of course, made in large quantities. Are tenders called for?

Mr. ROWELL: The purchases are made through the War Purchasing Commission.

Mr. PARENT: Are any patients being treated at the Kent House, near Quebec city, or will there be any in the near future?

Mr. ROWELL: The Kent House does not come under the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and I cannot give my hon. friend any information in regard to it.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: With reference to the minister's statement that the War Purchasing Commission does the purchasing, is there not a purchasing agent in the Department of Militia, and has he nothing to do with the purchases of these supplies?

Mr. ROWELL: The Department of Militia has nothing whatever to do with the purchase of supplies for the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment makes its requisition for the supplies it requires, and the purchases are made under direction of the War Purchasing Commission which supervises everything that is purchased.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is the minister using existing technical schools in Canada for vocational training, or is he establishing new ones in the different centres? What, for example, is he doing at Halifax?

Mr. ROWELL: For the Military District of which Halifax is the centre, the department has three schools of its own for vocational training, but under arrangements it has with fifteen other schools in Nova Scotia, returned soldiers are being trained in those schools. The bulk of the department's work, so far as it relates to vocational training, is being carried out under an arrangement between the department and the various institutions existent in Nova Scotia.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who is in charge?

Mr. ROWELL: Professor F. H. Sexton, an officer of the department is in charge of vocational training, is in charge at Halifax.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister said that there were in the province other places where technical education was given to soldiers. What are the names?

Mr. ROWELL: I have not the names of the different localities in Nova Scotia, but I shall be glad to get the information, and I will write my hon. friend giving him all the different places where these are in the province.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Supposing a soldier at Ste. Anne de Bellevue hospital near Montreal wants to get some technical training. If he does not find at the hospital the necessary equipment, is the department doing anything toward sending him, say to the technical schools we have in Montreal?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. A certain phase of this re-training is carried on in the hospital, if the soldier is able to do this work, and it aids in the cure of the patient to have him encouraged to undertake certain work in the hospital. As soon as he is able to be transported from the hospital and to undertake work in an institution or commercial enterprise outside of the hospital, arrangements for that are made.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: How many tubercular patients are being treated in sanatoria at the present time, and how many beds has the department ready for returning tubercular soldiers?

Mr. ROWELL: There are at present approximately 1,800 tubercular patients undergoing treatment, and approximately 150 vacant beds, so that the hospital accommodation for tubercular patients is at the present time in round figures 1,950 beds. Then, in those various units which I have mentioned, which are now in course of construction, provision will be made for about 859 additional beds, making a total of about 2,800 beds available for treatment of tubercular patients when the present accommodation is completed.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: I am not quite clear as to the scheme under which this department is operating; that is to say, I understood from the minister that a returned soldier, discharged to civilian life, was, if requiring treatment, entitled to free treatment for one year. Is that correct?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. There are two classes of cases. A man who is discharged without disability, and who suffers from any disease or injury during a year after discharge gets free treatment if the disability is not due to vice or misconduct. That is a provision made by the Government for the returned soldier, and it is effective for one year after discharge.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: That is if he breaks down within a year.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, if he suffers from any disability or disease not due to vice or misconduct. That provision was made a few months ago. If a man breaks down and his collapse is due to or aggravated by service he receives not only free treatment, but pay and allowances for himself and his actual dependents so long as he is thus disabled.

Mr. MICHAUD: I understand there is a soldiers' home in Ottawa; what does it cost per day per patient?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know to what home my hon. friend refers.

Mr. MICHAUD: The Soldiers' Home in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. ROWELL: There is no Soldiers' Home in Ottawa operated by this department. There may be an hospital under the Department of Militia and Defence. I believe there is the Sir Sanford Fleming Home, but I have no knowledge of that.

Vocational Expense, Administration and Training, $750,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What does that include?

Mr. ROWELL: This includes the administration and training in the vocational branch. It covers such matters as maintenance, repairs, light, heat, and power, stationery and office supplies, car fares of soldiers attending classes, telephones, telegrams, laundry and clothing expenses, subsistence of staff, subsistence of students attending vocational school. That would be the meals they might have there while the school was in session.

Mr. PARENT: Has any part of this amount been expended?

Mr. ROWELL: No; this is a vote for the present year. The actual expenditure last year on this head was $645,452. The amount is larger this year because there will be a larger number of students attending these vocational classes.

Salaries, Administrative, Clerical, Training, Industrial, $5,178,420.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This is a very large item for salaries, and it does not include all salaries, because doctors and nurses are under a separate item. Cooks, orderlies and general staff are also separate. It seems that a very large proportion of the whole expenditure is salaries, and it would be well to have some explanation of this item.

Mr. ROWELL: Previous to the transfer to the Department of Militia and Defence of a number of hospitals operated by the Military Hospitals Commission, men who broke down as a result of their war service were given treatment in hospitals by the Military Hospitals Commission, and their pay and allowances were issued by the Department of Militia and Defence. Under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment the number of men for treatment on April 1, 1918, was 1,776, and this number has increased in the present year to 7,381.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Do I understand the minister to say that we have 7,381 employees in this branch?

Mr. ROWELL: No. I was speaking of the maintenance. The numbers taking treatment or being retrained necessarily largely determines the number of employees. These salaries are for all branches of work of the department including the new Information and Service Branch co-operating with the Department of Labour. The personnel served by the department has increased three-fold during the past year and probably the peak of the load has not yet been reached.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I interrupt the minister to ask what connection this has with the Department of Labour?

Mr. ROWELL: Before I answer the hon. member there are two or three facts I would like to give the Committee. This salary item varies, as may be supposed, with the general variation in the number of men cared for. The occupational work carried on in hospitals by this branch has been developed considerably during the past year. On April 1, 1918, the number of men undergoing curative training, together with those in attendance in certain work shops, was 3,817, while on April 1, 1919, the number was 9,059, thus entailing increased instructional facilities together with increased cost of administration. It is expected that the rate of growth will be materially accelerated in the near future. For the last three months the increase has been at the rate of about 2,000 per month. My hon. friend has asked what is the relation of this work to the Department of Labour? Under the Act passed last session whereby provision is made for co-operation between the Federal Department of Labour and various Provincial Governments, a number of employment offices have been established throughout Canada. In each of these offices there is a representative of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. That representative is paid out of this vote. The object of having a representative of the department in each of these employment offices is to ensure that the returned soldier when he comes seeking employment not only gets a fair show, but is given the preference as far as is possible. It is proving to be of great advantage to have representatives of the department in all these employment offices throughout Canada. The representative is there to meet the soldier when he comes in, and to keep track of all opportunities of employment that may be available and to acquaint the men of them. I am glad to say that the results are proving very gratifying.

Up to the 17th of May, just a week ago, the number of applications from demobilized soldiers for employment was 30,146. The total number placed in positions was 22,838, being 75.7 per cent of the number of applications received. In addition to the placing of demobilized soldiers in employment,

the representatives of this branch have interviewed on their return to Canada 150,297 members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force with a view to giving them information or assistance, and particularly for the purpose of properly informing each man as to the benefits which are provided by the Government of Canada for him.

The number of men seeking information from the representatives of the department on matters other than placement in employment averages about 40,000 per month.

Under this branch information was gathered from every soldier on the field as to the particular occupation or pursuit in which he would like to engage on his return.

The department has information collected from all the soldiers who were overseas which gives a full record in the case of every soldier and the occupation in which he desires to engage on his return to Canada. This involved the collection and tabulation of over 6,000,000 items of information. We were able to ascertain what percentage of men desired to engage in any particular occupation. All that information was collected and tabulated by the Information and Service Branch of the Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does that include university training on the other side?

Mr. ROWELL: No; the Khaki University is under the Department of Militia and Defence.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I would like more details from the minister about this large item of $5,178,420. What is it for?

Mr. ROWELL:

Salaries—Administrative, clerical and industrial re-training.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister tell me how large a staff he has in these different branches?

Mr. ROWELL: The total number of employees to be paid out of this vote, on the 31st March, 1919, was 3,891. Of these 37.8 per cent are females in clerical positions not sought by returned soldiers. Of the total remaining 34.8 per cent had seen service in France; 4.7 per cent had seen service in England; 4.2 per cent had seen service in Canada; 2.2 per cent had been rejected or exempted; 6.6 per cent were over age or under age, and only 6.4 per cent were male employees who had not seen service in the C.E.F.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: You are classifying them altogether?

Mr. ROWELL: That is classifying them altogether.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What number are returned soldiers?

Mr. ROWELL: 1,698 actually served with the forces or 43.7 per cent of the total number of staff. If females are excluded the percentage of those who served with the forces is 81.5 per cent.

Mr. POWER: I have here Sessional Paper No. 263 being a return from the Department of the Secretary of State to a large number of questions. Amongst others there is the question whether it is true that only returned officers are offered the higher positions in this department. The answer is:

No. In selecting ex-members of the force for vacancies in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, the suitability of the applicant and his particular qualifications for the position are the determining factors.

That is very good. I quite agree with the minister but in selecting suitable persons to fill the higher positions, I think pains should be taken to inquire into the qualifications of not only returned officers but non-commissioned officers and men. The minister states that he has 6,000,000 odd records of these soldiers who were overseas. Surely, with these 6,000,000 odd records, and with 400,000 men, if the department would take the pains to look them over, they would find some men who had these qualifications and who possessed the peculiar knowledge of the needs of the returned soldier to fit them for the position of deputy minister or other higher positions.

Mr. ROWELL: I will convey my hon. friend's representations to the minister in charge of the department. I now have the information that the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) asked for as to the institutions in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island where training is being given. They are the Nova Scotia Agricultural College; Acadian Business College; Acadian University; General School, Glace Bay; Charlottetown Business College; County academy, Halifax; Dalhousie University; Dominion Navigation School, Halifax; King's College, Windsor; Maritime Business College, Halifax; Maritime Business College New Glasgow; Maritime College, Halifax; St. Dunstan's University, Charlottetown; Business College, Truro; Union Commercial College, Charlottetown; Nova Scotia Technical College, Halifax; Camp Hill Hospital, Halifax; Nova Scotia Sanatorium, Kentville.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I would like to express the wish that the minister who is piloting these Estimates through the House would impress upon the minister in charge of this department the necessity of giving greater consideration to the claims of returned soldiers. As one of the returned soldiers in this country I think it is an insult to this army that amongst these 400,000 men they should not have found a man capable of taking the deputy ministership of a department such as this one which is dealing entirely with the problems of this war and of the men who have been disabled through service to the country. It is all right enough to give men at the bottom the little jobs as clerks and errand boys but when you have men quite capable of filling many of the higher positions I think they ought to have them.

Mr. POWER: With regard to these many items of information which have been furnished, could the minister tell me how many times the overseas soldiers were examined in order to secure these 6,000,000 items? If my information is correct the soldiers were bothered to death with whole series of questions submitted to them by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. Under these circumstances I have no doubt that it was a comparatively easy matter to get these 6,000,000 items. I want to pass to another subject—the labour bureaus. I understand that 30,000 men have been given employment but no information has been given to the Committee to show how long these men remained at the employment which was provided for them or how many found suitable positions. My experience of sending men to the labour bureau in Quebec is that they are shipped to positions that they cannot hold either through being injured or through not having the requisite training. They remain for two or three hours, or perhaps a day, when they have to return to the department to seek more suitable positions. When a man with an injured hand is sent down to the railway station to be a mechanic or something of that kind, or to do work that he cannot possibly do, I do not see that there is any reason for congratulating the Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment on what it has done in connection with finding employment for men. The experience of every member is to the effect that very few men placed by the department have remained in the positions which have been found for them.

Mr. ROWELL: The department has a system of follow-up in all cases where employment is secured with a view to seeing if the employment is satisfactory and assisting the soldiers in finding permanent positions. It may be quite true that some soldiers find position which are not suitable but every effort is made to secure such suitable employment as is available. Of course, the department cannot create employment. It can only offer the soldiers the best positions available. If he should find the position unsatisfactory and leave it, the department will endeavour to secure him another. The department follows him up to see that he gets satisfactory employment. 65.2 per cent of those who have been re-trained are still in the positions found for them when they graduated.

Mr. POWER: I know a farmer, a returned soldier, who went to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment looking for a position. It was in winter, and he could not farm then. He was offered a position as chauffeur for a doctor. "That is the only position we have," they said, "take it or leave it." The man had hardly seen an automobile before he went overseas, but he said he was willing to take the position, and do the best he could. The doctor gave him a week to learn, but he was not of a mechanical turn of mind and he could not learn in that time; so he lost this position. He went back to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment and they said: "We gave you a position, but you could not hold it." You could not blame the man for not holding it.

Hospitals and Sanatoria—salaries—doctors and nurses, $2,000,000—cooks, orderlies and general staff, $500,000.

Mr. COWAN: I think this is the proper item on which to discuss the dental service of this department. The minister announced very briefly this afternoon that he had decided to establish a dental service as distinct from the Canadian Army Dental Corps. The minister probably will not thank me for trying to make an announcement on his behalf, but as I happened to be, and have been for the last thirty-five years a dental surgeon, also assistant director of the Canadian Army Dental Service in military district No. 12 since that district was first formed, he will probably pardon me for making a few observations. In the first place, I approve most heartily of the course he is pursuing in establishing this separate dental service for the department. It may be asked why a separate service is necessary when the Canadian Army Dental Corps is in existence. As I see

it, the Canadian Army Dental Corps has given to Canada a very satisfactory service. We have set a pace for the world. We have established a service that was unknown to us heretofore, and I think we have to thank probably the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence for the advance made in that regard. The Canadian Army Dental Corps has given to Canada a distinct and a new place in dentistry. Heretofore Canadian dentistry has been submerged, so to speak, under American dentistry; we had no distinct place of our own. It is due to the fact that we established this corps, and the further fact that it has given such magnificent service overseas, that Canada is recognized as occupying a distinct place in the dental world to-day. Wherever the corps has gone, they have always caused a good deal of jealousy among the dentists serving in the corps of other armies.

I suppose it will be asked why it was necessary to create a separate service. I approve most heartily of the step, because just as it would be inadvisable to put a dentist in control of the Army Medical Corps, it is equally inadvisable to put a medical man in control of the Dental Service. The two are distinct professions. We dentists have always felt that we had the business ability to handle satisfactorily our own affairs, and the record of the Canadian Army Dental Corps in this war has proved that ability conclusively. The corps has not caused any trouble at all, I am satisfied, to the Militia Department; it has served, and served well, and at salaries much lower than could have been earned in civilian practice.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The transfer has not been made yet?

Mr. COWAN: The minister this afternoon announced that he was going to establish that service. I have every reason to believe that the Canadian Army Dental Corps is to be continued for service to the Militia Department, and that this new branch is to be used in the service of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment.

Mr. ROWELL: I think my hon. friend understood me, but perhaps some other hon. members did not. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is not taking over the Dental Corps, but is establishing a branch for treating the ex-members of the forces coming under its care.

Major-General MEWBURN: We felt that during demobilization we could not disband the dental service. A very large number of men are coming back from overseas or are here already, some thirty thousand, who will require further dental treatment. Many of them are suffering from trench mouth and other mouth diseases, and it would be manifestly unfair not to give them treatment. At first we thought it could be done in connection with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, but that was not considered feasible. So after consultation, we decided to continue the Dental Service during the period of demobilization, so that the men requiring treatment could get it.

Mr. COWAN: I approve most thoroughly of the course which is being followed by both departments in connection with the dental service. In the position I occupied in Military District No. 12, it was my duty and opportunity to observe conditions, and I know something of them. Many of the men are coming back from overseas in a most deplorable condition, dentally speaking. The conditions under which they have been living for the last two or three years have brought about a dental condition which is very very difficult to deal with to-day, and the minister is absolutely right when he says that they should receive the necessary dental treatment until they are at least in the condition in which they were when they enlisted. It will take a considerable time, some months, for the Dental Corps as now established to finish up their work in connection with the Militia Department. It cannot be done in the time which was first specified, namely, sixty days after discharge; that is absolutely impossible. It would nave been equally impossible, if the corps had been demobilized as at first proposed, to attend to these men in our hospitals because they are already occupied by patients who require quietness more or less. Further, it would be utterly impossible for as satisfactory a service to be given in the hospitals, because the treatment is entirely different from that of the Dental Corps. For these reasons it was found advisable not to demobilize the corps, and I approve as strongly as I can of the course which is being pursued. I am satisfied that in about a year—I hope less— it will be possible to demobilize the corps, but I believe it will be necessary to continue for a very much longer period of time a Dental Service in connection with the hospitals.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who appoints the doctors and the dentists?

Mr. ROWELL: The doctors would be selected by the Director of the Medical

Service, and the dentists by the Director of the Dental Service.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: What percentage of the medical men appointed to this Soldiers' Re-Establishment Commission have seen service in France? I have been informed that practically all those employed are civilians who have never been out of the country.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is misinformed. My information is that in round figures 90 per cent of the men in the Medical Service have seen service overseas.

Pay and allowance for ex-soldiers and sailors undergoing medical treatment, $5,000,000; Vocational training, $3,500,000.

Mr. ROWELL: While the men are undergoing treatment they are entitled to pay and allowance, and that is the estimate of the amount required, having regard to the number who have been receiving treatment during the past year and the number that we anticipate will require treatment during the current year.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are sailors on the same basis as soldiers?

Mr. ROWELL: On the same basis.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That is, sailors in the Canadian Naval Service?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, those who suffered disability due to service are entitled to retraining or treatment.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many ex-soldiers and how many ex-sailors are now in the different hospitals?

Mr. ROWELL: 7,800 patients are now in the hospitals undergoing treatment for disability incurred on active service, 5,400 are receiving general treatment under the direction of medical and surgical experts, 1,800 are being treated in tuberculosis sanatoria, 600 mental cases are being treated.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does that include sailors?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes; I have not the division as between soldiers and sailors.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to know what is being done in my own province in regard to vocational training. Are many classes being taught, and in what lines?

Mr. ROWELL: In the province of Nova Scotia the department is conducting three schools itself, and it has arrangements with twelve other schools, and with forty-nine independent firms with whom certain soldiers are getting their industrial training, supplemented by a branch of this department. The particular institutions in the province of Nova Scotia, as of March 31, 1919, with which arrangements have been made for industrial retraining are as follows:

INSIDE SCHOOLS.

Institution.	Course.	No. Pupils.
Camp Hill M.H.	Barbering	2
	Shoe repairs	2
	Woodwork	15
	Con'l Education	13
	Telegraphy	16
	Dentistry	1
	Stationary engine	1
Nova Scotia Technical	Marine gas engine	5
	Auto Mechanics	40
	Drafting, M. and A.	17
	Structural design	1
	Janitors	2
	Elec'l engineer	31
	Steam engineer	7
	Mach. tool oper'n	23
	Oxy-Acetylene-Wdg.	5
	Shoe repairs	22
	Est'g Quan's & Surv.	3
	Painter and Decorator	1
Nova Scotia Sanatorium	Telegraphy	1
	Auto mechanics	3
	Woodwork	1
	Total	212

OUTSIDE SCHOOLS.

Nova Scotia Agric. College	Agriculture	23
	Poultry	1
Acadia Business College	Commercial	1
Acadia University	Applied Science	1
	Arts	2

OUTSIDE SCHOOLS—*Con.*

Institution.	Course.	No. Pupils.
Cen. School, Glace Bay	Mining	6
Charlottetown Business College	Commercial	1
County Academy, Halifax	Gen'l Educ'n	1
Dalhousie University	Medicine	2
Dom. Navigation School, Hal.	Navigation	2
King's College, Windsor	Theology	1
Maritime Bus. College, Hal.	Commercial	37
	Stenography	2
Maritime Bus. College, N.G.	Commercial	2
Maritime College of Halifax	Pharmacy	2
St. Dunstan's University, Char.	Commercial	2
Success Bus. Coll., Truro	Commercial	2
Union Comm'l Coll., Charlottetown	Commercial	6
	Total	94

SUMMARY.

Inside Schools	212
Outside "	94
Indust'l Est't.	49
Total	355

INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS.

Institution.	Course.	No. Pupils.
Amherst Pianos	Piano Finishing	1
Atlantic Cable Office	Telegraphy	3
Arthur, F. G.	Electrician	1
Can. Gov't. Ry	Freight Agent	1
Dom. Iron and Steel	Oxy-Acetylene-Wdg.	1
Dom. Coal Co.	Electrical	1
Donohue, Jas.	Sheet Metal Wk.	1
Graham's Ltd.	Vegetable Evapor'n.	1
Halifax Nautical Instr't.	Naut'l. Instr't. Reprs.	1
Hardy, S. H.	Harness Mkg.	1
Imperial Publishing	Printing	1
McNeil, D. A.	Barbering	1
MacAlpine, K.	Boat Building	1
Mack, G. E.	Watch and Clock Rep.	1
Maritime Teleg. and Tel. Co.	Cable Splicing	1
Mitchell & Schaffner	Sail Mkg.	1
Nova Scotia Co.	Cleaning and Pressing	1
N. S. Furnishing Co.	Upholstering	1
Phillips, G. & T.	Book-Binding	1
Phinney, N. H.	Piano Tuning	1
Phinney, N. H.	Piano Polishing	1
Rawding & Nile	Barbering	1
Redmond, D. P.	Barbering	1
Riggs, John	Barbering	1
Ross, A.	Tailoring	1
Ross, M.	Tailor's Cutter	1
Ross, M.	Garment Mkg.	1
Studley, J. B.	Barbering	1
Wamboldt, A. D.	Tinsmithing	1
Westchester Sta.	Telegraphy	1
Gates, Major H. E.	Drafting	1
MacInnes & Son	Carpentry	1
Port Hood Collierico	Mining Engineer	1
Roy Build'g. Const'n.	Electrical	2
Exide Storage Battery	Elec. Storage Batteries	1
Kelly, Ltd.	Leather Work	1
Purdy Bros.	Machine Tool Opr'n.	1
Northern Motor Wks.	Auto Painting	1
Acadia Coal Co.	Mining	1
Ureka Garage Co.	Auto Mechs.	1
Charlottetown Guardian	Linotypist	1
Herald and Mail, Halifax	Linotypist	1
Lampleur, H.	Woodwork	1
Windsor Carriage Co.	Auto Painting	1
Cape Breton Elec'c. Co.	Salesmanship	1
Hants Journal	Linotypist	1
	Total	49

Mr. McKENZIE: In my own town I know a young man who lost his sight, and after coming back from France he entered some school of vocational training in England—I forget its name.

Mr. ROWELL: Would it be St. Dunstan's?

Mr. McKENZIE: I think so. First he learned stenography and became an efficient stenographer—and I mention it as an extraordinary thing that a man totally blind could learn stenography—but he was a strong, active fellow and preferred manual work, so in the same college he took up a carpentry course, which he completed. On returning home the college authorities gave him two suits of clothes and $250 cash. I do not know what the arrangement is, but I thought it was a very excellent institution, and if we have more of such institutions we will be doing some good.

Mr. ROWELL: An arrangement was worked out between the department and St. Dunstan's Hostel in England for the training of blinded ex-members of the Canadian Forces. Further arrangements have now been made for the continuation of their training if necessary in Canadian institutions. The St. Dunstan's scheme of aftercare for the blind is being fostered in Canada from Pearson Hall at Toronto, called after Sir Arthur Pearson, the head of St. Dunstan's Hostel. What they have done for the blind is almost a miracle, and too great credit cannot be given to Sir Arthur Pearson. We are trying to follow his example here.

Progress reported.

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. 65, to incorporate The Northwest Route, Limited.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate), for the relief of Martha Campbell.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 90 (from the Senate), for the relief of Rosa Hirst.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of David Jamieson.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian North.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Davies.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Millman.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Irvine Tuck.—Mr. Wallace.

Bill No. 103 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wilmot Orley Wiles.—Mr. Ball.

Bill No. 108 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary King.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 109 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Herman Depper.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 110 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Rogers Latimer.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 112 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Pinkerton.—Mr. Mowat.

ATHABASCA AND GRANDE PRAIRIE RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 72, to incorporate the Athabasca and Grande Prairie Railway Company, and recommending that the title thereof be changed to "An Act to incorporate the Athabasca Grande Prairie and Fort Vermilion Railway Company."—Mr. Tweedie—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 9—line of railway authorized:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has a plan of this line been deposited with the Department of Railways?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: A very complete map was placed before the Committee and the fullest information submitted in regard to the whole subject. Senator Pope was present and gave a detailed explanation of the reasons why this charter was asked for. The matter was thoroughly investigated by the Committee.

Section agreed to.

On section 13—issue of securities for purposes other than railway.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What are the other purposes which this company have in mind?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I understand that the company have some 18,000 acres of coal lands in Alberta, not far from the Peace River district, and their intention is to build the line beyond the coal mines into the Peace River district for the purpose of distributing the coal. They have already paid into the Dominion Treasury about $125,000 in annual dues on these lands. The extent of the coal fields is reported to be very great and the quality

of the coal the very best. They have already expended about $250,000 and cannot proceed any further until this line of railway is constructed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is an interior line; it does not reach any seaport?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: It is an interior line. It does not parallel any other line; it is being built merely for distribution purposes. They connect with the National Transcontinental and the Canadian Pacific and distribute over a section of the Peace River district that at present has no railway facilities.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

JURISDICTION OF PROVINCIAL COURTS IN DIVORCE CASES.

In Committee on Private Bills:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some time ago I asked the Acting Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Meighen) if he was aware that a case was pending before the Privy Council in connection with the claim made by the provinces in the West that Provincial Courts had jurisdiction in matters of divorce.

I asked the Acting Minister of Justice if the Federal Department of Justice was represented. I notice that the case is being or has been argued before the Privy Council, and that the Dominion Government is not represented. This is a very important matter affecting a question of the highest importance and one in which the Dominion Government ought to have been represented.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not familiar with the circumstances connected with the case to which my hon. friend has drawn attention, and I am therefore, not able to state whether it is a case in which it is proper that the Dominion should be represented. I would suggest that the hon. member ask the question of the Acting Minister of Justice when he returns from Winnipeg.

DEPOSITS IN DIVORCE CASES.

In Committee on Private Bills:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wonder if all the deposits have been made in these cases. I noticed in the press the other day that a senator stated that the deposits were not always made. It is simply appalling to think of the number of divorces that have come before Parliament this year. I think there are more cases of divorce this year than there have been since Confederation.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry I have not the information respecting the matter.

Mr. CARVELL: These Bills have passed the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should like to know from the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee if he has ascertained that all the deposits required by law in these cases have been made.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Probably when the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee (Mr. Steele) is in the House, my hon. friend will ask him.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 114 (from the Senate) for the relief of Vernon Balm Bailey—Mr. McCurdy.

Bill No. 102 (from the Senate) for the relief of Simon John Fraser.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 111 (from the Senate) for the relief of Mary Ann Scheib.—Mr. Fripp.

DIVORCE.

On the motion of Mr. J. M. Douglas for the return to the Senate of the evidence taken in divorce cases:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am informed that the fees in these divorce cases are remitted. Of course in doing this we are facilitating the granting of divorces by the Parliament of Canada. I do not sit in the Committee when these cases come up because I do not recognize divorce, but as a public man and as a Canadian, I am appalled at the number of divorces Parliament is granting. There are more divorces during this session than since Confederation and that is a period of half a century. I had always thought that Canada was a British country, but we are being fast Americanized. In the United States there is one divorce for every twelve marriages. Ottawa is becoming the Reno of Canada as a result of the granting of innumerable divorces. I take the number of divorce Bills that we have passed this evening. Ten have received their third reading and five or six their second reading. Going on at this rate, it is evident that we are passing through a social revolution. The institution of the family on which society rests is passing through a crucial test indeed. I would certainly object to the remission of the fees in these cases.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply —Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Public Works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia, $201,330.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Does that mean that all these items go through in bulk?

The CHAIRMAN: Unless there is a special motion that we take the resolution up item by item. They are all included in one resolution.

Mr. McKENZIE moved:

That the resolution be considered item by item.

Motion agreed to.

Arisaig—repairs to wharf, $3,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: When will that work be done?

Hon. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): We will proceed with it just as soon as the money is available. Wherever it is possible, to prepare the plans and specifications they are being prepared and there will be some cases in connection with this list in which we have actually called for tenders before the money is voted, taking the ground that a vote of one-sixth of the Estimates is a justification for proceeding. We have found in the past, and I believe it has been the experience of all ministers and of the department generally that a great deal of time is lost by reason of waiting until the Estimates are all passed by the House. It takes some time to get these works under way and our intention is to have the work started at the earliest possible moment and to have it finished before cold weather comes on.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This work is very much needed. The wharf at Arisaig is in very bad condition. But if the Department of Public Works comes along in its usual leisurely way, I am afraid the work will be of very little use to the people during the present season. I would urge upon the minister the importance of having this matter attended to with as little delay as possible.

Mr. CARVELL: I appreciate that.

Boisdale—wharf, $1,800.

Mr. McKENIE: That is to replace a wharf that was there before?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, for repairs.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister intend calling for tenders?

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

East Bay Beach—wharf extension, $650.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is that the wharf at the head of the bay?

Mr. CARVELL: Beach Bay is off the Bras d'Or lake somewhere. My hon. friend ought to know the geography of it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I know the place very well. It used to be called the Head of the Bay.

Ecum Secum—completion of wharf, $1,700.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is meant by "completion?" That wharf was built not more than eight or ten years ago. I understand it is not in very good repair, and that this money is being voted for the purpose of putting the wharf in repair. Am I right in that?

Mr. CARVELL: This is for the building up of a crib 40 by 40 feet and 4 feet high, and also the building up of a crib 26 by 20 feet and 10 feet high, in order to complete the wharf which was constructed in 1914.

Gabarus—extension of beach protection, $1,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is that for a new work or is it to extend a section of Gabarus harbour?

Mr. CARVELL: This is to continue the pile protection work to the already existing wharf and for the protection of the harbour.

Mr. McKENZIE: Last fall, or a year ago last fall, there was a terrific gale that did a great deal of damage to public works in that district. Many claims or demands came to the department for repairs after the storm. I understand that there was considerable damage done to the wharf at Gabarus. This is probably for replacing or extending the work that was done before?

Mr. CARVELL: It is.

Livingstone's Cove—to repair and strengthen wharf, $4,600.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is to be done there?

Mr. CARVELL: This is to repair the damage caused by the severe storm of November, 1918. A cribwork block 65 feet long, 16 feet wide, and of an average depth of 16 feet, is to be constructed. The block will have a creosoted substructure.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What I said about Arisaig applies to these other places.

Mr. CARVELL: I can assure my hon. friend it applies to every public work for which I am asking an appropriation. I appreciate as much as anybody the necessity of getting to work early. I admit that we did not make as early a start last year as we should have done, and I am afraid that in many cases this year we shall not accomplish all we wish to do. Every week I demand from the engineering office a statement of the entire progress on all important works under the department; a statement also of the works for which tenders are being called; a statement of the works in respect of which we shall be able to call for tenders next week; and another statement showing the preparations. I find that demanding this information hurries things along. We must have about three or four dozen works now actually contracted for in different parts of the country for which the money has not yet actually been voted.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has the material been ordered for the work at Livingstone's Cove, and have any steps been taken in the construction of the wharf?

Mr. CARVELL: No. The difficulty is this: We are taking the ground that on any public work for which we can call for tenders we are justified in calling for tenders even before the Main Estimates are voted, but in respect of works which must be done by day labour, such as small repairs like this, we have to have the money voted before we can pay the bills.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: We voted one-sixth part of the Estimates some two months ago. That would surely enable the minister to take some action in preparing for the work this summer. At least, he could have contracted for the material. I presume that in nearly all these cases the work will have to be done by day labour because you cannot very well contract for these repairs. Consequently, it is of the greatest importance that material should be ordered as early in the season as possible. This is one of the worst seasons of the year in which to obtain material in that locality, because the farmers are all busy and no one can be got to do that kind of work, whereas a month or two ago they would have been very glad of the opportunity of taking out some timber and getting ready for the season's work. But that time has passed, and there is no help for it. All I will say is that it is not the way we would like the business to be done. There is very urgent need of the repairs to Malignant Cove, which is the next item, and the deputy minister was kind enough to tell me that he would do something towards having those repairs made. The top of the wharf has been carried off and landed in a field some distance away, where some farmer rescued it. The planks are there and it is very important that the repairs should be made because a ship discharges there and the wharf is required for the goods. Has the minister had any word from the locality about what is being done there?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I do not think any word has come back. But positive instructions were given to the engineer to proceed with the work at once. As to the other wharf my hon. friend referred to, I cannot say that instructions have been given to procure materials for this particular work, but we have already made arrangements for a large amount of material in all parts of Canada in order to be ready to start work as soon as the money is available.

Neil's Harbour—repairs to breakwater wharf, $1,100.

Mr. McKENZIE: This wharf is also a breakwater. Neil's Harbour is a fishing village of considerable importance, and before the breakwater was constructed the fishermen did not have very much shelter for their boats, and consequently had to haul their boats up every night and launch them next morning. Since the breakwater was constructed they have been able to anchor inside, and this convenience has brought quite a number of new settlers to Neil's Harbour. In the terrific storm last year the breakwater was pretty badly battered, and I presume the minister has received a report on the damage done.

Mr. CARVELL: The damage was caused in the terrific gale of November 4, 1918. The estimated cost of the repairs is $1,100, covering round timber, guard rails, facetimbers, sheathing, covering, fenders, ballast, etc.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope that $1,100 will be enough to restore the breakwater to its former condition. But as soon as possible the minister should have the breakwater extended for about its present length. The shelter afforded by the present breakwater is not very great, and on account of the number of boats—and larger boats are coming there for shelter—there is not sufficient space for all behind the breakwater, and the request of the fishermen for some years back has been that the breakwater should be extended so as to give them more room. I can assure the minister that it is not

throwing money away to increase the fishing facilities along the coast of Nova Scotia. It is quite unnecessary to point out what a splendid food is the fish these fishermen catch, and how important it is they should have the opportunity of taking this harvest of the sea where there is an abundance of it; but it is impossible to reap the harvest unless facilities of this kind are put at the disposal of the fishermen. I keenly realize that money is scarce and hard to get—I must say, however, that large votes are being taken which I think could have been postponed for the present—and in view of the financial condition of the country I have not the appetite, shall I say, to press very hard for an expenditure at the present moment, but I trust that when our finances are in a little better shape this breakwater will be extended.

I would like the minister to bear in mind that we had in the Estimates of 1911-12 large votes for works in various parts of the Dominion—considerable of which was in the county that I represent. The Minister of Public Works of that time, Hon. Mr. Rogers, always told us that as soon as the war was over and conditions got better the works so provided for would be the first to receive the attention of the Government. Carrying out that idea, if the minister will look back to what was in the Estimates in 1911-12 after the change of Government, he will see that a great many of the works have been dropped. I cannot put my finger on the page of Hansard where that promise was made, but it was made repeatedly, that before the Government undertook anything new in the line of public works the old programme would be carried out. If the old programme were carried out in regard to my own county I would be very well satisfied, for facilities would be afforded to the fishermen along the eastern coast of the counties of Victoria and Cape Breton that would be of very great benefit indeed. And those facilities would not be altogether for the benefit of the local fishermen. Boats come from all parts of Nova Scotia to the fishing grounds off the coast, and safe anchorage is just as necessary for them as for the local boats. I have said on several occasions, and I repeat it now, that no other industry in Canada to-day holds out such prospect of profitable development as the fisheries both of the Atlantic and the Pacific coast, and I would impress upon the minister and the Government the opportunity which presents itself to them to make a record in connection with the development and proper handling of that great industry.

Port Hood—wharf repairs and extension, $7,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What repairs were done at Port Hood?

Mr. CARVELL: This is to repair the present work and to construct a new block 20 by 100 feet on the southern end of the block constructed during 1914-15. It is estimated that the cost will be $7,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: This wharf has an exposed location which renders it essential that the work should be done as soon as possible. As to the importance of the wharf I need say nothing, for it is the only wharf along that shore, and quite a trade is carried on there. Unless the work is done early in the summer it cannot be undertaken at all.

Mr. CARVELL: This work will be pushed forward just as rapidly as possible.

Saw Pit—wharf improvements, $1,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is something new. We have heard about a mere sawdust wharf; this is Saw Pit wharf?

Mr. CARVELL: It is in Lunenburg county, but it is not a sawdust wharf.

Mr. DUFF: There are two Saw Pit wharves in Nova Scotia. I am not sure if this is in Lunenburg county or not—I hope it is.

Mr. CARVELL: This is in Lunenburg county. It is only worth $1,000. It might be built partly of sawdust—I am not sure.

Scotch Cove (White Point)—breakwater extension, $8,400.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a White Point in my county, but I do not think this is my White Point.

Mr. FIELDING: It is in Queens county, I hope.

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is in North Cape Breton. It is for the purpose of extending the present breakwater. The contract is for an extension, 50 feet long by 30 feet wide, to the present breakwater which was originally built at a cost of $28,934.

9 p.m.

Mr. McKENZIE: This extension is just exactly the improvement that I was praying for at Neil's Harbour, but we have reason to be thankful that we are getting this extension. White Point would be a better name for the place than Scotch Cove. It may be called Scotch Cove, but not to

my knowledge. I think when the wharf was built it was called White Point wharf.

Yarmouth Bar—repairs and improvements, $4,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have directed the attention of the department to the need of repairs to the wharf at Baddeck. There are breaks in the sides and at the ends; the ballast is running out, and the condition of the wharf is getting bad very rapidly. There is much tourist travel at that point in the summer season, and we take pride in the good appearance of our wharves and landing-places. The repairs required are not very extensive, and I hope the minister will do what is necessary to put this wharf in good shape.

Mr. CARVELL: That is under consideration.

Mr. FIELDING: These Estimates were prepared, I assume, some months ago, and since their preparation the minister has no doubt received from his officials information which will be very useful in the preparation of the Supplementary Estimates. I take it for granted that in urgent cases brought to the minister's attention by his own engineers, provision will be made for such works as may be necessary. At all events, we may be permitted to hope so.

Mr. CARVELL: If I provided in the Supplementary Estimates for all works that have been suggested by engineers and interested parties the amount would stagger my hon. friend, who for many years was the watch-dog of the Treasury. These small works, which are constructed chiefly of wood, are naturally subject to the wear and tear of the elements, and during the war they have probably not been taken care of as they should have been. A series of storms last autumn caused damage along the Atlantic coast which will probably run into half a million dollars. In many cases we were unable to have accurate surveys made at the time these Estimates were prepared, and my hon. friend is right in saying that we have much information to-day which we did not have then. I am afraid, therefore, that additional amounts will have to be voted in the Supplementary Estimates in respect of many of the items in the Main Estimates.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: A work in my constituency that is in very much need of attention is the breakwater at New Harbour. This breakwater was built ten or twelve years ago—perhaps more than that—but it was never finished and it is not sufficiently long to protect all the fishing boats. Before the breakwater was built, the fishermen there had to pull their boats upon the beach and sometimes sit up all night to look after them in case of a storm. After the construction of the breakwater a certain number of boats were able to find shelter behind it, and a flourishing village has grown up at that place, where a large fishing business is carried on. But the breakwater is not long enough to protect all the boats that operate in that harbour; when a storm comes some of them are unable to crowd in behind the breakwater. In 1911 the Government of that day voted $10,000 to complete this breakwater by extending it some 300 feet or more out into the harbour. The vote was carried along for one or two years after the change of Government and then it was dropped, with the promise that it would be restored. But time has passed and nothing has been done. I have not been asking for anything in my constituency during the war, because I wanted to assist the Government in saving as much money as possible. As a matter of fact, there is only one small item in these estimates for the county of Guysborough. That is for $1,700 for repairs to one wharf. There are 150 miles of coast line in Guysborough county. That county is also one of the greatest fishing counties in Nova Scotia. I wish to say that the case of New Harbour is a very urgent one. I see that $60,000 is appropriated for harbours and rivers generally in Nova Scotia. I do not know whether the minister could find the money in that vote for this work at New Harbour, but I do know that nowhere along the coast of that province is a work more needed than it is at that place. I would urge the minister and his staff to do something in the matter and provide shelter for the fishing boats and greatly assist production in that locality. No expenditure anywhere in Canada has produced better results than have come about through the construction of the breakwater in that harbour, but unless we complete it, sufficient protection for the fishermen who do business there will not be afforded. I leave the matter in the hands of the minister, and would urge him to give it special attention.

Another matter has been drawn to my attention, a very important one, about which nothing has been done. At Wine Harbour, further west on the Atlantic coast, a storm filled up the channel. The boats could not get in or out of the harbour, and the cellars in the village were flooded with water. When the people asked the

Public Works Department to do something about it, they got the reply that the department had nothing to do with it; that it was purely a muncipal affair. But it was the closing of the mouth of the harbour by the storm that caused the trouble in the village. While the department is not responsible for keeping water out of cellars it is part of its duty to keep the harbour open. A very small amount of hand dredging would have done the work. There was no municipal authority to attend to it and it has not been done. I submit, with all seriousness, that it is really the duty of the Public Works Department to open up that harbour with as little delay as possible. Will the minister do it?

Mr. CARVELL: I have heard of the latter case; it was brought to my attention some time ago. I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the Public Works Department was responsible for the storm. My hon. friend might have a logical reason for asking the department to dredge out the sand and gravel that have been deposited by the storm, but I do not think that we can be held responsible for the flooding of cellars. As to the other matter, this is the first I have heard of it. Although this work is well known in the department, the particular matter mentioned by my hon. friend has not been brought to my personal attention. I shall be happy to give it the best consideration that I can. I would not like to say that it will be provided for out of the general vote of $60,000; it has been the experience of the department that these general votes are always required to take care of ordinary matters that come up during the year. A storm arises and a wharf or a breakwater is damaged to some extent, and it has to be repaired immediately. But if it be at all possible, I will endeavour to see if we cannot build the extension asked for by my hon. friend.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $14,000.

Mr. McISAAC: Under this item I should like to ask the minister regarding a couple of public works which are very necessary and to which I have already directed his attention. One is the projected boat harbour at North lake, in King's county. The minister has before him all the data concerning this work and is also advised of the reasons why it is so necessary. What a haven it would be for fishing boats along the coast, because there is no other place within twenty-five miles where they can enter for shelter. These are excellent fishing grounds. This public work was projected before the war, and tenders were called for, but in consequence of the outbreak of the war the matter was dropped. Since then nature has done something to our advantage; it has changed the outlet of the lake, and under present conditions it will not require more than about one-third of what it would have originally cost to construct this work. In addition to this, if the harbour is built and solid side walls constructed, it would afford the provincial government an opportunity of building a bridge across the outlet, which would be of great convenience to the people, shortening their travel in that section. I sincerely trust the minister will be able to bring down in his Supplementary Estimates an amount sufficient for this public work so extremely necessary, and which I have been endeavouring to get for the last two or three years.

I have also called the minister's attention to the necessity for a small wharf at a point on a little island called Boughton island, on which there are some eighteen or twenty farmers who are great producers, but who have no means of getting the products of their farms—and they are good farmers—to Prince Edward Island, which for them is the mainland, across a small strait, except in dories. The provincial government have projected a highway right across the centre of the island down to tide-water, and if such a wharf as desired could be built, at which large gasoline boats could be loaded, it would be of the greatest possible convenience to these people who are so isolated, and would enable them to carry their products to the mainland. If the minister would be able to bring down in his Supplementary Estimates amounts to cover these two items of necessary public expenditure it would be deemed a great favour and would be of the greatest possible convenience to the people to be served thereby.

Mr. CARVELL: I want to assure the constituents of my hon. friend that if they do not get these works it will not be because their representative has not done his duty.

Quebec—Gross Isle quarantine station, extension of wharves, $50,000.

Mr. PARENT: Has a contract been given for this work?

Mr. CARVELL: No. The plans are practically completed now and we are about to call for tenders.

Isle Verte—repairs to wharf.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Isle Verte is on the south side, but opposite Isle Verte there is

Green Island, and I regret to see that there is not a sum sufficient to finish or extend even one work there. The residents of this place are not wealthy. It is very difficult for them to send their products to Quebec, and the river is their only means of transport. A few years ago they started two wharves, one at the upper and the other at the lower end of the island. The one at the upper end is not completed, and the lower one, opposite Isle Verte, should be extended so as to enable the biggest schooner to reach the wharf. These people exported last year over 24,000 bushels of potatoes to Quebec, and apart from the fish they catch, this is all they have to live on. I should like the minister to take a note of this matter with a view to seeing if there is a possibility of having an extension built on the lower wharf, the cost of which will only be a few hundred dollars.

Mr. CARVELL: This is the first time this matter has been brought to my attention as far as I can remember. I shall certainly take a note of the matter and have an investigation made.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I was sorry to see that sufficient work had not been done at Isle Verte, but I must say that I was pleased that nothing had been done at Cacouna East. I would like to know if the report is true that some money is to be expended on the wharf at Cacouna East. I do not want to take up the time of the committee in speaking about that small wharf, but I think it is a useless wharf and an expenditure of money on it will be unnecessary. I understand that $100 is to be spent on it this summer.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no personal knowledge of the matter but will be glad to make an investigation. Only yesterday the hon. gentleman spoke to me about it and I have not had time to consider the subject. The amount is very small, but if as he says it is unnecessary to spend the money the expenditure ought not to be made.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Only two years ago an expenditure was made merely for the purpose of erecting a fence on each side of the approach to the wharf, and if the minister were acquainted with the locality he would know that the money was uselessly spent. The municipal road skirts the shore and the farmers reside south of the road. The road is free and there is no necessity whatever for a fence because there are no cattle to trespass. It is a very easy matter to have petitions signed. I know that the resident engineer is anxious to convince the minister that the wharf was a necessity, but unfortunately the member wants to impress on the minister that it is not, and that in fact that the wharf is useless. It is a contest between the member and the resident engineer, who, however, by some means or other succeeded in having a petition signed by about a hundred persons. I am told that even merchants six or seven miles down in Isle Verte signed the petition insisting on the necessity of a wharf at Cacouna East. It is all very well to have a hundred signatures to a petition, and I am not opposed to the expenditure of money in my riding when I am convinced that there is a real necessity for it, but when I see $100 spent for nothing, just to please an individual I must enter a protest, and accordingly I call the minister's attention to the matter.

Mr. CARVELL: If the facts are as stated by the member the money will not be expended. I will see that an investigation is made immediately.

St. Laurent, Island of Orleans—Repairs to wharf, $15,000.

Mr. PARENT: With regard to the wharf on the Island of Orleans this item is rather large but I suppose it is due to the storm that occurred last fall destroying the wharf. I understand that the policy generally followed by the department is that when an amount is voted exceeding $5,000 the work must be given by contract and tenders called for. But I would urge upon the minister, owing to the wharf having been practically destroyed, the necessity of having the works started at once and not waiting until tenders are called for. The same remark applies to the wharf at St. Jean, which has suffered from the same storm and is in about the same condition.

St. Anne de Beaupré—Wharf repairs and reconstruction, $39,000.

Mr. CARVELL: As regards the item under discussion—Ste. Anne de Beaupré—over a week ago special orders were given for the construction of a temporary landing place with a plank walk leading to the shore and it is our hope that the work will be all completed inside of two weeks from to-day or to-morrow at the outside. We realized that if this work was to be of use this year it must be done immediately because of the immense traffic that takes place there in the month of June. A temporary landing will therefore be ready inside of two weeks

and that will enable us to properly prepare plans and we expect to call for tenders and have the work completed during the summer.

Ste. Famille—wharf repairs and reconstruction, $17,000.

Mr. FOURNIER: Is there anything provided in the Estimates for a wharf at St. Valerie in Bellechasse county? The wharf there was destroyed last fall.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot state to my hon. friend what may appear in the Supplementary Estimates. I can only say that it has been put up to me in the most forcible manner possible by my hon. friend. And, as I told my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. McIsaac) it will not be the fault of the hon. member (Mr. Fournier) if his constituency does not receive the improvement he asks.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I want to say a word about the titles to land taken for wharves. Perhaps the minister is aware that application has been made for a petition of right by the Seigneur, Mr. Fraser, of Rivière du Loup, against the Government on the pretext that the land and everything else in his seigneury belongs to him, even the fish in the river; the farmers are not allowed to fish. The seigneur does not allow the farmers to take the sand but charges them ten cents for every load they take to put upon the road. Those representing the seigneury have petitioned the Government under the pretext that the Government must pay them either a yearly rental or a certain purchase price for the whole property. I see that the minister has an able lawyer in his department. I have to congratulate him upon that, because we do not want the case to be in the hands of lawyers named by the Department of Justice; I have not much confidence in that quarter. A lawyer has already been named by the Minister of Justice to attend to that very case, but what has the Department of Justice to do with a case which properly belongs to the Department of Public Works? I want the minister to take note of that. If a petition of right is granted and the case goes to court let him have a lawyer to study the case, let him come to Rivière du Loup, look over the matter and see that justice is done to whom justice is due. If the minister wants to come and see for himself he will be welcome.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do not go on Sunday.

Mr. CARVELL: I will not go on Sunday to Rivière du Loup.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. GAUVREAU: No minister will denounce you from the pulpit. I am quite satisfied that the minister is right when he tells me that nothing will be spent at Cacouna East. I think his intentions are good but I would like to know if, in his absence—I will not say behind his back—there is any means by which the deputy minister or the chief engineer, or some other official, where only a small amount is involved, can write to the resident engineer and say: "Spend such and such a sum of money on such and such a work," this money being taken out of the vote for harbours and rivers.

Harbours and rivers, generally, repairs and improvements, $75,000.

Can this be done without the knowledge of the minister?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, some little matters of that kind can be done without the knowledge of the minister, although there has not been very much money expended in the last year and a half by the Public Works Department that the minister has not had personal knowledge of. I assure my hon. friend that if I live until Monday morning I will see that a pretty rigid investigation is made into the matter he has referred to. If the facts are as he has stated, there will not be any money expended there this year. As to the other matter, I am quite familiar with these points involved in connection with one big seigneury down on the lower St. Lawrence. The point is one of such importance that it should be decided by the court according to the law and facts of the case. I think my hon. friend is perhaps a little severe on the Department of Justice. It has been rather an unbusinesslike arrangement that has been carried on ever since Confederation by which matters are handed over to the Justice Department by the different departments requiring legal advice. That is all right if you want simply a decision upon an abstract principle of law, but unfortunately the custom has been for many years that where there was litigation the matter was handed over to a local solicitor who might be subject to all sorts of local influences, and he was the Department of Justice, representing the Dominion of Canada. I have tried to adopt a different course. I have secured the services of a man in whom I have absolute confidence, a lawyer who has had very great experience in arbitration and expropriation cases. The Department of Justice was consulted before the appointment was made and gave its hearty assent and is loyally working in conjunction with the solicitor of the

Department of Public Works in all these matters, the one referred to by the hon. gentleman included. It is being looked after by the solicitor of the Department of Public Works in connection with the Department of Justice, because, while we have no legal right to go into court and take charge of this case, we do have the right to take a very active part in the preparation of the case, and we will be there and see that it is properly put before the court.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is this very interesting law point? Is it about land?

Mr. CARVELL: The point is whether the seigneurs have the ownership in the sites of all the wharves down the river St. Lawrence which are located upon the seigneuries. A sort of test case is being raised at Riviere du Loup.

Mr. GAUVREAU: The pretext of the seigneurs is that they are the owners of the land down to low tide, and they claim that you have no right to place the wharf there unless you pay a certain amount to them.

Mr. CARVELL: That we are practically trespassers in very many cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am surprised that that point has not been settled. When I was Solicitor General the case came before the department. The Seigneur of Riviere du Loup claimed that he was the sole proprietor of the seaweed. People from time immemorial had gathered the seaweed in summer time but he claimed that, under his title, the people could not take the seaweed. I had a commission appointed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries and, if I remember correctly, the commission decided that it was not a weed, but an animal; it even had claws, and therefore the seigneur, Mr. Fraser, could not claim to be entitled to the seaweed. That was the decision given by Professor Prince after consultation with another authority on fish. It would be a very easy thing for the department to determine whether the seigneur can claim the shore as his property; his rights must be well defined in the title. We had a similar case in Gaspé around Grande River. We had the case tested, and the preposterous claims of the seignieur were set aside by the Privy Council, and the people were given the right to use the shore.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The case is not the same in all the seigneuries. In the case at Rivière du Loup the title given by the King of France was to certain land along the river St. Lawrence with the shore and shelter in front of that land. In other seigneuries, title is given only as far as the river, and does not include the shore. I do not think the seigneurs have any right to claim compensation for the land on which a wharf is built, because in all the titles navigation rights are excepted. Of course, wharves are built for navigation purposes, and surely the rights of the public are paramount to those of the seigneurs. I do not think the Government would have any difficulty in winning these cases.

Mr. CARVELL: That is the point at issue. I have not studied it closely, but I know generally what the situation is. The case is under preparation by the department to be tested out in the courts, and when the case is decided we shall know what the court says, at all events. I am afraid the decision of Professor Prince is not of very much assistance to us when a wharf is in question, because while a wharf may have claws to fasten it to the ground, it could hardly be construed as an animal.

Harbours and rivers—Ontario—Pembroke—repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: I would draw the minister's attention to the exceptionally dangerous condition of this wharf. Six large boats use it, and I would not take the price of any one of them to go on that wharf at night, it is so exceedingly dangerous. I trust that within a very few days after the passing of this item something will be done to improve the condition of the wharf.

Mr. CARVELL: We are now preparing plans and specifications for every work which can be done by tender and contract, and we have already called for tenders in a great many cases. I presume the work at Pembroke will have to be done by day labour and in the case of all small repairs of this kind we intend to start work just as soon as the item is passed and finish up the work before August or September. I can assure my hon. friend that we will be at work on this wharf within a few days.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: The work required is patching the surface.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I presume the minister's remarks apply also in the case of the wharf at Cornwall.

Mr. CARVELL: My remarks apply to every public work for which we are asking an appropriation.

Dredging—Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, $45,000.

Mr. PARENT: With regard to this item, perhaps the minister may think that we are quite persistent in our request for certain works on the River St. Charles, in the province of Quebec. It just occurs to me that if the works cannot be proceeded with in connection with the building of the dam, perhaps we could find some means of dredging the river so as to accomplish what the people are so anxious to have done. In looking over Hansard recently I read the statement made by the minister on the 13th of May to the effect that if the works on the St. Charles river had not been proceeded with it was due to the fact that that part of the contract under which the city of Quebec was to take care of the sewage was never performed. Here is what my hon. friend said:

> The sewage of at least three-quarters of the city of Quebec enters into the St. Charles river above the location of this dam and before the work was started an agreement was made with the city of Quebec by which they were to provide for the sewage.

My information is that the contract did not contain any such agreement. What it did contain was an agreement on the part of the city not to ask the Government to pay any of the expenses that might be incurred by reason of any change in the sewerage of the city. It was not a condition that completion of the works was to be dependent upon the sewage being taken care of by the city. All the department has to do is to go ahead with the works, and it will be then for the city of Quebec to attend to their sewage, if it is found necessary to do so.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend has correctly interpreted my words, and if I put his version of the contract along side of mine, I do not think there will be very much difference between us. He may be using the exact words of the agreement, and I may be paraphrasing them. There is no doubt there was an agreement or understanding with the city of Quebec that they should provide for the sewage. It is quite true we might go on and spend another $2,000,000—it will take that much to finish the works—and then when we had expended that much and waited for three months and found we had a cesspool there causing typhoid fever and other diseases, we would have to say: "We have got to take out these works in order that the city may put in its sewerage." That is not good business. I would very much like to go on with this work. In July last I had some correspondence with the mayor of Quebec. I called his attention to the fact that the city had not carried out their part of the agreement, and intimated that I did not see how we could go along until some provision was made to take care of the sewage. I think my hon. friend, with his intimate knowledge of the location, is sufficient of an engineer to know exactly what could happen in three or four months' time with the small amount of water coming down the St. Charles river, if we built that dam and made a pond behind it. Much as I would like to proceed with the work, I do not see how we could go on with it until something is done by the city. If they would make arrangements to do the work we might start simultaneously. But until something is done by which we
10 p.m. are assured that the city will carry out their part of the agreement, I do not think we would be justified in doing anything further.

As to the dredging, I do not think my hon. friend is serious. Unfortunaetly no money can be expended by the Public Works Department which gives so little labour, considering the amount of money expended, as on dredging. Dredging is practically a machine proposition, and very few men are needed to operate a very extensive dredge. Then, on the other hand, if you are going on with the dam proposition and raise the water fifteen feet, you do not need very much dredging, because then you create an artificial lake with fifteen feet more water in it than there is at the present time. So I think my hon. friend, when he thinks it over, will see that it would not be a good business proposition to proceed with these works until some arrangement is come to with the city of Quebec.

Mr. PARENT: It will take a certain time before the works are finished. In the meantime, if the Government does proceed with the work it could get into communication with the city.

Mr. CARVELL: I would rather make an arrangement first.

Mr. PARENT: The contract says plainly that the Government will first start the work, and when it is finished the city will attend to its part of the contract. That is the way I understand the terms of the contract. But I understand that my hon. friend is afraid of typhoid and other diseases resulting from the completion of

the dam. I would remind him that there is not only a dam to be erected, but locks also, and when the works are finished it would be very easy to prevent typhoid by opening the locks and letting the river flow through as before. I call my hon. friend's attention specially to this, that an enormous amount of money has been spent on these works, and they are deteriorating while in an incomplete state, so that a lot of money is being lost in that way. If proceeded with I think the country should win out in the end.

Mr. McKENZIE: Some years ago certain dredging was done at the mouth of the Little Bras d'Or harbour. I think I brought it to the notice of the minister last year. I do not know whether anything was done to complete the work after we discussed the matter in the House?

Mr. CARVELL: I think nothing was done.

Mr. McKENZIE: A good deal of money was spent there some years ago with very excellent results, making a splendid harbour and a good channel to the mouth of the Bras d'Or—creating a new harbour practically. The harbour was there, but there was a bar across the mouth of it. That bar was partly removed and a depth of about twenty-two feet of water obtained. But there are patches here and there that were not cleaned out, and in that way of course the channel is dangerous. The amount of work left undone is comparatively small.

In connection with that I would like to call the attention of the minister to the following. A delegation from North Sydney, consisting of the mayor of that town and Dr. McLean, waited on the minister some six weeks ago in connection with a relatively small amount of dredging at Sydney. I have not heard whether or not anything was done; the only difficulty was the obtaining of a proper dredge to do the work.

Mr. CARVELL: Last year our whole plan was disorganized by the loss of the dredge Cape Breton. Moreover, we had a dredge that was to do some of this work along the coast and then proceed to Yarmouth, but the demand came for the construction of the hydroplane station at North Sydney and the dredge was taken there and remained there during the latter part of the season. There is a dredge now in New Brunswick; it is fitted up and ready to start on Monday morning to do some of this work. It is to go to Sydney and Bras d'Or and also to North Sydney. It is our intention, unless something happens that we cannot foresee, to carry out during the present summer all the work to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where is the dredge that was working at North Sydney in connection with the hydroplane station? Is it still there?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, but that is a suction dredge; the work referred to by my hon. friend must be done by a dipper dredge. There is no dipper dredge in that locality, but one will go down there some time in the early summer.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Is anything in contemplation with regard to dredging at Little Current? It is anticipated that 150,000 tons of coal will go into Little Current during this season, but because of the condition of the channel only small boats can go to the wharf. Light-draft boats going into the upper lakes with coal cannot carry back large cargoes, and if such boats must be used the difficulty with regard to getting tonnage will be increased.

Mr. CARVELL: We have no dredge on the lakes that would be available for the work at Little Current. This matter was brought to my attention a number of times last year. But there is another work at Little Current which I think we must go on with. A very serious fire occurred there some months ago and the wharves were burned down. While I cannot make any positive announcement, I feel that something must be done at once, and quite a large expenditure will be involved. Whether it will be possible to carry on both works at that important point this summer I am not sure, but one or the other will be proceeded with. The matter that my hon. friend has directed attention to will certainly be discussed when the Supplementary Estimates are being prepared.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would not like the minister to feel that I suggest for a moment that the dredging should have precedence over the re-construction of the wharf, because the wharf is a vital necessity; they cannot get along without it.

Roads and bridges, $309,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Speaking generally, bridges are supposed to be controlled by local governments, but there seem to be exceptions. Perhaps the minister could give in each case, very briefly, an explanation of how these expenditures on bridges come to be chargeable to the Dominion.

Mr. CARVELL: The first item is the Banff bridge. Banff, as my hon. friend is aware, is in a Dominion reservation known as the National Park, all public buildings in which are under the purview of the Dominion Parliament. I personally inspected the Banff bridge; it really must be attended to. It is an ordinary light steel bridge which was probably quite sufficient for the traffic when it was constructed twenty-five years ago, but which is entirely inadequate now. There is a tremendous tourist traffic over this bridge in summer. We are asking for $100,000, but that will not be sufficient to build the new bridge. There has been a good deal of discussion about the character of the proposed bridge. The people are very anxious that it shall be built along certain artistic lines. They want an arch bridge instead of a steel bridge, and they are desirous that it shall be in keeping with the rest of the works around that important centre—the Canadian Pacific hotel at Banff, and other public buildings. After investigating their request carefully we found that the granting of it would involve a very large expenditure. We had designed an ordinary steel bridge. The engineers are now working on a sort of combination steel and concrete arch bridge which will meet the traffic requirements and at the same time comply with the wishes of the people of that vicinity. The Canmore bridge is also in the National Park.

The next item is a contribution by the Dominion of $7,000 for repairs to the Capilano river bridge. The Capilano river flows into Burrard Inlet and is west of the Indian reserve. I am just a little doubtful whether we have overstepped the mark or not in this vote, but I did not make the grant without personally inspecting the bridge. It seems that some dredging was done by the department two or three years ago at the head of Capilano river, and the contention is that this dredging so changed the channel of the river that it undermined the piers of a fine bridge that had been erected by the municipality on the route of a very important highway. One marvels sometimes, when he sees the splendid public works that have been built out in the country in these western districts, at the faith which the people there possess. I feel that I would hesitate before I would spend the large amount of money which has been spent in that part of the country on such works. They, however, did it, and one of the piers of this bridge was washed away. It was contended by the engineers—and from what little knowledge and experience I had in looking it over I agreed with them—that the damage resulted to a certain extent from our works. The proposition was then made that we divide the cost between the Dominion and the province and the municipality, and an agreement was entered into; in fact, I think the bridge has been constructed, and this item appears in the Estimates to cover it.

Mr. CROWE: I understood that the repairs of the Capilano bridge would cost something around $30,000; that the municipality and the provincial government offered to contribute some $10,000 or $11,000 each, and that the Federal Government was going to contribute $10,000 or $11,000. The amount of $7,000 will not be enough to contribute one-third of the cost of the repairs.

Mr. CARVELL: The next item is "Edmonton—repairs to bridge." This is a small amount of $1,200. It seems that many years ago the Dominion Government built the low-level bridge across the Saskatchewan river at Edmonton, and this is to take care of certain repairs.

The next item is $2,500 for the interprovincial bridge at Matapedia, for the purpose of putting a new plank roadway over the bridge. It was under contract; the contract was not let until the last year, and as the contractors contended that owing to great difficulty in getting labour, they could not do the work within the prescribed period, we gave them the right to extend the contract to the first of June. I am not sure that the work is not finished by this time.

The next item is for a new bridge between Ottawa and Hull to replace the present Union bridge over the Ottawa river below the Chaudière, $120,000. There happen around Ottawa many things which demand the expenditure of public money, but which would not, of course, be tolerated for a moment in any other part of Canada, and this is one of them. I do not know how this came about, but many years ago the Dominion Government built a bridge across the Ottawa river below the falls. It was perfectly good for all the traffic existing at the time, but the people of Ottawa and Hull wanted an electric railway, and they promptly put an electric railway across the bridge and then they came back and said: This bridge is not sufficient to carry the railway; you build a new bridge for us. This seemed a peculiar proposition. I know if I had asked for anything of that kind in New Brunswick, I would have been told

I was absolutely crazy, and I think I would have been. I refused to pay the total expense of building this bridge, and the result was that we entered into negotiations with the provinces of Quebec and Ontario and they agreed to pay $40,000 each, and the Dominion is to pay the balance. I believe our proportion will amount to just about $40,000. I think this bridge is under contract now for $110,000, and there will, of course, be some extras, which will bring the cost up practically to $40,000 each, and in that way a bridge which will be sufficiently strong to carry the traffic will be built.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it necessary for us to vote the whole amount?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, it will take the whole amount. We make the contract with the Dominion Bridge company, and then we receive the reimbursement of $80,000, or $40,000 each from Quebec and Ontario, so that we have to vote the whole amount in order to carry out our contract with the bridge company.

The next item is for a bridge at North Timiskaming. This is a bridge not over an interprovincial river, but over a river within less than half a mile of the boundary line, so that it is practically across an interprovincial river. I am sure that it was so nearly an interprovincial river that it was felt proper that the Dominion Government should share the expense. This item is to provide for the superstructure and some small repairs to the substructure. In this case the province of Quebec pays $15,000. Tenders were called for, and a contract was let some time ago at somewhere around $75,000 or $80,000, and the bridge will be finished in a very short time.

The next item of $7,000 is to take care of the approaches to bridges in the city of Ottawa. It is wonderful what people do around here, but the custom has become so long established that it has practically become law, and I suppose we must carry it out.

The next item is for repairs to bridges at Portage du Fort, also up the Ottawa river, and then there is a small amount for improvement to the river road at St. Andrews, Manitoba.

Mr. PROULX: I am sorry I do not see in these Estimates any amount for the construction of a bridge between Hawkesbury and Grenville. The construction of that bridge had been decided upon before the war; in fact, tenders had been called for and an Order in Council passed awarding a contract to the lowest tenderer, but war was declared almost immediately and so the work was suspended. I had hoped that the work would be resumed after the war, but I do not see any amount in the Estimates. I hope it will be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is quite right that tenders were called for and an Order in Council was passed, but I do not think the contract was signed. It was just a week or two before or practically at the time that war was declared, and the matter was allowed to drop. When I came into the department, of course, the matter had practically ceased to exist. I have not included this in the Estimates for this year for the very good reason that I thought we should wait until the highway policy of the Dominion and the provinces was settled, because I do not think we would be justified in erecting a bridge costing, I suppose, $500,000 or more, across the Ottawa river until we know exactly whether it will form part of the general highway from Montreal to Ottawa. Personally, I feel very strongly on this question, and I should like to see a beautiful highway extending from Montreal to Ottawa. To my mind it is incomprehensible that the capital of Canada is absolutely cut off as regards automobile traffic, from the rest of the world. A man would require tremendous courage who endeavoured to get out of Ottawa in an automobile.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: It cannot be done.

Mr. CARVELL: I agree with my hon. friend. If the railway employees strike, we should have to use aeroplanes because we cannot get out of Ottawa by automobile. I should like to see a highway built from Ottawa to Montreal, and a highway from Ottawa to the St. Lawrence river, so that we could get over to the United States and west. Until, however, the question is settled, we should hesitate to decide whether a bridge should be built at Hawkesbury or Vaudreuil. I do not want the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) to think I am endeavouring to take the bridge away from Hawkesbury, but we should wait to see where the highway is going to be constructed, and when that matter is decided the Dominion of Canada would be justified in contributing towards the construction of a bridge across the Ottawa river.

Mr. FIELDING: Is there a well-defined principle now regarding interprovincial bridges as to what relation the provinces and the municipalities have to them?

Mr. CARVELL: There is a well-defined principle. The only thing is that there is a provision in the British North America Act—

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think so.

Mr. CARVELL: I have held that opinion, but I may be in error.

Mr. FIELDING: I must not contradict my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL: And I will not contradict my hon. friend either but it is easy to settle the question.

Mr. FIELDING: This is the reason why I imagine there is no such provision. A good many years ago, when I had something to do with the affairs of Nova Scotia, the Dominion Government would not contribute a penny towards an interprovincial bridge, but let us pay a duty on the bridge when we got the material. However, things have changed a bit since then, and I suppose there is a better understanding.

Mr. PROULX: Ontario and Quebec contribute a portion of the cost of this bridge which is interprovincial, while the bridge at Ste. Anne and Vaudreuil could not be provincial. It is midway between Ottawa and Montreal. Nature has provided its location, and it is on a solid rock foundation.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot say that there is any policy in these matters. I simply take things as I find them, and I have not yet asked for any appropriations for either interprovincial or international bridges. Of course, international bridges are provided for by the British North America Act, and I was under the impression that interprovincial bridges were also.

Mr. FIELDING: It may be so.

Mr. CARVELL: Even if it were, I entirely agree with the suggestion of my hon. friend that it is a pretty risky business to go into it. I think I ought to take this occasion to remark that it is astounding the demands that have been made upon the Federal Government, since the armistice was signed, for the expenditure of public money on all sorts of schemes. I sometimes admire the ingenuity of the men who conceive these projects. I believe I have been asked during the last four or five months to spend one hundred million dollars in all sorts of undertakings. Every day sees its quota. I think to-day is one of the small days, but the amount is pretty nearly a million. We are being asked to-day to spend money for works that would not have been thought of five or six years ago. The only explanation I can offer is that in the last four and-a-half years the Government has been spending tremendous sums and has been practically the paymaster for the country. People have been selling goods to the Government and receiving cheques and have not had to look after anything, and they have got the idea that the Government ought to act as paymaster. I do think that the people must have a notion that in some way we turn a crank at Ottawa and grind out notes, or that we have an inexhaustible vault filled with gold and all we have to do is to dig down with a dipper dredge and scoop it up. There must be some such conception on the part of the people or they would not make the demands they make on the Government. I am getting away from the subject of interprovincial bridges, however. I do not know where we are going to land if some one does not apply the brakes and if we do not get down to sound business principles and declare that we will not expend money except on certain really necessary public works.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I quite agree with the statement of the minister as to the isolation of Ottawa from the rest of the country, and I think it is extraordinary that the capital of the Dominion should be so isolated. We are not isolated from a railway point of view, for Ottawa is a good railway centre. But if you leave Ottawa by automobile, when you have reached a certain radius you cannot go further. It seems to me that the good-roads policy has made such steady progress in all parts of the world, and especially in America, that the Provincial Governments of both Ontario and Quebec should see that transportation by way of good roads should be available from Ottawa eastward and westward. I am informed that it is the policy of the Quebec Government to have a new road betwen Montreal and Ottawa. I am not at liberty to say whether it will be on the north or south bank of the Ottawa river, but the Prime Minister stated not very long ago in my presence that he did not understand why there should not be as good communication by highway, between Ottawa and Montreal, for instance, as there is between Montreal and Quebec. The good-roads policy adopted by the Quebec Government eight or nine years ago has undoubtedly produced excellent results in our province. It has attracted a large number of tourists and has improved our country hotels. It has proved for the farmer as well

as the resident of the city a source of comfort, and for the farmer a source of wealth. Coming back to Ottawa, it is incredible that this city should be isolated as it is. I am not speaking for myself. Sitting on this side of the House, I can not claim to have the privileges enjoyed on the other side. I have no automobile, but I say that the capital of the Dominion should have all-round excellent communication, and in view of the improved highway system that is being advocated in every progressive province, it is not fair that our capital should be isolated.

Telegraph and Telephone Lines—Nova Scotia —Pictou Island—Telephone cable, $5,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I wish to congratulate the minister on the fact that he is doing something to put Pictou Island in touch with the rest of the Dominion. Pictou Island is situate in Northumberland Straits between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. It is of considerable size and is inhabited by a hardy race of Scotchmen and if my hon. friend will go there at any time I am sure he will be accorded a right Highland welcome. These people have never had the advantage of communication with the mainland and I am very much pleased that the minister is taking this step which is urgently needed. A friend of mine, the Rev. Allan Simpson, D.D., a retired Presbyterian minister, living in New Glasgow, was engaged in preaching the gospel to the people of this island last season when he observed the isolated condition of the place. He noticed that they had no telephone communication with the mainland and that they were at a serious disadvantage in case of sickness, or when there was any urgent necessity for communicating with points outside. I think he had a good deal to do with creating an interest in this matter and starting the agitation to obtain this telephone connection, and I am quite sure it will cheer his heart very much to know that the minister is taking the necessary steps to bring it about. The cable, when completed, will be a great boon to the people of the island not only in connection with the fishing industry but also in their social and business relations with the rest of the country. I have been informed that the department has some wire on hand that could be utilized without incurring any great expense. I trust that the work of laying the cable will be commenced at once and that the people will have the advantage of it during the present season.

Mr. CARVELL: I can assure the hon. member that there are no votes in these Estimates that are not serious. When I asked Parliament to vote $5,000 to lay that cable I expect to lay it, that is, if the steamship Tyrian ever gets into the water; it has been in dry dock now for a year. When we get it out the crew will want more pay. They have been kept there without doing anything and I do not know whether we will get the boat going again or not. We intend anyway to lay the cable. I accept all my hon. friend says about the good qualities of these people. I think they must be good people. I was just wondering whether this was the island that my hon. friend was telling me about last summer where one of those good thrifty Scotch people parted with some $3,000 or $4,000 for white paper. Some sharp chap came down there. If so, I think they need a telephone to wake them up.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Some care will require to be exercised in order to avoid the ice in the winter season. I do not know much about laying cables but I have heard it said that some investigation should take place to see that the best spot is selected so that the cable will not be swept away in the winter time.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was sorry to hear the minister give such a bad reputation to the Tyrian. She must have got into bad company. We had her in Sydney.

Mr. CARVELL: That is where she became demoralized.

Mr. McKENZIE: No, she was a respectable boat and she was always on time whenever there was anything to be done. But some evil genius thought that Halifax was the centre of the earth and that everything had to gravitate there. Immediately after the change of Government they took the boat away from North Sydney to Halifax, and they have of course manipulated the Tyrian ever since for their own purposes.

Mr. CARVELL: Is it a fact that my hon. friend stole her away from Halifax some few years ago?

Mr. McKENZIE: She was in the market for a proper dwelling place, and, having the best harbour in the world, the Tyrian being a stranger, we took her in. But she was led astray by those bad influences at Halifax. I think the trouble is not with the Tyrian, but with the people who are trying to make too much money out of her.

She has a good captain and good men, and I cannot understand why there should be any trouble over the Tyrian. I believe there are some people around Halifax so fond of easy money that they try to find something wrong with her and to keep her wrong as long as they can.

Mr. CARVELL: When the Tyrian goes out of commission I am going to see that she stays out because I am not going to be a party to squandering $60,000 a year on a boat that does not do anything. Of all the useless things that I ever heard of the Tyrian is the most useless. It is a little boat that never was any good. It only cost $20,000 when it was bought. I am told that she has cost the Government $1,000,000 up to date. The moment I think of the telephones and telegraphs owned by the Dominion of Canada I get hot under the collar. This is an illustration of what we are spending.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If you maintain a cable system such as we have in the gulf of St. Lawrence, how can you do it without a cable boat?

Mr. CARVELL: I would get rid of the cable boat and establish wireless stations. Here we are spending $60,000 a year on a boat that does not get into the water for more than about two months in the year. The fault may be in the department officials at North Sydney or at Halifax, but it is something I will not stand as long as I have anything to say about it, and I do not think that any Minister of Public Works ought to stand it. Something must be done to limit it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you not wireless stations all over the gulf?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, there are a good many of such stations.

Mr. FIELDING: In the meantime there are several cable lines which are broken, and the people interested are clamouring to have them repaired. If the Tyrian cannot do it what provision has the department made to meet that situation?

Mr. CARVELL: We have managed to repair them during the past year by fitting up scows for small works. I think the Lady Laurier is a ship that is capable of being fitted with cable-laying apparatus, and the apparatus is stored at Halifax. Whether we can do that or not we are not going to keep the Tyrian going under present conditions. If we have to get rid of the cables we will do so and we will adopt the wireless.

In connection with the Magdalen Islands I think the cable might be entirely abolished and that we might rely on the wireless. The same thing applies to Anticosti. They have the wireless to Anticosti during the summer season and it is closed down during the winter. There is no reason why it should not be kept going continuously. There is Pictou island, Scatari, Deer island and Grand Manan off the coast of New Brunswick, and some others, were cable connection must be maintained; but we can dispense with the cable if it is necessary, in order to maintain this ship, to spend $60,000 a year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does not the great advantage of cables over wireless lie in the fact that you can utilize the cables for telephone purposes?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is all very well to talk about getting rid of the Tyrian. I do not care whether the minister takes advantage of the Tyrian or the Lady Laurier or of any other steamer, but the cables are there and unless you have a perfect system of wireless stations you cannot do away with them as easily as my hon. friend thinks, because in the interest of navigation these cables must be maintained. My hon. friend spoke of the Magdalen Islands. They are isolated from the mainland for four or five months in the year. You have Bird Rock, which forms part of the Magdalen islands group. It is the first station in the river St. Lawrence seen by the mariners as they come up the river. It is connected with the group of islands and with Cape Breton by cable. You have your station on the rock. You have Bryan island, which was the first island sighted by Jacques Cartier when he discovered the river St. Lawrence. For navigation purposes you must maintain these cables unless you get a perfect system of wireless stations. If you can substitute that I have no objection. I do not know anything about the Tyrian, but I do know that, on account of the very rough weather in the gulf of St. Lawrence, it happens very often that the cable is broken. I have experienced some very serious troubles myself by reason of being out of touch with my electors for weeks and weeks during the winter because the cable had broken and they were awaiting the return of the Tyrian early in the spring to repair it. I do not know what my hon. friend will do but he must not forget that ocean navigation is interested in maintaining these cables.

Mr. FIELDING: I am, like my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux), not concerned in the Tyrian, but I am interested in the cables. There are a couple of cables that have come within my observation and knowledge which have been broken and for some months they have been waiting for something to be done to repair them. They have been brought to the attention of the minister, and the Tyrian cannot do the work some other means should be devised for doing it. It may be that the dropping of the cables and the substitution of wireless is the proper policy, and I have no objection to it; but in the meantime I hope my hon. friend will do whatever he can to help out the situation to which I have called his attention.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I might make a statement about these wireless stations. These are largely isolated positions and there are a great many posts, so that you would have to have a day and night operator at each place and it would be a bill of expense. I remember this was all gone into before the House some years ago. The great advantage of cables is that anybody can use them for telephone purposes. If the telegrapher is absent one could use the cable as wireless. I have no special interest in the matter other than the general welfare. I think it would be short-sighted to deprive these people of their cable stations.

Mr. CARVELL: I quite agree with all that has been said. I do not propose to take service away from anybody. In most of these cases there is no telephonic communication. They rely entirely upon the telegraph.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It could be put in easily.

Mr. CARVELL: You would have to lay a new cable, because they do not put telephone circuits in when they are laying these cables. The telegraph is a single wire, while the telephone requires a circuit.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They are exactly the same.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend will investigate he will find he cannot get very far on a single wire. It is true the Government telephone system is practically all single wire, but it is an antiquated system. If you are going to put in a telephone system you would have to have two wires. I quite realize that navigation must be looked after, and I believe that many of these cables must be maintained.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Ships must be reported long in advance of their arrival.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. That can be done by wireless in a great many cases. But I shall have more to say about this matter when we come to another part of the Estimates. I am not willing to lose $400,000 or $500,000 a year in maintaining a telephone and telegraph system when we can get along without losing that amount. I want to treat it as a business proposition.

Saskatchewan and Alberta—Peace River Line —office and dwelling at Grande Prairie, $4,000.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: Would it not be possible to do without these telegraph lines in the north country now that the Edmonton and Dunvegan railway has been built to Grande Prairie?

Mr. CARVELL: So far as the telegraph lines are concerned, in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta there is no necessity for the Government ever spending another dollar; but perhaps I am going a little too far. There are one or two places where the line must be maintained, from Spirit River and Grand Prairie, for instance, to west of Hudson Hope, because there is no railroad there yet. Then, about fifteen or twenty miles of line has to be maintained around the western end of Lesser Slave lake. There are also ten or twelve miles to be maintained in Saskatchewan. Outside of that, the whole thing could be handed over to a company, and I would suggest handing it over to the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, as that is now owned by the Government, and let them run the line where it is necessary, as a business proposition, or it could be handed over to the Edmonton and Dunvegan railway, as their line practically parallels ours.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why is it necessary to clear the woods when you can use the railway right-of-way?

Mr. CARVELL: While the line practically parallels the railway, it deviates from it in many places and trees have to be felled.

British Columbia—Mainland telegraph and telephone lines—general repairs and improvements, $10,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What mileage have we on the mainland of British Columbia?

Mr. CARVELL: We have many telegraph lines in northern British Columbia that must be maintained as that is the only

means of communication the people have with the outside world. The Yukon line runs from Ashcroft practically up to Dawson. After leaving the Fraser river it strikes the Grand Trunk Pacific at Fort Fraser, some short distance west of Prince George. From there it practically parallels the Grand Trunk Pacific to Hazelton. Some arrangement should be arrived at about this line. There is no reason why both the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific should maintain telegraph lines paralleling each other for two hundred miles. There is also a line from Hazelton to Prince Rupert paralleling the Grand Trunk Pacific. That should be handed over to the railway. When the Vancouver and Great Eastern is constructed to Prince George, a very large part of the line from Hazelton to Fort Fraser could be handed over, but at present we must maintain it. The line from Hazelton to Dawson must be maintained by the country. There have been a good many suggestions that communication might be had by wireless between these places. That might be done from Atlin to Fort Fraser, but from there to Dawson you would have to have a land line. When we come to the southern part of British Columbia, it is an entirely different proposition; there it is a telephone proposition pure and simple. But I do not wish to discuss that on this item, it is a question that should be considered very carefully by the House. We could not settle it in one night or one week, or even in a year perhaps. It should be approached purely from a business standpoint.

Miscellaneous—Architectural Branch—salaries of architects, clerks of works, inspectors, draughtsmen, clerks and messengers of outside service, $60,000.

Mr. CARVELL: These are services that are maintained annually, the architectural branch, salaries of architects, draughtsmen, clerks, messengers, etc. These are men that we utilize in the Outside Service to go round the country for inspection purposes and things of that kind.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: Does this department derive any revenue from the building of the tremendously large reservoirs on the upper Ottawa river?

Mr. CARVELL: No, we do not.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: These large dams control the supply of water in the Ottawa. From the Timiskaming down to Ottawa city many miles might be benefited, but it seems that the dams are maintained and operated expressly for the benefit of certain mills in and around the Chaudiere and the Deschenes, while the mills on the upper Ottawa, that is, the boom area, can go practically dry. Protests are probably considered, but it is the large mills in and around Ottawa that derive 98 per cent of the benefit. Personally I think it would be well within reason that the mills in and around Ottawa should contribute somewhat to the upkeep of these improvements.

Mr. CARVELL: This is the first time I have heard this question raised. One would naturally suppose that a storage proposition benefiting a mill on one part of the river would benefit mills on other parts of the same river. However, there may be some conditions that I am not acquainted with.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: There are.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no doubt that these works were built expressly for the purpose of controlling the water in the Ottawa river, and there is no doubt also that they have been a wonderful boon to the water-power development in Ottawa and other places along the river. I have been told by gentlemen interested in the water-power development of the Chaudiere that these works have practically doubled the capacity of electrical plants around this city. While we receive no revenue from these works—and I am not sure that the Government should engage in them—yet there is no doubt that they constitute the proper scheme for all parts of the country, and I only wish it were possible that the proper authority, whichever it might be, could carry on such works in every part of Canada. I am a great believer in water-power development, and the only way we can increase the capacity of our water-power is by storage dams.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Dominion Government has jurisdiction?

Mr. CAHILL: Yes, we have the right.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the riding which I have the honour to represent there happens to be a large number of these storage dams, and although there they come under the Department of Railways and Canals, I would direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the practice of keeping the water six inches higher than the law reserves. I wonder whether the Government would furnish us with a little dynamite to keep the water down to the proper level?

Mr. CARVELL: That is a complaint that seems to follow the building of all these

dams. I have received complaints from Timiskaming and North Bay.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Everywhere.

Mr. CARVELL: I think the attendants have to work too hard and have not sufficient time to take the stoplogs out and look after them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Signals are sent up from Ottawa and from Peterborough when they want the water controlled. I purpose taking this matter up in another way with the Department of Railways and Canals, so far as my riding is connected, to see if some proper method cannot be devised to meet the complaints. The control is always in the interests of large manufacturers here in Ottawa, Peterborough and in other places.

Mr. CARVELL: I received a complaint only two or three days ago in connection with the North Bay works. But it only shows that people do get unreasonable, because for some weeks every stoplog has been taken out of the North Bay dam, and I am told there is greater facility for the water escaping to-day than before the works were placed there.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is the French river?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. But we have had very heavy rains and the lakes are very high, and my hon. friend will remember that we also had very heavy rains during the latter part of last year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They did not let the water off when it was high, and consequently when the rains continued they were flooded.

Monument to His late Majesty King Edward VII, $5,000.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is this, please?

Mr. CARVELL: This has been carried forward for some years. The contract was awarded, but was not proceeded with.

Monument to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, $25,000.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How does that compare with Sir John's monument?

Mr. CARVELL: I am sorry I cannot answer the question. I will get the information.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It does not matter.

Mr. CARVELL: Nothing has been done; it is just simply voted.

National Gallery of Canada, $10,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I suppose the National Gallery is this building?

Mr. CARVELL: No, this vote is not for the purpose of being applied on this building. It is practically for the staff of the National Gallery.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Carvell the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Monday, May 26, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Labour for fiscal year ended March 31, 1918.—Sir Thomas White.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

STEAMER PRINCESS.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. What steamer has replaced the Princess?
2. Who has been appointed captain of the said steamer, on what date was he appointed, and by whom recommended?
3. How many years' experience has the person appointed had as captain?
4. What are the names of the applicants for this position and how many years' experience has each of said applicants had as captain?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. C.G.S. Loos.
2. Wm. Tremblay, May 5, 1919, appointed by Civil Service Commission.
3. His captain's certificate is dated April 8, 1915.
4. No information in Naval Service Department. The advertising for this position was carried out by the Civil Service Commission.

Dr. O. B. KEDDY.

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. Was O. B. Keddy of Windsor, county of Hants, physician, in any way in the employ of the Militia Department of Canada, or in connection with the British Expeditionary Forces stationed at Windsor, Hants county, during the war?
2. If so, in what capacity was he so engaged, what work was required of him, how much time was he required to devote to it and what was the rate per day and the total amount of money received by him?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 and 2. Yes; he was employed as medical officer examining recruits for the Imperial army and railway construction troops. He was paid as follows: Under 50 men, $1 per

head; 50 to 100 men, $2 per day; 100 to 150 men, $3 a day; 150 and over, $4 a day. Dr. Keddy was paid a total amount of $1,436.44; $607 of this was incurred in examining recruits for the Imperial army, and is being recovered from the Imperial Government.

RUMANIAN RELIEF—MARINE INSURANCE.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. What firm is doing the Marine Insurance on cargoes from Canada under the relief arrangements for Rumania, Greece, Belgium, etc.?
2. Are other firms asked, or allowed to complete?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. In connection with the credit to the Kingdom of Rumania for the purchase of goods in Canada, the Canadian Trade Commission, acting as agents for the Rumanian Government, have placed marine insurance through the firm of Messrs. Jones & Proctor Bros. Ltd., Toronto.

2. The commission is of opinion that the Rumanian Government would be better served by handling the insurance through a single firm than by calling for tenders. They state that the method adopted is the best way from a competitive standpoint of handling marine insurance. It is stated that the firm selected was instructed by the commission to place the business with companies registered in Canada, provided rates were satisfactory.

OVERSEAS MILITARY EXPENDITURES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Were the Overseas Military expenditures audited?
2. If so, who was in charge of the audit and by whom was he appointed?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to submit these expenditures to a further examination by the Auditor General's Department?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.
2. Colonel L. A. Dowie is general auditor, Overseas Military Forces of Canada; appointed by the Canadian Government.
3. Yes.

VICTORY LOAN ADVERTISING, 1918.

Mr. DUFF:

1. What amount was paid for advertising in 1918 for the Victory Loan?
2. What amount was paid the same year for printing, in connection with the said loan?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

Assuming that question means what was paid for advertising and printing for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918, for the Victory Loan floated in November last, the answer is as follows:

1. $275,596.88.
2. $219,257.23.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. Is Hadley B. Tremaine, M.P. for Hants, in the employ of the Government of Canada or in any way connected with the Military Forces of Canada?
2. If so, when was he first appointed?
3. In what capacity is he so engaged and what salary does he receive?
4. How much pay has he received from the outbreak of the war up to and including the 12th day of May, 1919?
5. Is the wife of the said Hadley B. Tremaine in receipt of separation allowance? If so, how much has she received to date?
6. If the said Hadley B. Tremaine was and is in receipt of pay from the Military Forces of Canada, was he and is he in receipt of his indemnity as a member of the Parliament of Canada?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many soldiers enlisted in the 117th Eastern Townships Battalion went overseas during the war?
2. How many of the said soldiers saw active service?
3. How many were killed in action?
4. How many were wounded in action?
5. How many died as a result of said wounds?
6. How many were rendered unfit for further service?
7. How many recovered from said wounds and returned to duty?
8. How many died from sickness or other causes?
9. How many officers and men of all ranks received decorations, medals or other rewards for bravery?
10. What are the names of the said officers and men?

INCOME TAX OFFICE, EMPLOYEES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I ask the Minister of Finance if the men employed at the income tax office in Montreal and elsewhere are appointed by the Civil Service Commission. If not, under whose authority are their appointments made?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): The appointments are made by the Government upon the recommendation, in the first instance, of the Commissioner of Taxation, who is responsible for the administration of the office.

LABOUR SITUATION IN THE WEST.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): In view of the serious situation which the papers indicate prevails throughout West-

ern Canada, has the Government any information to give the House regarding the strike in Winnipeg, and the threatened strike which the press to-day predicts in Calgary, Edmonton, and other western cities?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Labour): There is nothing substantially new to report in connection with the Winnipeg strike, but I may say that the telephone service is almost normal and business activities are being gradually re-established. There is no official information as to the probability of a strike at Calgary and other places in the West.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): I would like to know what steps the Government intends to take in regard to the situation in Edmonton and Calgary, particularly in Edmonton. I am in receipt of a communication to the effect that a sympathetic strike is declared there, and that there is likely to be danger to property and person.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No official information has been received by the Government or the Department of Labour in respect of the matter to which the hon. member refers, and until there is the Government cannot very well express an opinion on the subject.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Did the postal employees in Winnipeg return to work this morning? It was stated that they would be obliged to go back to work at 11 o'clock this morning or their places would be filled.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Department has had no information from Winnipeg to-day respecting the return of the postal employees. Last evening, however, we received a message to the effect that a great number would likely return this forenoon, but there has been no confirmation of that.

Mr. CHARLES MURPHY: May I ask my hon. friend whether he or any other member of the Government has received communications from North Vancouver regarding the conditions that prevail there? I have received two letters written on paper headed, "Second Narrows Bridge and Terminal Railways Special Joint Committee", signed "Ewart Adamson, Campaign Manager". In the second letter, which I received to-day, attention is drawn to the industrial and labour conditions at North Vancouver, and the concluding sentence reads: "Even now our form of representative Government is being weighed as against the Dictatorship of Labour". Can my hon. friend give the House any information as to the conditions existing in Vancouver?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have no knowledge of this matter, but I shall make inquiries and endeavour to give the hon. member information to-morrow.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

On motion of Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways) Bill No. 117 to authorize an extension of time for the completion of the St. John and Quebec Railway between Centreville, in the county of Carleton, and Andover, in the county of Victoria, N.B., was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—time for completion extended to December 31, 1919:

Mr. CAHILL: What is the nature of this agreement?

Mr. J. D. REID: The agreement made between the Government of the province of New Brunswick and the Dominion Government was that the Provincial Government should pay for and build a road from Centreville to St. John, which the Dominion Government was to take over and operate on a percentage basis, this Government taking 60 per cent and the Provincial Government 40 per cent of the gross earnings. This 40 per cent which the Provincial Government was to receive was to help pay the interest on the bonds. The road has been partly constructed, and is now in operation from Gagetown to Westfield, where it strikes the Canadian Pacific near St. John. When the agreement was revised a couple of years ago, it was decided to run over the Canadian Pacific from Westfield to St. John, instead of duplicating that last fifteen or twenty miles.

Mr. CAHILL: Will this road be merged with the Canadian National Railway system?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. You can take the Canadian National now from McGivney Junction and connect with this road. That would be the short line over the Transcontinental into St. John. That part of the road between Centreville and Andover has not yet been completed by the Provincial Government, owing to the increased cost of labour and materials. When at the beginning of the session I asked for an extension of time in which to complete the road between Gagetown and Westfield. I overlooked the

fact that the road was to be built from Andover to Centreville, thence to Westfield, and into St. John.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the distance from Andover to Centreville?

Mr. CARVELL: Twenty-five miles. The road has been completed for about 160 miles and is in operation to Gagetown. The last 40 miles from Gagetown to Westfield will be completed and in operation within three or four weeks at the very outside. When completed it will be operated by the Canadian National Railway system under the agreement ratified by Parliament in 1911.

Mr. J. D. REID: The road is being operated now from Centreville to Gagetown, about 160 miles, on the 60-40 per cent basis.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it the intention of the Government to take over this line when completed?

Mr. J. D. REID: If the New Brunswick Government construct the road between Centreville and Andover, the Dominion Government will take it over on the 60-40 basis.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is there not a line running from Andover to Centreville now?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What amount has been paid by the Dominion Government towards the construction of this road?

Mr. J. D. REID: The usual subsidy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No guarantee of bonds?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, the bonds were guaranted by the New Brunswick Government.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Have there been any net earnings since the road was in operation?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not think the 60 per cent would pay the operating expenses, nor the 40 per cent the interest on the bonds.

Mr. CAHILL: About how much of a loss will this mean to the Dominion treasury?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think I gave a statement some time ago of the earnings of each part of the Canadian National Railway system, but if not, I can give the figures for this particular line when my Estimates are up. The loss is not very great to the Dominion Government. The 40 per cent does not come near paying the interest on the bonds, but, of course, the provincial Government must stand that loss.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the agreement of 1911 include the extension that is asked for now?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Act that we have already passed covered all this, and in addition 25 miles from Grand Falls.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported the third time and passed.

At this point the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister, and Hon. Arthur L. Sifton, Minister of the Interior, entered the Chamber for the first time since their arrival home from the Peace Conference. The hon. members of the House rose in their places and cheered.

HALIFAX HARBOUR MASTER.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine) Bill No. 119, to amend the Act respecting the appointment of a harbour master at the port of Halifax, was read a second time and the House went into Committee on the Bill—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—maximum remuneration of harbour master increased from $1,800 to $3,000; to be retained out of fees collected.

On section 2—harbour master's fees increased: rates of fees:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister explain on what basis this schedule is prepared?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The object of this Bill is to enable the harbour master for the port of Halifax to receive a greater remuneration than he is receiving at the present time, namely $1,800 per year. His salary is paid him according to the fees that he can collect from vessels entering the harbour. This Bill provides that he may receive a larger remuneration than $1,800 a year but not more than a maximum of $3,000. The old Act was passed in 1885. When we consider the high cost of living to-day and the fact that the harbour master has to pay boat hire, I am sure hon. members will agree that $1,800 is not a sufficient remuneration for him especially in view of the fact that at other large ports the harbour masters are receiving as high as $5,000 a year. The object of this Bill is to enable the harbour master to increase the salary he is now drawing and also to increase the fees levied against ships.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has there been a proportionate increase in these fees? Wages have only gone up a little more than one-third and there should not be more than a corresponding increase in the fees exacted from ships.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The increase that the Bill provides for is a very small one. We propose to increase the fee for every ship over 1,000 tons register from $5 to $7. As I explained when this matter was before the Committee on Wednesday evening I do not think the harbour master will get more than $2,000 or $2,500 a year. If we do not increase the fee from $5 to $7 the harbour master will continue to receive the same meagre salary of $1,800 that he received in 1885. It is only a reasonable proposition that this small change in the fees should be allowed and that the harbour master, if he collects $2,000, or $2,500, or even the maximum of $3,000, should be allowed to keep this himself.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I cannot understand why you are limiting the salary of this officer to the meagre pittance that he is being given here. I imagine some of his clerks will be receiving more than $1,800 a year and if he is worth anything why not give him a straight salary or give him a sufficient proportion of the fees to ensure him a proper income. No apology is required for giving this officer a larger remuneration.

Mr. McKENZIE: The ships that enter the harbour complain very bitterly about there being any fees at all. They believe that they should be exempt from any fees of this kind. I think that if you pay the harbour master $3,000 he will be satisfied. He only used to get $1,800 and, while that was small, he was evidently satisfied to stand by. I am not complaining about the fees being raised sufficiently high to secure $3,000 but immediately anything of this kind is done the ship masters complain that you are reducing their meagre earnings. I do not think the harbour master of the port of Halifax is required to devote all his time to the duties of his office. We have a very capable harbour master in my town and we have a very good harbour. I do not know of anything particular that this harbour master does except to see that ships arrange themselves in proper shape and that they do not unnecessarily get in each other's way. I think that is all he does. He has not to decide anything excepting that, if there is any complaint about a ship being unseaworthy, he may have something to say about it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot agree with my hon. friend about the duties of the harbour master not being most important at a very large port like Halifax. The tonnage entering and leaving that port each year is so considerable in amount that the harbour master has to give all his time to his duties there. The duties of the harbour master are to see that berths are allocated to vessels entering the port.

He also has to see that the vessels are properly moored. The harbour master has full charge of the port, and I consider that his duties in the case of such a port as Halifax are most important. When one compares the port of Halifax with the port of Montreal, where the harbour master receives $5,000 a year, and with the port of Quebec, where the harbour master gets $3,500 a year, I do not think that we are overpaying the harbour master of the first-named port when we place him in a position whereby he may possibly make five or six hundred dollars a year more than he is now drawing. For instance, in the year 1917 the total amount of fees collected in the port of Halifax only amounted to $1,832. Now, if the total amount of fees collected in 1920 do not exceed $1,800, that is all the harbour master of Halifax will be allowed to get in the way of salary; but if the fees, as I have already stated, amount to $2,500 or $3,000, he will draw a more substantial remuneration. Considering the fact that Halifax is a very large and important seaport, I hope that hon. members will agree with the reasonableness of the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not complaining about the harbour master getting a salary of $3,000; I think it is little enough for him, but I know how vigorously shipping masters in the past have complained regarding the exaction from them of any unnecessary fees. I simply wished to be sure that there were no greater fees to be collected than were necessary to meet the salary proposed to be given to the harbour master.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In regard to the fees to be collected, we are only proposing a very slight increase. From my experience as a commissioner for the port of Montreal, I know that the shipping agents are always on the alert and do not want to pay anything more than they are obliged to pay, which is only natural. I am quite sure that the small increase in fees which is proposed here is not going to be a burden on any of the ship-owners, nor will it have any detrimental effect on shipping, but it will yield the harbour master a larger remuneration.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Under whose control is the port of Halifax at the present time? I understood when the Halifax disaster occurred that the port had been placed under the control of a naval officer. Does that control still continue, or has it again been placed under the department?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: During the war authority over the port of Halifax was exercised by the Naval Service, but since the signing of the armistice control of the harbour has once more reverted to the department.

Mr. PEDLOW: Why is the harbour master of Halifax paid by fees, whereas the harbour master of Montreal receives a salary of $5,000, and the harbour master of Quebec a salary of $3,500? If it is deemed desirable to increase the remuneration paid to the harbour master at Halifax, why not adopt the course which has been followed in the case of the other two harbour masters mentioned?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The system of administering the port of Halifax is entirely different from the system which obtains in the ports of Montreal and Quebec. The two latter ports are administered by a harbour commission, and power is vested in them to pay to the harbour master whatever salary they may deem fit. On the other hand the port of Halifax is not under the control of a commission, but is administered by the Department of Marine, and we are not allowed by the Pilotage Act to pay the harbour master a fixed salary; his salary can only be obtained by the collection of fees.

Section agreed to, Bill reported, and read the third time.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine) the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the provisions of sections 432, 862, and 865 of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide:—

1. That notwithstanding anything in Part VI of the said Act, the Governor in Council may, when it appears to him to be in the interest of navigation, appoint the Minister to be the pilotage authority for any pilotage district, or for any part thereof; and the said Minister shall thereupon supersede the then existing pilotage authority for that district or part of a district: Provided that nothing in said Part shall authorize the Minister to sit as a tribunal for the trial of offences of which pilots may be accused before the pilotage authority; but such Minister may, in any case not provided for by Part X of the said Act designate a tribunal or officer to try any such offence.

2. That for and in respect of all ships entering a port to which Part XII of the said Act applies, and at which a Harbour Master is appointed, and discharging or taking a cargo, ballast, wood or water, there shall be paid as fees the amount prescribed by paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) of section 862 of the said Act; that paragraph (h) be repealed; and that the following paragraphs be added to the said section:—

"(h) for every ship over seven hundred tons and not over one thousand tons register, five dollars;

"(i) for every ship over one thousand tons register seven dollars."

3. That the salary or remuneration of each Harbour Master shall from time to time be fixed by the Governor in Council, but shall not exceed the rate of one thousand two hundred dollars per annum, and shall be subject to the provisions prescribed by the said Act, providing for the payment into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of all moneys received by him for fees, after deducting therefrom the salary or remuneration fixed as aforesaid, and if the moneys received by him for fees in any year amount to a less sum than is so fixed, then such less sum shall be his salary or remuneration for that year.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain the object of the resolution?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The object is to enable me to introduce a Bill permitting the Department of Marine to take over the control of all the pilotage systems of Canada and to vest authority in the Governor General in Council. At present, and for some twelve years past, the pilotage systems of the two districts of Quebec and Montreal have been under the Department of Marine. In order to determine what steps should be taken in the interest of the greater efficiency of the pilotage system in Canada, the Government appointed a Royal Commission in the early part of 1918, consisting of Mr. Thomas Robb, of the Shipping Federation, Montreal; Captain Bayles, Deputy Warden for the port of Montreal; and Captain Harrison of Halifax, to inquire into the matter. The commission visited all the important seaports on the coasts of Canada, such as Halifax, Sydney, Louisburg, St. John, N.B., Vancouver, Victoria, and Nanaimo, and their report, which has been already tabled, recommends very strongly that these pilotage districts, outside those of Montreal and Quebec, be taken under the supervision and direct control of the Department of Marine. I am sure hon. gentlemen will recognize that the only object the Government has in recommending that this course be followed is to place the pilotage systems

in the ports referred to on a much more efficient basis than they have been in the past, and to provide for much more rigid pilotage examination. It is the intention of the Government, if the resolution should pass, to appoint a local superintendent of each one of these leading ports who shall be a seafaring man holding a master mariner's certificate. In addition the Government intends to appoint a general superintendent of pilots, to be stationed at the head office of the department in Ottawa, who will have general charge of all the local officers and of the various pilotage systems. It is further provided that the harbour dues on ships of over one thousand tons registered tonnage shall be increased to $7.

A great many of the harbour masters who are looking after our ports now are only allowed to draw a maximum salary of $600 per year. The object of this Bill is to allow them, if they collect sufficient fees, to draw a maximum salary of $1,200 per year. For instance, the harbour master for the port of Victoria, can at present, only draw a salary of $600 per year, whereas if this Bill passes, he will be allowed, providing he collects sufficient fees, to draw a maximum salary of $1,200.

There are, therefore, two important matters in the resolution before the Committee: First, that the pilotage systems of Canada from Halifax to Victoria be vested in the authority of the Governor-in-Council under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and, second, to provide harbour masters who are now drawing $600 a year a maximum salary of $1,200.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Have the Boards of Trade or the shipping authorities of any of the ports asked for this legislation?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The efficient management of the pilotage systems of Montreal and Quebec under the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the past twelve years was considered sufficient evidence to warrant the Government in appointing a Royal Commission to investigate the pilotage systems of these other ports. All the shipping interests and also the various Boards of Trade appeared before the commission when it visited those ports, and this Bill is receiving the unanimous approval of those interests.

The pilotage systems of the ports that I have referred to were looked after by local pilotage commissions, and as those commissioners did not receive any remuneration for their services, naturally they did not give the attention that they should to their duties. There is great scope to increase the efficiency of the pilotage systems. which systems it is now proposed shall be vested in the Governor in Council, and eventually shall come under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, more particularly as we are going to have a local superintendent, who will be an ex-master mariner holding a master's certificate. All the interests concerned agree that this should be done.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This is a revolutionary proposal in a way, because it is removing the control of pilotage altogether to Ottawa. There must be a large number of pilotage commissions along the coasts of this country, and under the law they have jurisdiction to determine the age, the qualifications and the skill of the pilots who are acting in their particular vicinity; to grant or withhold licenses to those pilots; to make regulations for their control, and other powers. The minister is proposing to sweep them all away and vest the control in an officer at Ottawa. I hesitate about approving the change, because I do not think it is wise to centralize this control. The local authorities know these pilots, they have been trained in the vicinity, and the commissioners are the best judges. Ottawa is too far away from the sea coast for an officer stationed there to possess the necessary local knowledge. A thousand miles makes a great difference in efficiency in matters of this kind. With all due respect to the minister and his department, I would hesitate to take this authority out of the hands of the local commissioners and transfer it to some one in the department.

From what I have heard in this House and have gathered from the press, I do not think that the management of the pilots in the St. Lawrence river has been such a great success as the minister describes. I think it is open to a great deal of criticism. We are aware of the patronage that has existed in connection with the appointment of those pilots, and it is only a few days ago that we were called upon to vote a considerable sum of money to pay pensions to pilots on the St. Lawrence river who should never have been appointed. I do not know whether that system of appointment is still continuing or not, but I am aware of the fact that owners of ships coming up the St. Lawrence river will not employ some of the pilots appointed; they prefer pilots that they know are competent and they do not care as a rule to take any pilot that comes along. As a matter of fact, I do not think that the management of the pilotage business in the

St. Lawrence river commends itself so much to the people of Canada that they want to place all the pilotage systems under the authority of the same officer. I am not speaking for the different Boards of Trade in the country or the ship owners, but I would be surprised if they have all agreed to this proposal.

We are told that a Royal Commission investigated conditions. I do not know who these Royal Commissioners are, but I understand it was a Royal Commission consisting of two or three captains, officers of the Government. The trades people were not represented on the commission. It would be a very easy matter for two or three officers to travel around the country and get opinions favourable to their own theories. I would not place so much reliance on the report of those Royal Commissioners as I would on the report of the representative men selected from the business interests of the country. I would advise the minister to hesitate before he takes this revolutionary step of wiping out all the pilotage authorities and centralizing the control at Ottawa.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The only criticism that is likely to fall upon the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries is that successive governments did not take any step several years ago that I purpose taking now. As to the hon. member's remarks in reference to the Montreal and Quebec pilots, the best answer I can give is the almost total absence of any accidents during quite a term of years. It is true that several of the large steamship companies prefer to engage certain pilots to take charge of their vessels. But from any knowledge that I am possessed of—and I do not claim to be an authority on pilotage, although I have been connected with it for a good number of years—I do not know of a more efficient lot of pilots than those who have charge of vessels in the Montreal and Quebec districts.

In regard to the personnel of the Royal Commission, none of those gentlemen are connected with the Government. Mr. Thomas Robb is president of the Shipping Federation and occupies an important position; Captain Burns is deputy Port Warden of Montreal, and Captain James Harrison is superintendent of one of the large steamship companies at the port of Halifax.

Here is what the commission states about the Montreal Pilotage district:

> From the evidence adduced before your commission, it appears that the administration of the Montreal Pilotage district has been carried out in an efficient manner, and in this respect considerable credit must be given to the civil servant who has been handling the records, etc.

The commission also pay the same tribute to the Quebec Pilotage district. Their recommendation to the minister is this:

> That the commissions at present administering the pilotage service in the districts of Miramichi, Sydney, Louisburg and St. John have been found by your commissioners to have outrun their usefulness, and we recommend the immediate enactment of legislation appointing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the pilotage authority for these districts.

They make the same recommendation as regards the pilotage districts of Vancouver, Victoria, and Nanaimo.

The hon. member has made reference to the local pilotage commissions. The authority that those commissions have at present is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council and to the approval of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. So that we are not taking away any powers from them; we are simply saying that their work must receive the approval of the minister. But hon. members will readily see that a pilotage commission that receives no remuneration at all is not entirely satisfactory. It is not particularly interested in the rigid examination of pilots, nor in seeing that their efficiency is kept up to the standard that the importance of the calling demands. The pilotage systems of Montreal and Quebec have certainly worked admirably.

I am only asking for authority to take these pilotage systems over providing that we think it necessary to do so. But I would not care to assume the responsibility of the pilotage systems in Vancouver, Victoria, Nanaimo, Halifax, St. John and Sydney being what they should be if they are left in the hands of local pilotage commissions. There is a great deal of opportunity to increase the efficiency of the pilots and to see that the examination is a great deal more rigid. Therefore it is in the interests of navigation that this resolution should pass.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not wish the minister to misunderstand me. I did not condemn the pilots of the St. Lawrence; there are no better pilots than they. But I have been informed that they are not all efficient, that there are some who should not have been appointed, which is proved by the very fact that the minister has asked us to retire them and provide for them otherwise.

In reference to the other pilotage commissions, if it is not the intention of the minister to interfere with them, I would not have the same objection. But I do not think they should be interfered with unless there is some request from the locality that is interested. The fact that the pilotage commissions have been giving their services free of remuneration is not any reason why they should be dismissed. In the county I represent we have had a pilotage commission for many years, and the commissioners have not received any remuneration, but they are very proud of their position and they have done good work in the appointments they have made.

They accept these responsibilities and discharge them very well without remuneration; but there is no reason why their services should be dispensed with if everything is satisfactory to the locality concerned. If it is the intention of the minister to take over the pilotage only in cases where the people of the harbours concerned wish it, then I would not have so much objection to the measure.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think my hon. friend is under a misapprehension as regards Montreal and Quebec pilotage. I do not say anything about other ports, but the transfer to Ottawa some years ago of the control vested in the pilotage commissions of Montreal and Quebec was a change for the better. Before that time there had been many accidents in the St. Lawrence river, but since then the river has been practically free from accidents. At first the pilots were very much averse to the move and opposed it strongly, but they have become reconciled to it because they find that under the supervision of the Department of Marine and Fisheries the pilots have become more versed in their profession and more alert in their service. The superannuation plan was adopted when Mr. Brodeur was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in order to provide for old pilots who had become blind and who were unable to give further efficient service. The list of superannuation is decreasing yearly, and after a while there will be no more. May I ask the minister whether pilots, especially those of Montreal or Quebec, who are nearly all French Canadian, may pass their test examinations in the French language? I read something in the press about this some time ago. I know that the minister is as broadminded as a man can be, but I would like him to give the assurance that the pilots may pass the examination in whichever language they choose.

4 p.m.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am happy to inform my hon. friend that, in line with their general ability, the French Canadian pilots speak one language as well as the other, and the examination is such that they have to be familiar with the English language as well as the French. The examination may be carried on in French if the pilot so desires. But having regard to the fluency with which they speak English it is of little importance to the French Canadian pilots whether the examination is in English or is in French.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the members of the Pilotage Board in Ottawa?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is no Pilotage Board here now, but if this Bill goes through I hope to have a General Superintendent of Pilots at Ottawa who will be in charge of all the pilots at the various ports. At any port where the French language is the dominant one, we shall provide a superintendent who can speak that language.

Mr. LOGGIE: I wish to congratulate the Government upon bringing down this measure. The matter was not looked into in a near-sighted manner, as the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) would seem to indicate. The shipping interests as well as the manufacturing interests were fully heard, and I am sure that better service will be given under a management that is in direct touch with Ottawa than could be given through a local commission. I would like the minister to provide that in any event there shall be a minimum salary of $300. I have heard from harbour masters in small ports that there is a very great grievance because the fees were so small that they did not provide a reasonable remuneration for the work done, and it would be nothing but fair to include a provision that if the fees were only say, $200, the harbour master in any case would get $300. The work is considerable and the responsibility a grave one, and it would be in the interests of all concerned if the minister could fix a minimum for the harbour master in accordance with my suggestion.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not think it is necessary to consider that. I have a memorandum showing the remuneration that harbour masters receive at various ports, and in most cases it amounts to between $500 and $600 a year. We think that that is too low, and that it ought to

be increased, provided they receive sufficient fees, to a maximum of $1,200.

Mr. DUFF: How are the pilots on the St. Lawrence route appointed ?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Whenever there is a vacancy it is advertised through the press, and any one may apply. I presume the hon. member refers to apprentice pilots, who have to pass the examination required every year until they become full-fledged pilots, when they take their turn as vacancies occur.

Mr. DUFF: Is the examination taken before the Pilot Commission or the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Department of Marine and Fisheries set the examination and have everything to do with it.

Mr. FOURNIER: It is true that practically all the pilots speak both languages, but probably some are not as fluent or as well versed in one or the other language as might be desirable, and I think it might very well be provided that in the case of inquiries or accidents, testimony could be taken in French. I do not quite agree with part of the remarks of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). I have the honour to represent the constituency of Bellechasse, in which there are many pilots, and I do not think my hon. friend has a precise knowledge of the St. Lawrence route. If he travelled with some of the pilots over that route on two or three occasions I am sure he would be convinced that these men are expert navigators. Indeed, I do not think that better or more prudent men could be found. The channel is narrow, and they are obliged to travel at night, and notwithstanding the difficulties they encounter, there are very few, if any, accidents. I suggest that it should be provided that testimony should be accepted in both languages.

Mr. DUFF: In places like Halifax, Vancouver, and St. John, are the local superintendents to be appointed directly by the Minister of Marine or by the Civil Service Commission? The appointment of superintendents in these places is a very important matter, and these men should be appointed by the minister himself, after consultation with the shipping men, who are best informed on the subject. These appointments should not rest in the hands of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I agree with the views of the hon. member, and while the Civil Service Commission will have the appointment of local superintendents, I, as minister, will necessarily be called on to pass upon their qualifications. The efficiency of the pilotage system very largely depends on the knowledge and qualifications of the local superintendents.

Mr. PARENT: Does the practice of " tour de rôle " still obtain, and, if so, does the present Bill seek to abolish it?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: " Tour de rôle " still applies.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are in the county I represent a very large body of pilots, and I should like to know somewhat more about this Bill. I must say, in justice to the pilotage system in the harbour of Sydney—a system that has been in existence for at least a hundred years—that the work has been excellent, and while there may have been some complaints, as there necessarily are against every human institution, considering the number of pilots at work in Sydney harbour and the very large number of ships with which they have had to cope, I think the number of accidents or complaints of any kind must be a very small percentage indeed. In view of this fact, I would like to be assured that full justice will be done to these men, and that they will not be placed in any worse position than they are under the present management. Is the minister making any provision for members of the pilotage system at Sydney who will be called upon to retire, or who he thinks should retire? And I may ask also if he is making any provision for the officers who are now employed in connection with that work. I do not know how many officers there are, but I think there are two or three men who are paid salaries in connection with the work of the commission and who are doing the work very well. I suppose it would be regarded as just as great a hardship to the men in Sydney to deprive them of their living as it is to those in Quebec and Montreal, where provision has been made by way of pension for those pilots who were retired. I am not finding fault because such provision has been made by reason of a change in the system, but I do say that the same justice should be meted out to men in other parts of the country who will be deprived of their living as a result of this change. In Sydney harbour under the present plan, which has been in force for some time, apprentices are appointed by the board and it depends to a great extent upon the ability of the apprentice as to when he shall be admitted to the full

status of a licensed pilot. Once he gets a license I do not think there is any difference between him and others. Can the minister say how old a pilot must be before he gets a license, or is there an age limit; and to what age is he permitted to serve under the provisions of the statute? I think the maximum age now in Sydney is sixty-five years. I do not know that there is any fixed minimum, but I suppose a man could not become a pilot under twenty-five or thirty years of age at all events. How apprentices can be appointed from Ottawa rather puzzles me. The pilotage commission is on the ground there, they know the men, and I have never had very much reason to complain about the appointments they have made. Of course, it has been a political institution. When we were in power, Grits were appointed, but since the change of Governa Grit has not had much chance of becoming a pilot or an apprentice. But we did not find very much fault with that, because it was regarded as a part of the party system and as legitimate patronage. Now that a change is proposed I should like some explanation of the system the minister is going to adopt. If it is still going to be the party system, he must be advised by some person in the constituency who has knowledge of party affiliations. If it is not going to be the party system, there must be some agency through which the apprentices and pilots will be appointed regardless of party affiliations. We have already the supposed non-party system in connection with the post office and custom house and other departments, but as I have already pointed out in this House there is a marvellous instinct exercised in making these appointments, and a Grit is never by any possibility appointed where the vacancy should go to a Tory. I am only mentioning these things so that the minister will devise a system that will be satisfactory to all concerned and that justice shall be done. I suppose that once a man has been appointed as an apprentice, the position he gets as pilot depends upon the place he takes in the examination. The discrimination, as I regard it, can be more effectively exercised in selecting the apprentices. I think in Sydney harbour we have 32 pilots; 34 would be the limit. I should like to know whether it is the intention of the minister to reduce that number and whether any other radical changes are proposed in the pilotage system at Sydney.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend need have no fear of appointments being made on political grounds. Ever since I have been minister I have paid absolutely no attention to party politics in administering this department, and that will be my attitude so long as I hold office. Hon. members on the other side of the House who call upon me well know that I am as ready at all times to serve them as I am to serve members on this side of the House, and no one will strive harder than I to keep the pilotage system free from political patronage.

With regard to apprentice pilots, the local superintendent at Sydney would report to the general superintendent of pilots at Ottawa, and that report would come before me, so my hon. friend need have no apprehension as to the qualifications of the apprentices or that appointments will be made on party lines.

At Sydney there are 33 pilots and 7 apprentices. It is not my intention to interfere with that organization in any way, except that I have had a request from the port of Sydney to take the pilotage system under the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the same way that Quebec and Montreal have been taken over. The only change will be that instead of the local pilotage commission having charge of the pilots, the local superintendent will have charge of them.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister did not answer my question as to what he is going to do with the officials there.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government has no pension system for pilots except for those of the Quebec district, and that has to be approved by Parliament each year. The various pilotage systems throughout Canada, however, have pension funds of their own and provide for their pilots when they reach the age of 65, which is the age limit. It is not the intention of the Government at the present time to propose a pension fund for pilots. The pilots have annually to pass an eye test and show that they possess the other necessary qualifications, and then when they reach the age of 65 they are generally retired, although a pilot may continue to the age of 70 subject to the approval of the minister. If the pilot on retiring has no means of his own the Pilotage Fund generally takes care of him.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will there be a local examiner at each port?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. PELLETIER: I understand that this legislation is for the purpose of putting

the different pilotage systems under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. When the Bill comes up we shall have an opportunity of studying all the details. There are several important questions to be considered—the question of pensions, for instance. Conditions vary at the different ports. In Halifax, for instance, the pilots may have to get on the bridge of a ship and stay there for only two or three hours, whereas between Quebec and Father Point they will be on duty from twenty-four to twenty-eight hours. I have no objection to the passing of this resolution because we shall have ample time to consider all the important questions involved when the Bill comes up. I approve of the systems being placed under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am somewhat interested in this question because I live down there and understand the conditions. I think it would be of great advantage if the examiners and those in charge of the pilots were required to speak both languages.

Mr. MARTIN: Is it true that the department purchased at a cost of $70,000 or $80,000 a steamer to take the place of the pilot boats at Halifax, but that she was found cumbersome and the pilots had to take to the pilot boats again?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Department of Marine and Fisheries simply borrowed from the Department of the Naval Service the boat now used by the pilots.

Mr. MARTIN: Am I correct in understanding that the department equipped her at a cost of $60,000 or $70,000, and had to abandon her afterwards?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not aware of any such expenditure as the hon. gentleman speaks of. I shall be very glad to look into it.

Mr. LOGGIE: I want to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the hon. gentleman will be out of order.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. BALLANTYNE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 122, to amend the Canada Shipping Act, founded on the resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—CASE OF EUGENIE ALIAS "VENUS" COTE.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Calder for the House to go into Committee of Supply:

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to bring to the notice of the House a question which I could not follow up the other day, as I had a motion which I had at a previous period in the session placed on the Order Paper. That motion having since been dropped, I now desire to direct the attention of the House to the case of the King versus Eugenie alias "Venus" Coté. I bring this question before the House because an inquiry was urgently asked by the Toronto Globe into the case. The facts are very simple. On June 8, 1918, the Toronto Globe published under flaring headlines the following:

> Young Girl posed as man. Outrageous sentence upon her rouses a storm of indignation. Two years in Prison! Trying to help country. She contravenes some old statute.

The despatch is suposed to be sent from Kingston, and is dated June 7:

> Kingston, June 7.—Because she posed as a man, had her hair cut in military style, and went so far as donning a man's attire in order to do her bit in a log-driving bee for the Chaleur Bay Pulp Co., at Restigouche, "Venus" Cote, Rimouski, Quebec, aged twenty-three is now a prisoner in the Women's ward at the penitentiary here having been sentenced to two years for this awful crime. The girl was brought here in male attire, and the authorities at the big prison did not know whom they were dealing with till they read the commitment presented by the officers who had her in charge.
>
> As a result of the bringing of the girl to the penitentiary, there has been a storm of indignation over the treatment given her. There is an old law which states that it is an offence for a woman to wear male garments, but the opinion is that the penitentiary is no place for this sturdy young girl who showed such enterprise in endeavouring to help her country.

There is a further despatch supposed to be sent to the Globe and dated Kingston, June 7:—

> An effort will likely be made by Women's organizations to have "Venus" Coté, of Rimouski, Quebec, released from Portsmouth penitentiary. Miss Coté arrived here yesterday to serve two years for posing as a man and wearing male attire while she worked at log driving.

The facts are thus very clear: A young girl, who, according to the Toronto Globe, in the month of June last was doing her bit in a camp on the Baie des Chaleurs, was arrested because she was posing in male attire. For the terrible offence of thus appearing in public, and at a lumber camp, she was cruelly sentenced by a Quebec judge to Kingston penitentiary for two years. Then the Globe said that an effort was being made by the women's organizations to have "Venus" Coté released from the penitentiary. The Globe was not satisfied, and the editor, apparently to serve the

end of justice, on June 10, published as a leading editorial the following:—

Coté Case Calls for Action.

If the facts are as represented in Press despatches, from Kingston, the case of Miss Coté demands immediate action from the Minister of Justice. This young woman, whose home is in Rimouski, Quebec, is twenty-three years of age, According to public reports, she responded to patriotic appeals for workers to take the places of men called to the colours by donning male attire in order to do her bit at a logging bee for the Chaleur Bay Pulp Company at Restigouche. In so doing, she apparently contravened some old statute which makes it an offence for a woman to wear male garments. Some busybody took action, and some court sentenced her to two years' imprisonment in Kingston Penitentiary for her heinous offence! Her arrival at Kingston to serve this term is said to have occasoned amazement at the big prison, and the despatch states "the opinion is that the penitentiary is no place for this sturdy young girl who showed such enterprise in endeavouring to help her country."

This is no case in which the slow methodical process of judicial procedure should be permitted to crawl its course. It is a case for prompt investigation and immediate action. If the facts are as published 24 hours should not elapse before this girl is honourably freed, recompensed for the injury done, and publicly commended for the spirit which found expression in her action. If a cruel injustice has been done, the Minister of Justice should deem it his peremptory duty to do everything in his power to right the wrong and deal with those responsible for its perpetration. An effort is already being made by earnest and enterprising women's organizations in Kingston to secure the girl's release. But the minister should not wait until the humanity and patriotism of womanhood have forced his hand. In this case, called to his attention by publicity, he should act at once on his own initiative.

An outraged public sentiment wants to hear from Hon. C. J. Doherty.

As you will see, Mr. Speaker, this is a very strong indictment. First against the "busybody" who caused this unfortunate young lady to be arrested because posing in male attire she was nevertheless doing her bit and taking the place of slackers; second, it is also a very strong arraignment of that judge in Rimouski who dared sentence a girl to two years in the penitentiary; and third, this article contains a very broad hint of disapproval of the Minister of Justice because forsooth he might not act promptly enough in dealing with the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Was it a judge of the county court, or a judge of the Superior Court of Quebec who imposed the sentence in this case?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was a magistrate, but I am not myself passing judgment on the magistrate. I am drawing an inference from the article in the Globe. Not only is there an implied charge against the busybody who brought this young lady to justice, not only is there an implied charge against the judiciary, but there is an implied charge against the whole population of the district of Rimouski.

As I read the despatches published in the Globe, and the editorial comment on them, I became somewhat nervous, because you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that during the month of June last, war conditions seemed to call for unity in this country. We had reached a very serious period of the great conflict, and I did not think it was a proper thing that a young girl should be sent to the penitentiary for two years, because, forsooth, she was "doing her bit", when according to the Globe there were so many slackers in the district of Rimouski. So I followed up this case. I thought the request for an investigation should not be delayed at all and so I waited, waited and waited until finally, nothing having been heard from the Department of Justice, and no investigation having taken place, I said to myself, "It is my duty as a loyal citizen of the province of Quebec to inquire into this matter." So I wrote to the Assistant Attorney General of the province. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must confess my surprise when I found that instead of this young lady "doing her bit" and being cruelly sent to the penitentiary for contravening an old statute, information which had been laid before the magistrate at Rimouski, showed that the circumstances were altogether different. First of all, the editor of the Globe should have understood at once that any girl named Eugénie alias "Venus" Coté must have something dubious in her record, and should have made a little inquiry before at once launching an attack upon the district of Rimouski and its young men, and before publishing all these innuendoes against the judiciary and the people of Quebec. As I stated a moment ago, I wrote to the Assistant Attorney General of the province of Quebec, who sent me by the next mail the record of the case, and here is what I read in that record:

Copy.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Rimouski Justice of the Peace Office, Rimouski.

Frederic Joseph Astle, Hotelkeeper in the village of Little Metis, district of Rimouski,
Plaintiff.

Vs.

Eugénie Côté, spinster, from the parish of Ste. Angèle de Merici,
Accused.

Be it publicly known that on the eighteenth day of May, 1918, at Rimouski, in the district

of Rimouski, the said Eugénie Côté (and having consented that I would proceed with a summary examination and without a jury), has been found guilty by the undersigned for having malignantly, illegally and criminally, in the village of Little Metis, in the district of Rimouski, on or about the 14th of May, 1918—

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the very accurate special press despatch published in the Globe in June had reference to a case which had been made in the month of May previous. It shows how diligent and well informed the press of Canada is, and how honestly it always presents the facts to its readers.

—stolen, taken and removed the following articles from the dwelling, a summer residence, of Mrs. John Thomas Molson, viz: 25 silver forks, 22 silver spoons, a butter knife with a bone handle, opera glasses and case, 50 pieces of household lingerie, marked "J. T. Molson;" a package of playing cards, a small case containing a pair of scissors and a tooth brush, two playing balls, two linen table-cloths, all being the property and in possession of the said J. T. Molson, and estimated to at least fifty dollars.

Eugénie Côté was sentenced on the 18th of Mach, for the said offence, for internment during five years in the authorized penitentiary in the province of Quebec.

Given under my signature and seal on the day, month and year hereabove first mentioned, at Rimouski, in the above-mentioned district.

(Sgd.) H. R. Fiset.

True Copy.

(Sgd.) Arthur Chamberland,
Clerk of the Crown and Peace.

Therefore, Venus Coté was not sent to the penitentiary because she had donned male attire and had "done her bit." She had "done her bit," but at the expense of the summer residents of Little Metis. She was a burglar and was condemned for burglary; she was "doing her bit". Now, perhaps there are persons who may be surprised that Venus Coté should get such a long sentence, but she had been "doing her bit" before. According to a report received by the Attorney General from the judge, the following may be gathered:

Rimouski, June 13, 1918.

The Hon. the Attorney General,
Quebec,

Dear Sir:—

I beg to convey you the information asked for re the prisoner Eugénie Côté, presently detained in Kingston Penitentiary.

Eugenie Coté was sentenced on the 18th of March, 1918, for having stolen goods from Mrs. J. T. Molson's residence, at Little Metis.

The list of goods mentioned in the accusation contains only a portion of the valuable articles taken by the prisoner in that case.

The accused is a repeater: she having been sentenced by me on the 21st November, 1916, to serve five months in jail for house-breaking

[Mr. Lemieux.]

in the residence of a Mrs. Moise Habib, at Mont Joli.

The question of she being dressed in male attire, when arrested and convicted, has nothing to do with the penalty imposed upon her.

Two days after her incarceration in the common jail, at Rimouski, she escaped and would be subject for that offence to a further punishment.

So the dear little lady, the protegée of the Globe, was rather konwn to the police authorities, and evidently she knew all the tricks of the trade, for on being interned she managed to escape, and then donned male attire.

That girl is completely out of any moral sense. She smokes, chews, curses, blasphemes and runs about the streets and highways like a real vagrant and her case is still aggravated by the fact that for some months, she had dressed herself with male attire, because under such a disguise she could go round anywhere without being noticed and thus become a real cause of disorder.

Should you request more information about her whereabouts and moral condition, you might communicate with the parish priest of Mont Joli and St. Joseph de Lepage, and they will be able to furnish you with surprising facts.

When arrested, she was wearing masculine garments. She gave her name as being Xavier Coté, 19 years old. She had her hair cut and was so unclean in everyway that I could not recognize her at first; and it was only when we arrived at Mont Joli I found out that we had again to deal with Eugenie Coté.

Besides all her other vices, she is an inveterate burglar, for whom no correction would seem possible.

(Signed): H. R Fiset.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Toronto Globe was well informed indeed by its correspondent. But in the month of June last year it paid that paper better to preach Unionism than Unity and to be particular about the facts of this case. I imagine the Globe will at least make an apology to the magistrate and to the people in that district and also to its readers. And it should not omit to make an apology to the Minister of Justice, because unhappily he was a pretty bitter pill, and from the language used by the Globe we know, of course, that he was persona non grata with a section of the Cabinet. That is the case I wish to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker. It shows how the press of Canada, subsidized for its news, informed the public as to the real facts in this partisular instance.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

NAVAL SERVICE ESTIMATES—STATEMENT BY Mr. BALLANTYNE.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Naval Service—Salaries, $238,900.

Contingencies, $50,000.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Naval Service): Mr. Chairman, before asking the Committee to deal with the Naval Service Estimates, it will be in order that I should reply to the charges made some time ago by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) against the Naval Service. I regret that my hon. friend did not do me the courtesy to let me know that he was going to launch those charges on the floor of the House at that time, so that I might have been in my seat to reply to the inaccurate statements he then made. If the hon. member had said that the ships comprising the Royal Canadian Navy were not as efficient as they should be, I would not feel so much disposed to take issue with him; but he saw fit to detail a long list of inaccurate charges against the loyal and capable officers and men who have been defending the coasts of Canada to the best of their ability, and, as Minister of Naval Service, I am happy to say, in the most efficient manner during the period of the war. It is not my intention to reply to every charge that the hon. member made, because if I did I would take up too much time and probably I might weary the committee. I feel sure that he did not prepare these charges himself; no doubt they were collected together for him. When I was in Halifax last fall I quite accidentally came across a well-known man, not a member of this House, who was very busy trying to gather what information he could so as to supply the hon. member with the defective ammunition that he used in making these charges. I am sorry that the hon. member did not himself look into these matters more carefully; I am satisfied that he would never have made the charges had he known that they could not be substantiated.

I may mention in the first place that the establishment of the Royal Canadian Navy when war broke out on August 4, 1914, was only 300 men. Suddenly the Naval Service was called upon to furnish escorts for the convoys that were going out of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and Sydney, and also to provide the necessary patrols, and hon. members will appreciate what it meant to increase suddenly the establishment of the Royal Canadian Naval Service from 300 to over 5,000 men. During the period of the war over 10,000 men passed through the Royal Canadian Naval Service. I resent, and I am sure that the people of Canada will resent, the very unfair and unfounded charges that the hon. member (Mr. Duff) has seen fit to launch

5 p.m. against the loyal Canadian officers and men, as also the officers and men of the Imperial service, who gave their time and best efforts to Canada when her very existence as a nation was threatened. I am glad to take advantage of this opportunity, as Minister of the Naval Service, to pay my whole-hearted tribute to the splendid work done by the Imperial officers and men in the Canadian Naval service and by the loyal and efficient Canadian officers and men, who during the four and a half years of war, have been exposed to all kinds of hardship and of peril. I am surprised and disappointed that any member of this Parliament should make such unwarranted and unfounded charges as the member for Lunenburg has seen fit to make against these patriotic men who rendered to Canada and to the Empire such devoted self-acrificing service during the war.

Mr. DUFF: I said no such thing. If the minister will read my speech he will see that I took the part of the men and of some of the officers.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member made charges against the men and he cast slurs at the efficiency of the Naval Service of Canada. Having charged the Naval Service with inefficiency and blundering, and having cast ridicule upon it, he cannot now rise in his place and say that he did not make any charges against the personnel of the Canadian Naval Service. It will be interesting, no doubt, to the hon. member to hear what a stoker had to say with regard to one of his charges as published in the Montreal Star:

What the Navy Did.

Sir,—In a recent Star I saw that a Mr. William Duff, of Lunenburg, ran down the Naval Service on the Nova Scotian coast. Now, if it had not been for the Naval service there would not have been one of the Lunenburg fishing fleet on top to-day. I was on one of the naval boats, the Stadacona. We were sent out in very bad weather to find the Lunenburg fishing fleet on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and send them home because there were submarines around, and we did not stop till we had rounded every boat up. There was over 60 I was told. I did not count them myself—about 5 miles apart. In the meantime the men stood at the guns day and night, watching for subs. I happen to know that the Lady Evelyn is not the best equipped vessel in the service, and when she went to Magdalen Islands, she took something of a great deal more value than lead pencils. Mr. William Duff of Lunenburg may know a lot, but he doesn't know everything.

George Goodman, Stoker.

And now the hon. member says that he made no charges against the officers and men of the Canadian Naval Service. If he did not, what did he mean when he said that at the time the oil-tanker Lux Blanca was sunk by a submarine several miles from the gas buoy off Halifax, the naval officials at Halifax were holding a pink tea and playing bridge whist? To-day, when I charge the hon. member with making unfair and inaccurate statements with regard to the officers and men of the Naval Service, he tries to make out that he did not reflect upon the personnel; that he was referring only to the ships. Such an explanation at this late date will certainly not go very far.

It is strange that the hon. member should go for his information to a junior officer, Lieutenant Julian—a man who did not know the bow from the stern of a ship when war broke out and who knows very little more to-day. In winding up his long list of supposed charges he says that he asked this young politician, Lieutenant Julien, to what he ascribed the inefficiency of the Naval Service of Canada; and that Lieutenant Julian said it was due to Sir Robert Borden and the late Conservative party. That clearly shows that the charges were made for the purpose of trying to gain some political party advantage. The late lamented and gifted leader of the Liberal party, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, did his best to inaugurate a Canadian naval service, and he placed a Naval Service Act upon the statute book. The ships that we have to-day are the ships that were brought out to this country by the Liberal party. And yet a full-fledged Liberal like the hon. member for Lunenburg gets up and slams the navy that was created by his late revered leader.

It is not my intention to enter into any political controversy on the subject of a Canadian naval policy. It has always been a matter of great regret to me that the naval defences of the coast of Canada ever became a question of controversy between the two parties; I should have preferred to see it treated as a national matter and kept entirely out of the political arena. I shall not, therefore, this afternoon go over the history of former Liberal and Conservative Governments so far as it relates to a naval policy for Canada. The matter of a Canadian naval policy will be taken up in due time. When Parliament meets in the next session I am satisfied that the Government will place before Parliament and before the people a naval policy that will receive the unanimous approval of members of Parliament and of the people generally.

The first charge that the hon. member (Mr. Duff) makes is this:

> I am going to show, Mr. Chairman, that this $31,000,000 was practically all wasted, that it was not spent in the interest of the taxpayers of Canada; that it was entirely unnecessary, and did not in any particular, or in any way help to defend Canada or to protect the property of her citizens.

That is a nice charge to make against the Liberal party who created the Naval Service of Canada. It is strange that the hon. member throughout his speech did not return to the financial side of the question, except to say that the Government proceeded to waste money on the purchase of a lot of small boats that were utterly useless.

Then, the hon. member had something to say in regard to the Niobe and the Rainbow. He said:

> Shortly after Hon. J. D. Hazen assumed the position of Minister of Naval Affairs the crews of these ships were disbanded, the boys sent home and only a few men kept on board to act as caretakers.

I shall give the actual facts. On the 28th of July, 1914, when events in Europe first began to look alarming, the Rainbow was in commission with a full crew. On that day she was directed to prepare for war, and on the 2nd of August she was despatched to sea to cruise off Vancouver Island to be in readiness for any sudden attack by German submarines, known to be on the west coast of America. Immediately upon the declaration of war on the fourth of August, the Rainbow was ordered south to convoy His Majesty's gunboats Algerian and Shearwater to Esquimalt, a task which she successfully accomplished. She was continuously at sea until paid off in the spring of 1917, covering something over 50,000 miles during her period of service and her activities extended from Panama to the northern coast of British Columbia. By the battle off the Falkland Islands the great menace of the German Pacific fleet was removed; but there was considerable scope for useful work on the Pacific until the entry of the United States into the war. It was then decided that the Rainbow's trained and experienced crew could be used to better advantage on the Atlantic. So much with regard to the Rainbow.

The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) had also to say something about the Niobe. He said that upon war being de-

clared "it was found that her boilers were in such condition that it would take several months to put her in a seaworthy condition." Here are the actual facts, which are very much at variance with the statement of the hon. member for Lunenburg. The Niobe was ordered to prepare for war on the 28th July. Steps were once taken to bring her forward for service, and to raise a crew for her. She was ready for sea on the 31st August, 1914. She at once joined the N.A. & W.I. Squadron, her first duty being to escort SS. Canada with the Royal Canadian Regiment to Bermuda and return with an Imperial regiment. She then patrolled the gulf of St. Lawrence and coast of Newfoundland, whilst the First Canadian Contingent was preparing to leave and during their passage through Canadian waters. She subsequently formed part of the so-called New York Patrol until she was paid off in September, 1915, after a full year's efficient service, during which she steamed over 30,000 miles. Hon. members will see that there is a wide difference between the charge that the hon. member made, that her boilers were in such condition that she was not seaworthy, and the actual facts, which were as I have just stated. Furthermore, at the request of the Admiralty all the big guns on the Niobe were removed and used on the merchant marine ships, but only after the active service at sea to which I have referred had been performed.

The hon. member was good enough to say that he had no charge to make against my administration, but that he had as to the administration of my predecessor, Sir Douglas Hazen. I want to say, in fairness to my predecessor in office, that he is not to blame in any way for the Naval Service of Canada not having done more than that which it did render so effectively during the war.

In the early months of the war the Canadian Government inquired whether, in the judgment of the Admiralty, it was necessary or desirable to undertake preparation for naval defence. A reply was received stating that naval preparations were not necessary and that Canada's effort should be concentrated upon military forces. A further inquiry was made in the spring of 1915, with the same result. In the autumn of 1916 the Canadian Government was suddenly called upon by the Admiralty to undertake certain preparations for naval defence. The Department of Naval Service took up the matter immediately and vigorously, with the result that all the proposals of the Admiralty were carried out practically in their entirety and to the greatest extent that was possible in the circumstances. The result is seen in the large number of patrol boats of various types and sizes which were engaged in anti-submarine defence.

It will be seen, therefore, that the Government on two different occasions inquired of the Admiralty if there was anything that Canada could do more than was being undertaken at the time, and the reply was that the British Government did not desire that Canada should do anything more than concentrate her full effort upon necessary military forces to send overseas. The hon. member (Mr. Duff) makes this further interesting statement:

> I make the statement here that if the Niobe had been ready to proceed to sea the morning that war was declared she would have succeeded in capturing prizes which would have paid the Canadian expenditure for war purposes during the first year of the war.

I am sure that the hon. member finds himself in rather an awkward position this afternoon after having given expression to views that had been gathered for him by some persons who had very strong partisan political leanings, and who were not careful about the accuracy of the statements that they placed in his hands. The hon. member no doubt referred to German vessels sailing to or from United States ports, but I may say that the German Government took the precaution to warn all masters of ships in advance that war was likely to be declared, and on receipt of this intelligence these vessels were careful to remain in the shelter of neutral ports. It will be interesting to learn that an Imperial cruiser of very similar type to the Niobe put into Halifax the day after the outbreak of war and that Imperial vessels continually shadowed the Atlantic coast from that time on. Neither this ship nor any others of the fleet made any captures off the Canadian or the northern United States coasts, which, I think, effectively disposes of the supposition that had the Niobe been at sea she would have made many valuable captures. The committee may rest assured that the Imperial Government were quite awake to the possibilities of the situation and took measures to deal with it.

The further the hon. member proceeded with his speech, the farther he got away from the facts. He wanted to know why the Niobe did not capture the German steamer Willehad. If he had taken the trouble to ascertain the actual facts he would have learned for himself that this German steamer Willehad sailed from Montreal

on the first day of August, and war was not declared between Great Britain and Germany until August 4. Notwithstanding, the hon. member expected the Niobe to open up her guns, and if not to sink this German steamer, at least to capture her, before a state of war existed. I am surprised that the hon. member should have made such an inaccurate statement before the intelligent members of this House.

Mr. COPP: When did she sail from Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: She sailed from Montreal on the first day of August.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: When did she pass Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: She passed Quebec on the 2nd, and her movements were watched and telegraphed to the Naval Department all down the St. Lawrence. Furthermore, the vessel Canada was held in readiness to intercept her in the event of war being declared while she was in Canadian waters.

Mr. DUFF: Where was this ship on the 4th of August?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: On the 4th of August she was outside of Canadian waters on her way to Boston, where she arrived on the 5th of August. But, said the hon. member, while she was going down the St. Lawrence, the Naval Service did not watch her, nor make any attempt to capture her. It must be obvious that the reason we did not do so was that war had not been declared at that time. The hon. member said, in regard to the Princess Cecelia:—

> It was humiliating for Nova Scotians to know that the North-German-Lloyd SS. Princess Cecilia left Boston a day or two after the war was commenced, with the most valuable cargo ever shipped from that port. . . . . and that no effort could be made by the Niobe or any Canadian cruiser to go out and capture that ship.

The facts are these: The Princess Cecelia left New York on the 28th July, 1914, one week before the declaration of war, bound for an European port. When matters assumed a threatening aspect she was half way across the Atlantic. She was ordered to return to a United States port by wireless and reached Bar Harbour on August 4th before the declaration of war. She left Bar Harbour on the 6th November, 1914, under an agreement between the Imperial and United States Governments, for Boston, in order that better supervision might be exercised over her. She did not leave Boston until after the entry of the United States into the war in 1917, and then flew the United States flag. The value of sea power was never more startlingly demonstrated. No prizes were made on the North Atlantic coasts, as the German ships simply stayed in neutral ports or fled to them for shelter, making a rich harvest for those neutrals at a later date, when they in turn entered the war and took over hundreds of thousands of tons of the finest shipping in the world without an effort.

The hon. member's next charge is that relating to what he calls the waste of money on small patrol vessels. I do not suppose the hon. member knew that the Canadian Naval Service had to provide an extensive system of patrols. Not only did we have to have patrols outside our principal Atlantic seaports such as Halifax and Sydney, but we had to furnish escorts for the numerous convoys conveying Canadian and American troops across the Atlantic from Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and Sydney. These men of our patrol service who have served on small trawlers and drifters in all kinds of weather, performed as good service, and deserve as much commendation for that service, as our gallant soldiers who fought in the trenches in France for all that we hold dear. I cannot help feeling annoyed that the hon. member for Lunenburg should make such slighting and sneering references to the naval men who have performed such signal service for Canada. It might interest the members of the Committee to know what we have done in the way of Atlantic coast patrol. The patrol squadron consisted of:

10 Auxiliary Patrol vessels.
12 Canadian Trawlers (named).
7 Trawlers Sweepers Type known as P.V's and numbered).
36 Trawlers (known as T.R's and numbered).
36 Drifters (known as C.D's and numbered).
15 Drifters (Imperial and temporarily lent, known as I.D's and numbered)
6 United States Submarine Chasers.
1 United States Torpedo Boat (allocated to Air Service, Halifax).

The whole of the above were manned by Canadian Naval Service ranks and ratings (with the exception of the United vessels), the total number of ranks and ratings employed being approximately two thousand.

The area to be patrolled, and over which practical operations were continually carried out, extended from Belle Isle to Shelburne, and from Point Des Monts (St. Lawrence) to the Virgin Rocks, including the Nova Scotia Banks and Grand Banks. This area gave some 1,800 miles of coast line besides open sea areas and routes which had to be patrolled.

The operations on which the vessels of the Patrol Squadron Area were employed are:

Coast patrolling and investigation at all points of the coast line of reports of suspicious crafts sighted, suspicious lights, possible mines, etc.

Constant patrol of certain positions of strategic importance.

Frequent patrols of the Grand Banks and Nova Scotia Banks and giving warning to fishing vessels of enemy submarine activities.

Port patrols off Halifax and Sydney.

Daily mine sweeping of the approaches to Halifax, Sydney and St. John's, Nfld.

Frequent exploratory sweeps over mineable waters along the coast routes of shipping.

Convoy escorts to the slow convoys transporting stores overseas for some 150 to 200 miles out to sea. (These convoys number 25 to 43 vessels in a convoy) .

Convoy escorts to the troops convoys leaving Canada.

Convoy escorts continually along Canadian and Newfoundland coastal routes.

Organized searches over areas where any enemy submarines were known or believed to be operating. In addition to which a very considerable amount of salvage work has been done by the Canadian patrol vessels.

The force was divided between the bases of Halifax and Sydney in proportion to the measure of activities required in the neighbourhood of these ports and the force based on each of these ports were further divided into separate flotillas utilized respectively for patrols, convoy escorts, minesweeping, etc. The main principle guiding the amount of sea time for patrol, convoy escort and other flotillas engaged in work beyond the minesweeping of harbour approaches was that two-thirds of the force were actually in active employment, one-third being in harbour undergoing necessary overhaul, coaling, storing, etc., and their personnel receiving instruction in gunnery, minesweeping, signal, hydrophones, depth charges, etc.

By this it is seen that force was maintained actually at sea for two-thirds of its time, which, when the weather conditions of the coast, the class of vessels employed, the small number of their crews, and consequent strain are considered, together with the amount of work which has to be carried out even when in harbour, is considered as much as can be expected of the crews and at the same time maintain a good and efficient lookout.

When the war was on, a strict censorship prevented both my predecessor and myself from giving the public any information as to the splendid work the Canadian Naval Service was performing, and in one sense the country should be thankful to the hon. member for Lunenburg for making these charges, because it gives an opportunity not only to refute them in toto, but to place on Hansard the record of the splendid work of the Canadian Naval Service during the four and a half years of war.

I might also say that our Canadian patrols discovered several German mines, and no one can tell how many ships and how many lives have been saved by their vigilance in that respect. There is another thing. The people of Halifax and of Sydney, not familiar with the work of the patrol service, and observing these trawlers and drifters, which look very much alike, as they strolled along the port of Halifax or Sydney, were under the impression that the trawlers and drifters never went out to sea, and that has led sometimes to the unfair charge that the men of the patrol service doing nothing but attending pink teas and wasting the country's money and their own time. As a matter of fact, these trawlers and drifters proceeded to sea as divisions, and when they had stayed out the requisite number of days, they came back to port to refit. Surely no one will begrudge these men the short leave they were granted when they returned to their base.

I shall not refer to what the hon. gentleman had to say about chartered vessels and motor launches, but here is a statement that I cannot allow to go unchallenged. He said:

> When it was found that Halifax was full of these boats a base was established at Sydney. I have no hesitation in saying that the large expenditure of money for naval purposes at Sydney harbour was absolutely wasted, and there was no good result from having these boats in that harbour.

That is a very strong statement for an hon. member who was not conversant with the facts to make. In view of the brief outline I have given of the work of the patrols at Halifax and Sydney, I cannot understand how the hon. member could get up and state they had performed no service whatever for Canada, and that the expenditure in maintaining the base at Sydney was a waste of money. The hon. member for Lunenburg shakes his head. What I read were his actual words. I will read them again. He said:

I have no hesitation in saying that the large expenditure of money for naval purposes at Sydney harbour was absolutely wasted.

There I take sharp issue with him. I say there was no money wasted at the base at Sydney or at the base at Halifax. Words fail me to do justice to the splendid gallantry and efficiency of the men of our patrol service. Here again is another evidence that the hon. member could not have gathered this information from any trustworthy source.

The naval base at Sydney was first established in the spring of 1915. It was made a permanent base in 1916. During the summer practically the whole export trade of Canada passed through Cabot Straits. During the war Sydney became more important and in 1917 the Admiralty used it as a port for collecting the convoys proceeding from the North American ports to Europe. Convoys consisting of thirty, forty, or more merchant ships would leave Sydney regularly every week throughout the summer. Sydney was certainly a most important base and was used not only on the judgment of the technical officers of the Canadian naval service but also on the advice of the Admiralty. I think the advice I had, as Minister of the Naval Service, was more to be relied upon than the inaccurate information that the hon. member has received. The hon. member for Lunenburg follows along with this other statement:

Captains and mates were taken from the merchant marine service and held around Halifax for months doing nothing.

That might sound all right if there was a general election on but I do not see why the hon. member should make such an absurd statement as that these men were taken from the merchant marine service and held around Halifax for months doing nothing. What are the facts? When it was decided by the Admiralty to build 60 trawlers and 100 drifters, the department agreed to assist by providing crews for those in Canadian waters. This meant the addition of at least 1,600 officers and men. It is obvious these men could not be recruited, and instructed in their special work in a day, and, therefore, they were recruited and held in readiness, so that as each vessel was ready at the builders the whole crew could be despatched to bring the vessel out to sea without loss of time. That is what these men were doing at the port of Halifax when the hon. member says they were lying around doing nothing.

Mr. COPP: Could the minister tell me what year it was and at what time of the year these men were waiting for these trawlers?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If you get down to such details as the name of the month or the day of the month they were there, all I can say is that I have not that information before me; nor can I tell you whether it was full moon or half moon, but I can find that out if you want to know.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the minister say that these men were not kept at Halifax at all waiting for ships to be ready for use?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, I do not say that.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will he say they were not kept there for a whole winter by the hundred?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I say that they were not kept there for a whole winter and they were not kept there by the hundred, but there was of course a certain number of men held there waiting to man these ships. Then the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) makes another statement about the craft. He says:

Owing to their condition they were constantly undergoing repairs, most of them were unseaworthy and were not fit to go outside the headlands.

I do not know where the hon. gentleman got such information as that but I want to say that in view of the importance of their duties, these vessels were always kept as far as possible at the top notch of efficiency. There was room for a possible failure when these vessels were ordered out for duty. They were, therefore, always immediately overhauled on their arrival in harbour and any small defects made good, and as much time as possible was given in harbour for this purpose. Of course owing to the rapidity with which they were built, on account of the emergency, many of the vessels developed more minor defects than would be normally the case.

Then the hon. gentleman speaks of the crew of trawler No. 30 and he makes certain charges about that vessel. In July 1918, trawler No. 30 was engaged in escorting convoys and merchant ships to sea. The hon. member referred to the court martialling of certain members of her crew. Her crew had complained of leaks in the forecastle deck. All available caulkers were engaged in more urgent work and repairs could not be taken in hand at once. On the morning of the 18th, the men refused to take the ship to sea, and consequently

she was unable to take her part as escort to the outgoing convoy.

The ship was inspected by the shipwright officer, who reported that there was a slight leak over the starboard after bunk, also over the mess table; a leak in the captain's cabin, the worst on the ship. There were three or four leaks in the engineer's quarters. He further reported that the leaks were no more than might be occasioned in the case of a ship sweating and in no way impaired the ship's seagoing efficiency. In view of the fact that the country was at war, and these men put their comfort before the safety of valuable lives and ships in the convoy, the crew were tried by courtmartial for refusing duty and sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment. This sentence was considered not excessive.

The captain of the Hochelaga I wish to inform the hon. member, was not a member of the court which tried these men and the statement of the hon. member that he was a typical example of the distortion and misrepresentation employed by him throughout his speech to work up a case against the naval service. Then the hon. member had gathered certain shreds of information regarding the Hochelaga. He stated:

> There was a steamer on naval duty called the Hochelaga, which was commanded by a certain gentleman and which was sent to sea on patrol duty. The lookout on this naval patrol boat one morning sighted a submarine; he reported the matter to the captain, and the captain, who was in charge of eight or ten small boats in addition to his own, at once put up signals to return to port, and instead of stopping and endeavouring to get that submarine or be sunk in the attempt, the captain of the Hochelaga deliberately turned tail and proceeded back to port.

And yet, the hon. gentleman says that he has not made any charge against the officers and men who comprise the Canadian naval service.

Mr. DUFF: I did not say that at all.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hansard makes the hon. gentleman state that the captain—

> At once put up signals to return to port.

That is a direct charge against the officers and men of the naval service.

Mr. DUFF: Against some of the officers and men but not against all.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend need not try to draw the line too fine because his statements were general and sweeping. The particular charge that he makes in this connection is against the officers and men who were on board the Hochelaga. The facts are: On the 25th August the patrol ships Cartier, Hochelaga and trawlers Nos. 32 and 22 were patrolling, ships three to four miles apart. About 1.45 p.m. the Hochelaga sighted two schooners which being reported to the captain, he altered course to intercept them. When about four miles from the schooners a submarine was sighted close to them, and at the same time one of the schooners sank. The captain then ordered his crew to stations for "action," altered course towards Cartier, his senior officer's ship and away from the submarine, and reported the presence of the submarine by wireless. Cartier immediately steered for the position of the submarine, accompanied by Hochelaga, but the submarine had by that time disappeared. Then the hon. member for Lunenburg asks:

> Why in the name of common sense was he allowed to go with an honourable discharge?

There again the hon. gentleman's information is totally inaccurate. Here are the facts in that case: When the circumstances were reported, the captain of the Hochelaga was tried by court-martial on the following charge:

> That he did not, from negligence or other default, on sight of a ship of the enemy, which it was his duty to engage, use his utmost exertions to bring his ship into action.

He was found guilty and sentenced to be dismissed from His Majesty's service. By no stretch of imagination can this sentence be called an honourable discharge. There can be scarcely any greater disgrace than such a sentence in time of war, which carries with it not only the forfeiture of his commission as an officer, but also of all claim to pension, war service gratuity, medals, or other benefits. Surely that was enough punishment for a man who showed some neglect in the performance of his duty. This officer was not on the court which tried the crew of Trawler 30, for refusal of duty, although the hon. member says that he was.

Then my hon. friend unearthed another mare's nest and he referred to the oil tanker Luz Blanca, which was either sunk by a shell, or torpedoed by a German submarine, seventeen miles off the gas buoy at the port of Halifax. The hon. member made a number of charges of culpable negligence against the officers of the department in connection with the sinking of that ship. Here is further evidence that the hon. member made charge after charge against the

officers and men of the Naval Service of Canada. At the opening of my remarks the hon. member disclaimed having done so; but as we consider his speech we find that as he proceeded he time and time again makes absolutely unfair and inaccurate references to these gallant men. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to say:

> While this vessel was being sunk a number of the officers at Halifax were at pink teas and playing bridge whist. This is the way we were protected on the Nova Scotia coast.

I am glad of this opportunity to absolutely refute the accusation—the unfair accusation—that the hon. member has brought against British officers with a splendid record in the Imperial navy, and against the excellent officers and men who comprised the Canadian Naval Service of Canada. For the hon. gentleman to allege that in time of war these men who had donned the King's naval uniform would be guilty of attending pink teas and playing bridge while an oil tanker was being shelled and sunk outside of the port of Halifax, is absurd and nonsensical, and I hurl the charge back at him as unfair and totally inaccurate. Now, here are the facts in regard to the Luz Blanca, which may afford some information to the hon. gentleman: She left Halifax about 7 a.m. on the 5th of August, 1918. She was struck by a torpedo on her starboard side when about 35 miles southwest of the Outer Gas Buoy of Halifax harbour. There was a considerable amount of haze on this day. Her report of the attack was received by the senior officer of patrols at 1.45 p.m., and action was taken immediately. At this time there were at sea—one division of patrol vessels (i.e., four vessels) and two United States submarine chasers. The former had just left the convoy, and the latter were still in company with the convoy. The W/T. message was sent to both divisions, which was coded, sent, decoded and acted upon by 2.30 p.m.

That is very prompt action. This is how the officers were employed instead of attending a pink tea and playing bridge whist. The patrol vessels were uncertain of their position, as they had been at sea for some time in fog. Unfortunately, the senior officer made a wrong decision as to his position on the advice of a fisherman whom he happened to pass, and in consequence did not get into touch with the Luz Blanca. He was absolved from blame by the court of inquiry and the department concurred in this. Any man who knows anything at all about navigation—and I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) knows much about it—is aware that when a ship is in a dense fog it is nothing unusual for a navigator not to be able to determine what his right course is.

Mr. DUFF: Does the minister say there was a fog on that day?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do. I suppose my hon. friend later on will assert that there was no fog on the day in question.

Mr. DUFF: I absolutely assert that there was no fog on that day, and I will put up $1,000 to prove the assertion.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hon. gentlemen will appreciate, from what I have said already, whether the accuracy of the statement of the Minister for the Naval Service, or the accuracy of the statement of the hon. member for Lunenburg, is the more to be depended upon. The submarine chasers arrived on the scene too late to save the ship, but picked up survivors. Those are the facts in regard to the sinking of the Luz Blanca.

It now becomes my duty to deal with another statement by the hon. gentleman; and it appears that the further he proceeded with his speech the more intoxicated he became with his inaccurate statements.

An hon. MEMBER: He had been taking pink tea.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Probably he had been taking tea, and I hope it was not anything stronger.

Mr. DUFF: I must ask the hon. member to take back his suggestion that I was indulging in something stronger than pink tea.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will withdraw the observation, because I am satisfied the hon. gentleman would be perfectly satisfied with tea, and more especially "pink tea."

Now here is another statement by the hon. gentleman:

> That whilst a German submarine was off the coast, the Lady Evelyn was sent to Magdalen islands with six lead pencils.

It is a shame that the hon. member should occupy the time of the House with such frivolity as that, and to take up my time and the time of my technical officers in looking up accurate information to reply to any such nonsensical charge as that the Lady Evelyn was sent to the Magdalen islands with six lead pencils. The facts are that the Lady Evelyn left Sydney at five a.m. on the 3rd August on patrol duty in the gulf of St. Lawrence. Whilst on this duty she visited, in the ordinary course,

the various war signal stations in her area, at the same time landing any supplies required by them. She continued patrolling until seven a.m. on the 7th August, when she returned to Sydney. The submarine on the 5th August was operating off Halifax, and not in the area of the Sydney patrol to which the Lady Evelyn belonged.

Then the hon. gentleman dealt with the assistance rendered by naval vessels from the country to the south of us, and here is what he said:

> An American destroyer was off Cape Canso, she received a call to return to Halifax. When the commander of the destroyer received the call, he wired back that he had information a submarine was in his zone. Nevertheless he was ordered back to Halifax on some paltry excuse, and when he got there he was sent out on convoy with the ship that was to take Prince Arthur of Connaught to England.

The facts of the case are as follows: The Halifax subdivision of United States chasers were ordered to leave Halifax and to search Banquereau bank and return to Halifax, in order to escort H. M. S. Shannon, which ship was to convey Prince Arthur of Connaught to England. No submarine was sighted or reported by any of these vessels, and their programme of search was not curtailed in the least degree for the purpose of returning to Halifax. The normal routine was maintained, which would have been used in the case of any ship of the size of the Shannon proceeding to sea.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has the minister the log of the Lady Evelyn?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is available.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Can the minister tell us where she was on the 5th August?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I cannot off-hand tell the hon. gentleman the longitude and the latitude of the ship's position on that date—it is not to be supposed that I should know—but I will try and get that information for him. There is no necessity for me to refer to where the submarine went.

I pass over several of the hon. member's remarks and come to his statement that the Americans established seaplane bases at Halifax and North Sydney, and that this was a humiliating position for Canada. Well, let us see how humiliating it was for our beloved country. The seaplane bases at Halifax and Sydney were established, constructed and paid for by the Naval Service Department. As all naval operations on the Canadian coast were carried out in consultation with the Imperial and the United States authorities—that is to say, after our neighbour came into the war, it was agreed that when the stations were erected, the United States would lend such personnel as was desired to assist in operating them, for the following excellent reasons: I need not go into details, but there were large numbers of American soldiers going out of the ports of Sydney and Halifax, and it was necessary to establish a naval seaplane base not only at Sydney, but also at Halifax. The agreement was that the Americans were to provide the machines free of cost, which they very generously did—not only seaplanes, but kite balloons, and they were also prepared to supply airships. They also agreed to supply the personnel until we had a sufficient number of Canadian officers trained to take the places of the American officers. When one considers the number of men that we sent overseas and the number of men engaged in the naval service, it was not at all humiliating for Canada—when it came to filling the technical posts of pilots and crews of seaplanes, kite balloons and airships—to apply to the United States for the necessary skilled officers and men until Canada could provide the personnel. Canada had her share in this. We had to provide the buildings and the landing base, which we were proceeding to do as rapidly as possible, and some of the buildings were partially constructed when the armistice was signed.

As to the patrol of our waters by the United States war ships, the United States was one of the Allies. The tremendous British fleet was performing, as we all know, the herculean task of providing the necessary escorts for the vast number of ships that were carrying soldiers, munitions and foodstuffs, as well as holding the enemy at bay in the Kiel canal during the whole term of the war. Therefore, an arrangement was made with the United States for their navy to patrol a certain portion of Canadian waters. The United States established their outer base at Shelburne with a view to protecting the approaches to the northern United States ports. The patrol from Lockeport, east and north, was carried on by Canada. So the United States was only taking a fair share in looking after the safety of her own ports as well as the safety of her own soldiers.

Then the hon. member comes to an offer than he heard was made by Mr. J. K. L. Ross "to pay for a British cruiser if the Government would build the other four, but his offer was turned down." There is no record in the Naval Service to show that

any such offer was ever made by Commander Ross. Furthermore, at the outset of my remarks I clearly showed that the Canadian Government on two different occasions asked the Admiralty if we could do anything in the way of building ships or providing further naval service, and the reply was, "No; concentrate Canada's effort on the military forces."

Then the hon. member deals with the Halifax explosion, and here is what he states:

> There was absolutely no necessity for the Mont Blanc to come up harbour, and the Naval Authorities had no right to allow her to come up, there being plenty of space in the Eastern passage to lay, etc.

I would state that there was absolutely no reason why this vessel should not come up Halifax harbour. The channel is wide and straight, the largest ships in the world have navigated it throughout the war with ease and safety in all weathers. The people of the city of Halifax would, I think, be the last to claim that the entrance to Bedford Basin cannot be navigated, in all weathers and at all hours, with ordinary every day precautions on the part of pilots and masters for their ships. So there was no necessity whatever that the Mont Blanc should be held out for there was any amount of sea room and the day was perfectly clear. The hon. member further states that the collision was caused by violation of the rules of navigation. In answer to that, I may say that a court of inquiry was immediately ordered by me, as Minister of Naval Service. That court was presided over by Mr. Justice Drysdale of Halifax. The court found Pilot MacKey to be at fault, and his license was cancelled. Not even the slightest insinuation was made by the court that the Canadian naval authorities at Halifax were to blame.

It will require only a moment to deal with the statement of the young lad, Julian, who is the hon. member's authority for charging that the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt were in a deplorable condition. I can assure the hon. member that they were not; on the contrary, they were in constant use at the time and they have been in use ever since. I will not take up any more of the time of the House by referring to the commissioning of the Niobe and Rainbow; the fishery protection vessels; or the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve.

If my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) does not hold the officers and men of the Royal Canadian Naval Service in very high es-

timation, our beloved Sovereign does, and he has been pleased to approve of the following posthumous awards:

Mr. Albert Mattison, late acting boatswain, R.C.N., Albert Medal.

Late Stoker Petty Officer Edward S. Beard, V.R. 1731, R.N.C.V.R., Albert Medal.

John T. Gammon, Chief-master-at-Arms R.C.N., member of the Military Division of the British Empire Order.

Chief E. R. A. 2nd Class, Hay, R.C.N., Meritorious Service Medal.

Walter Critch, A.B., Official Number 1242, Newfoundland, R.N.R., Meritorious Service Medal.

The British Admiralty have requested that an expression of their Lordships' appreciation may be conveyed to the following officer:—Mr. Walter O'Reilly, Gunner, R.C.N.

The Admiralty have sent letters of appreciation to the next of kin of the following ratings:

Chas. C. McMillan, Leading Seaman, V.R. 2496.

Carl C. Wilson, Able Seaman, V.R. 1561.

Albert Sanders, Able Seaman, V.R. 4066.

Freeman P. Nickerson, Able Seaman, V.R. 1891.

Geo. H. Yates, Stoker, 2nd Class, V.R. 5480.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have covered the ground sufficiently to satisfy every hon. member of this House that there is no truth whatever in the charges that were made by the hon. member for Lunenburg either against the materiel or the personnel of the Naval Service.

I have shown what splendid service they have rendered, and as Minister of the Naval Service I have paid my tribute to them. I am sure that the House and the people of Canada will feel proud of the splendid work done by the Naval Service, its officers and men, of whose activities they have to-day been informed for the first time, in a meagre way.

In closing his remarks the hon. member (Mr. Duff) suggested that a committee of the House be appointed to investigate the affairs of the Canadian Naval Service. There is no ground for the appointment of such a committee; there is no necessity for it. I think I have made it plain that not one of the charges made by the member for Lunenburg is substantiated by the facts.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, some nineteen days ago the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), then Acting Prime Minister, introduced a resolution which was discussed before this House. The resolution had for its object the providing of $350,000,000 for different services of this country, a part of which money, the min-

ister told us, was to be expended this year for naval purposes. I took occasion that time to rise in my place and object strenuously to any portion of this $350,000,000 being spent for naval purposes, and this afternoon, nineteen days after the consideration of that resolution and after I had made certain charges against the Naval Department of this country, the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne) comes into the House and accuses me of discourtesy. Possibly, Sir, I may not be as extremely courteous as my hon. friend the admiral of the navy, nor do I hold any high rank in the fleet; but I do resent the imputation of discourtesy whether that imputation be made by the hon. Minister of Naval Affairs, or anybody else. If any one was discourteous to him, undoubtedly it was not I. We all regret the fact that the hon. minister has for the past six months been seriously ill, and from the time the House convened on February 20, as far as I know, the hon. gentleman was never in his seat until recently. But the work of his department was being conducted by the minister acting in his stead, and if I am not right in this statement I stand corrected. I understood that while the minister was not in the House he was in his home in Montreal recuperating from a serious illness. If it was necessary for the Minister of Naval Affairs to be present when this resolution was being discussed and when the whole subject matter involved in it was under consideration, any discourtesy that was shown him must be attributed to the then Acting Prime Minister, who introduced the resolution. I did not know that the resolution was to be introduced, for I had no notice of its impending introduction; nor did I know at what time I should have an opportunity of discussing the subject. I was in the House when the resolution was introduced and on the spur of the moment I rose in my place and made certain charges against the Naval Department—charges which I affirm that the Minister of Naval Affairs did not in any particular rebut this afternoon. It is quite true, he endeavoured to draw a red herring across the trail. He flapped the flag and eulogized the men, at the same time trying to make out that I, in my remarks, reflected on the men by alleging that they were no good and did nothing during the war. That is entirely incorrect, and is not borne out by my remarks as they appear in Hansard. In this speech the minister did not insinuate but deliberately stated that I had said in my remarks that the men had done nothing. Now, Sir, I will quote my exact words from Hansard, and I presume the minister will accept what I read as being correct. This is what I said :

> I do not wish to imply that all the naval officers were incompetent. There were a number of bright, young Canadian officers scattered through the fleet, and a large number of marines and bluejackets, who, if they had been given a chance, would have distinguished themselves and brought honour to Canada, but these men were not given an opportunity so to do.

In face of this, will the minister dare say that I deliberately attempted to besmirch the character of Canadian naval ratings and others connected with the Navy?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Did the hon. member not say, when he was referring to the Lux Blanca being torpedoed seventeen miles from the coast off the entrance to the port of Halifax, that admiralty officers at that time were trifling at pink teas and playing bridge whist? Will the hon. member say whether or not he made that statement.

Mr. DUFF: That is not an answer to the statement I have just made, but for the benefit of the hon. minister I will quote further from my speech later on; and as to the naval officers in Halifax in their relationship to the Lux Blanca, I have absolute proof that they did nothing to relieve the situation that existed on the occasion to which I referred. While, perhaps, they might not at that precise moment have been attending pink teas or playing bridge, I can substantiate the statement that this condition of affairs generally prevailed in Halifax at that time; and if the minister would grant the investigating committee which he refused this afternoon I could prove my charges to the hilt. I am quite aware that there are good men in the so-called Canadian Navy. For instance, there is young Silver of Halifax, who was lost on the H.M.S. Good Hope off the coast of Chili. No brighter boy ever donned the uniform than this young man, who went to his death as a hero in battle against German ships in the Pacific Ocean. Or take my good friend, the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), would anybody say for a moment that his son is not a credit to Canada—a young man who has been for four or five years in the Naval Service in command of a submarine chaser? No man, certainly not myself, would ever think of saying anything derogatory of young men such as these. Again, there is the son of Mr. Justice Brodeur. Would any one sug-

gest that he does not deserve the utmost credit? What I do say, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think it can be controverted, is that there were certain men in the so-called Canadian Navy who were not fit to be in it, and this fact I shall prove in a few moments.

The hon. minister was disposed to sneer at my knowledge of marine affairs, and he said I did not know much about the sea. Well, I do not profess to, but I think I know more about naval affairs than a gentleman who was born in the city of Montreal and had the odour of paint in his nostrils for the last ten or fifteen years. I was born with the smell of salt spray in my nostrils and have been familiar with the sea ever since I could toddle, and I should be the last to say anything disrespectful of men in whom I have taken an interest all my life. For this reason it did not become the Minister of Naval Affairs to sneer at me and to suggest that I was unfriendly to the fishermen or those whose calling is to follow the sea. I presume the minister likely derived his knowledge of the sea on a gumphead in Montreal, while I, on the other hand, got my knowledge of the sea on the sea itself, however little that knowledge may be. The entire speech of the minister consisted in sneering inuendoes and insinuations, and it was painfully evident to all present, as he read his essay, that he had not learned his lesson as perfectly as he might have done, for he did not even lay the emphasis on the proper portions of his address; he just recited his statement with the aid of the two officials at his side who coached him from time to time. He also suggested that the charges which I made in my speech some time ago were not prepared by me. Well, what about the answer of the minister himself? Did he prepare the statement he made this afternoon? Was there very much of a suggestion that the work was his own, or did it not rather appear that he was repeating what the officials of his department had prepared for him? I do not think that any one sitting beside me when I made my charges could question the originality of them, and I can prove and substantiate them in their entirety.

But I do not wish the admiral of the fleet to take my words alone for what I have said; I am quite prepared to give him some more evidence on this matter, and for this purpose I will first quote a gentleman well known in this country, Mr. J. W. Wilkinson, R.N.A.V., of Toronto. Let us see what he says—and I am willing to admit that this gentleman knows more about naval affairs than I do myself. This is what Mr. Wilkinson says:

> It has always been to me a source of disappointment and regret that Canada has ever failed to realize her duty with regard to assuming her full share of responsibility in connection with Naval Defence. . . . . .
>
> When considering Canada's weakness with regard to her naval obligations, I would ask, could anything be more grotesque than the ceremony which took place opposite the City Hall during "Sailors' Week," when under the auspices of the Navy League of Canada a dummy ship was christened the Victory, and at which the Premier of Ontario, the Lord Bishop of Toronto, and His Worship the Mayor, were present, while simultaneously the Captain of the steam trawler Triumph at the Toronto Exhibition, tells his pitiable story or how he was captured by a German submarine, of how guns and a wireless were placed on his steamer, and how he and his crew of twenty were crowded into a small boat, and after being insulted, had the humiliating experience of seeing his own boat steam away manned by a German crew, with the object of sinking the rest of our fishing fleet, and of which they were successful in destroying some twelve vessels. No effort was available from the Marine Department in the way of defending our fishing fleet against a cruel and relentless foe, who simply destroyed at his own free will. To use a well-worn quotation, "Nero fiddled while Rome was burning."

I may vary the quotation and say that "Mr. Desbarats fiddled while our fishing fleet was being sunk on the banks of Newfoundland and off the coast of Nova Scotia." Mr. Wilkinson proceeds:

> After four years of war, to appear to get busy over the British navy about the glorious work it has and is doing, would practically be an admission of ignorance, and to do so at the present time would have a tendency to place Canada in a false light by advocating the necessity of the British navy, when Canada, as a matter of fact, has no navy of her own to talk about.

Further on he says:—

> Notwithstanding that we thus have the enemy in our own waters, performing deeds of piracy and destruction at his own free will, without let or hindrance, as far as Canada's ability to defend herself is concerned, we read in the newspapers that the Naval Department at Ottawa calmly makes the statement that "all steps possible are being taken to meet the situation," and that a fleet of submarine chasers from the United States and British navies had put off after the enemy submarines. Are we to understand from this that Canada still refuses to assume any responsibility whatsoever as regards naval defence, but merely assumes the right when attacked by German U-boats to call for help to the United States and British navies? What greater proof is our present Union Government waiting for to make them realize that the great need of Canada to-day is a navy of her own?
>
> When we remember the indifference displayed by Canada in the past with regard to her naval responsibility, any thoughtful person must surely look on with amazement that even

after four years of war, and the enemy sinking our ships at his own free will in our own waters, that no action appears to be considered necessary for our Government to take in the way of providing a navy for our own protection.

He says further:—

There never has been a time when the want of a Canadian navy has been more keenly felt than at the present. We are at war and we want a navy to drive the enemy from our shores, and protect our ships sailing in Canadian waters. Is it not a fact that the very type of vessel is at present being built in Montreal for the British navy, which we require for our own coast defence, viz, the submarine chaser? Would it not, therefore, be advisable to get some of these or similar craft included in our Canadian navy, in order that they might be placed in commission with as little delay as possible? It would also be advisable in my opinion to have guns placed on all fishing vessels of sufficient size, which would at least give each boat a fighting chance. These are, however, all matters which I trust will be taken into consideration at an early date by the Marine Department.

Unless something of a definite nature be done while we have an enemy to fight, there will be a strong tendency with a very large section of the Canadian people to come to the conclusion when the war is over, that a navy as far as Canada is concerned, will not be necessary.

Those are the words of Mr. Wilkinson; they are not mine. Yet the minister this afternoon said, in effect, that I was the only person in Canada with the audacity to get up and say one word in this House against the Naval Department of which he is the head. He also quoted from a letter which he cut out of the Montreal Star. I wonder if the admiral of the naval forces also cut out an editorial which appeared in the Star on Saturday morning, to show to his leader on his return to-day? The letter which the minister read was no doubt written in good faith; I have not one word to say against the writer, but I noted this sentence which the minister read: "The patrol fleet had notified sixty Lunenburg vessels to go to port." Now, if there is one thing I know it is about the Lunenburg fleet, and particularly what happened last summer on the Atlantic coast, and I happen to know what happened to the fishing fleet. So if that is the only evidence the minister can adduce his defence of the Canadian navy is very badly supported.

I have also received some letters, and one of them happens to be from Montreal. I want to be fair to the Canadian navy. Any criticism I made was made in good faith. I made it as a business man who did not want to see the money of this country wasted. When I can say a good word for the Canadian navy I shall be only too glad to say it, and to be absolutely fair I shall read this letter in full:—

Dear Mr. Duff,

I read with interest the comments in the papers on your speech in the House regarding the Canadian naval situation, also your criticisms.

As a demobilized member of the R.N.C.V.R., I do not wish to make any remarks one way or the other, but I think that, while the question is up, it is only fair for me to draw your attention to what I consider the brightest spot in the whole service, namely, the Naval Hospital in Halifax. During the influenza epidemic last fall I was unfortunate enough to be one of the victims and was sent to this hospital for treatment, and I cannot speak highly enough of Dr. Rousseau, Dr. Irwin and the two nursing sisters, and, in fact, every one connected with the institution. I was in the hospital itself for about two weeks, and during that time every patient with whom I came in contact, had the same feeling of appreciation.

With regard to your remarks on the Naval College, while never having met Commander Nixon, I can only repeat to you what appeared to be the general opinion among the men I met while in the service, namely, that the Naval College was efficient, that it did splendid work and turned out efficient officers, and that those officers who had graduated from the Naval College and who were serving with the Imperial Fleet were highly thought of and efficient.

With regard to Lieutenant Julian's views on the general administration, I had the privilege of serving on the same ship with this officer and know him very well personally, and am sorry to say that both myself, and, I think fully ninety-nine per cent of the officers and men in the service are forced to agree with him.

Now, what has the minister to say about Lieut. Julian? He insinuated this afternoon that Lieut. Julian was no good, that he was not a good officer. I say that he was a good officer. He served four and a half years in the naval service and had a splendid record, with not one black mark against him. I say it was most unfair for the minister to insinuate that this man was not a good officer and a good Canadian. The writer continues:

I trust that in all fairness you will, while drawing attention to the dark spots, also draw attention to the bright ones. In October, 1917, I with a number of other officers, was sent from Halifax to Esquimalt, and we one and all were greatly impressed with the difference in the atmosphere prevailing at the latter station. In Halfax there was nothing but discontent and what seemed to us practically chaos, whereas at Esquimalt everything was efficiency itself and every one seemed well content.

On my return to Halifax in the spring of 1918, after having put in six months at Esquimalt, the difference in the atmosphere was doubly impressed on me. I think it was sufficient to say that every officer who was trained at the Esquimalt base feels the same towards it, and it was a heartbreaking experience to find that all the "esprit de corps" that had been created at Esquimalt was absolutely crushed

out after the men had been a very short time at Halifax.

Will the minister deny that this is true? This afternoon he flapped the flag and tried to make out that I was simply insinuating —that there was nothing in my charges. I have another letter which might interest the Minister of the Naval Service and the Admiral of "the Bum Boat Fleet." This writer says:

> It is all true, and further, the half has not been told. I think . . . . . .would give you some information along that line as he is pretty sore at them for the way he says they used him. He appears to be ready to squeal on them as he is awfully sore.

These are not my words. I could talk all night about the way naval affairs were conducted at Halifax. You must have noted, Mr. Chairman, that the minister this afternoon, trying to get some applause from his own side, endeavoured to make it appear that I had introduced politics into this question. Nothing was farther from my thoughts, and although Lieut. Julian in making his charges blamed the Borden Government, I was not responsible for that. After saying that I had introduced politics into this question, the minister in his next breath went on to say that I was making charges against ships built by the Laurier Government. If I was introducing politics, why should I introduce charges against ships built by the Laurier Government? I think that is a complete answer to the minister's insinuation. The truth is he was simply floundering around like a seal on ice and did not know where he was half the time.

He also objected to my remarks about the Niobe. He tried to make out that there was nothing wrong with this steamer's boilers. I tell you that the Niobe was compelled to come back from her cruise because her boilers were no good, the result of having been allowed to rust. It is quite true that for four or six weeks after the war was declared they did manage to patch the boilers up, but I would ask the minister how much money was spent for repairs on the Niobe from September 1, 1914, until she finally played out in 1915. The only reason she played out was that her boilers were out of condition. Will the minister, or anybody connected with the naval base at Halifax, deny that?

He tried to make out that I was getting my information from outside sources, and that it was second hand. I want to tell the minister that this is not the fact, and further that I watched operations proceeding and that any information I got was from the officers themselves and the men of the so called Canadian navy.

The minister also tried to make out that I had said that the men on the Hochelaga had run away from the submarine. I did not say any such thing. If the minister knew anything about marine matters he would know that the cook, steward, cabin boy and marines have nothing whatever to do with navigating the ship but that that is a duty which is left entirely to the captain. To make such an assertion shows very little knowledge of naval and marine matters on the part of the minister. He tried to make out that I had said the men were guilty of cowardice. I said no such thing. The men were all right. If I could only repeat some of the conversations that the men had with me on their return I would tell you how, with tears in their eyes, they told me that they wanted to fight the submarine but that they were not allowed to do so by the captain. The men are not to blame; they are all right. The men are all young Canadian boys, they thought they were going to do something for their country, they went into the Naval Service prepared to do it but they were prevented by the naval officials.

The minister also tried to make out that this captain of the Hochelaga was a great man. I hate to say anything unkind about anybody but if the minister knew where the captain of the Hochelaga came from and what service he had had, the information would make him hang his head in shame. I know all about the captain of the Hochelaga. I know how long he has been in the Naval Service, I know where he came from; and I say he never should have been put in command of that boat and I can prove it.

Then the minister talked about the Lady Evelyn and he practically said I was not telling the truth about that steamer when I said that she had gone to the Magdalen Islands to deliver six pencils. I beg the hon. minister's pardon. She not only delivered the pencils, but she also delivered some pads for the wireless operators. I have the facts from the officers who were on board the Lady Evelyn. I intend to repeat what these officers said and if the minister does not want to take my word I will give him that of somebody else. On August 20, 1918, the day that the Triumph was captured, the Lady Evelyn was in a Nova Scotia port. A wireless message came stating that the Triumph, a steam trawler owned by the National Fish Company of Halifax, had been captured by a German submarine on the Middle Ground,

a fishing bank off the Nova Scotia coast. Word also came that the German submarine commander had equipped the Triumph with guns and manned her so that she could be used as what is known as a raider. This word came to the Lady Evelyn. The captain immediately sent a wireless to the man in charge of the naval dockyard at Halifax asking permission to go and try to capture the Triumph. The men on the Lady Evelyn did not sleep all night, they kept steam up and they waited minute after minute and hour after hour for the expected word from the Halifax authorities to go and recapture the raider which had been previously a fishing boat. No word came from Halifax but the Lady Evelyn with Commander Shenton in command was sent to the Magdalen Islands to deliver six pencils and a few pads for the wireless operator.

Let me give a little more information about the Lady Evelyn. In a few days the Lady Evelyn returned from the Magdalen Islands and reported to the base at Sydney. The flash came over the wires that on a certain night a German submarine was coming up the strait of Canso. The Minister of Naval Affairs, of course, with his knowledge of marine matters and geography, knows where the strait of Canso is, but for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who may not have that information I will explain its location. The strait of Canso divides the island of Cape Breton from Nova Scotia and connection between either side of the strait is maintained by the operation of a steam ferry between Mulgrave and Point Tupper. That is practically the only means of communication between the great coal mining and steel districts of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia and the rest of the world. The situation was considered so serious that the Government ferry was laid up at Point Tupper. It was not allowed to cross the straits for fear the submarine might come up and attack it. The Lady Evelyn was lying at Whitney pier at Sydney with steam up waiting until word came from Halifax. The men were all on tenter hooks. They wanted to engage the submarine. They were anxious to go, and suggestions were made that they should not wait for orders but that they should take the Lady Evelyn and go to the strait of Canso. You can understand the state of mind in which these young men were when they were deliberately talking of mutiny, of taking charge of the ship, taking her up to the straits of Canso and fighting the submarine. This is what an officer said about it:

> We were in Canso a few weeks ago and all our old friends were there to welcome us and renew old acquaintances. While there one evening a party of young ladies from Canso came on board and entertained us with music and singing. We left next morning. We now hear they are being shelled, while we are lying comfortable at Sydney. Perhaps these same young ladies that entertained us are being murdered by the German beasts, while we, lying at anchor, steam up, ship ready with a lot of damn, stupid Englishmen preventing us from slaying the murderers of our friends and sweethearts less than a 100 miles away.

Would the minister be kind enough to tell this Committee why the Lady Evelyn was left at Sydney and why she was not dispatched to Canso to try and catch that submarine if submarine there was?

The Minister of Naval Affairs also endeavoured to contradict my statement in reference to the steamer Lux Blanca. I wish to tell the minister that if the officials gave him the information that he gave here this afternoon there is only one thing to be done with these officials and that is to get rid of them. The minister said that there was a fog that day. I was on the Nova Scotia coast and I never saw a more beautiful summer day than that on which the Lux Blanca was sunk. There may have been a fog in Ottawa and if so it was around the Naval Department.

But, Mr. Chairman, he went on to say that there were patrol boats that had gone out in answer to the Lux Blanca's S.O.S. call. I said they did not, and I think I can prove it in a few minutes. The minister this afternoon deliberately contradicted my statement, and said that patrol boats went out to help the Lux Blanca. But he had to admit that those patrol boats lost their way, and they tried to get their course from a fisherman, but the fisherman could not give them their course. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know very much about marine matters, but I will say this—and I am looking at my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) while I say it, because he had something to do with putting buoys and lights at the entrance to the mouth of Halifax harbour—that from my little experience of marine matters I can leave Halifax in a boat on a dark night or a foggy morning, feel my way out to the Fairway buoy, and can shape my course to where the Lux Blanca was sunk. If that is the kind of men the Minister of Naval Affairs had on his boats—if with their lead lines, their compasses, their horns, and everything

else, they could not find their way out in the fog,—my charge in that connection is proved out of the lips of the minister himself. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not want the minister to listen to anything I say; I am going to give him the evidence of somebody else. I would not expect him to accept the correctness of my statements, after what he said this afternoon I am almost afraid myself to believe that I know what I am talking about; but I will give him the testimony of other men. When the Lux Blanca was sunk, what happened in Halifax? I am going to recite a conversation which took place between a master mariner, who is the agent of a very large insurance company in Halifax, and who knows all about marine matters, and certain other parties. I will give what he said about the sinking of the Lux Blanca. This gentleman—he is a reliable man and I will give his name if necessary—said:

I was informed of the sinking of the Dornfontien off the Bay of Fundy and shortly after of the sinking of another vessel up the coast towards Cape Sable. I saw at once that the U Boat was headed towards this part of the coast and of course expected that the Dockyard was watching the course of events and would be preparing to look after her. Great was my surprise next morning when going to my office on finding Long Distance frantically trying to locate me. I at once took up the phone and found Captain..... of a fishing vessel speaking from down the shore, he said, I have just been sunk by a large German submarine a few miles of Cape LaHave. We are all out this morning, he is going towards the eastward and will probably get all of us who are out, for God's sake get in touch with the Dockyard and send help.

This marine insurance man continued:

I asked him the particulars and then rang off, calling up the Dockyard and giving them the information. I do not know who answered the phone but it was some stupid idiot who wanted to know how he could be sure the information was authentic and he also replied that everything that was possible was being done.

That day (I am not sure whether he said that day or the next day) a prominent merchant of Halifax called me up on the phone and told me a German submarine was shelling an oil tanker a few miles off Sambro, he said, I am going to call for you in my car and we will rush to the Dockyard and interview the "powers that be" and see if we can do any good, I replied, "I will be waiting for you."

A few minutes later the Halifax gentleman arrived in his car and we drove to the Dockyard and went at once to see Admiral Storey. He appeared a very sociable chap but I was not there on social calls that day.

I do not know whether this Admiral Storey gave the two gentlemen pink tea or not, but you will notice, Mr. Chairman, that this insurance man says "he appeared to be a very social gentleman." He went on:

We went over the situation with him as quickly as possible and then asked him what he was doing. He replied very calmly that he was sorry but that he had nothing he could send out to engage a modern submarine. I replied, "Great God! do you mean to tell us that with all those patrol boats" (pointing to a mass of boats I could see from his office) "you will calmly let a steamer be shelled to pieces by a German submarine and never lift your hand to stop them, and this almost before your eyes?" He replied, "Gentlemen, as I said before, I have nothing which can engage a modern submarine." We had a few more words and we left, and what we thought of the Dockyard I had better not say.

Now let us see what the captain of the Lux Blanca himself said:

When the Captain of the Lux Blanca arrived in port with his survivors he at once came to see me and I can tell you he was a very hot boy. He gave me the full particulars of the fight and he ended with. "Had I thought that the Dockyard of naval people would not send me help I would never have tried to do what I did. I was expecting help to come every moment from around the point but never a sign of assistance came. My ship was sunk underneath my very feet and two of my gunners killed almost in sight of the forts of Halifax and with all the patrol boats and everything else, not a sign of anything came to help me. What in Heaven's name can they be thinking of there? I put up an unequal fight for hours, but I might better have tried to save our skins for all the assistance I got from the Canadian navy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us go on a little further.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman assert that there was anything in the Canadian Navy in the shape of a war vessel fit to go out and cope with a modern submarine at that time?

Mr. DUFF: I am very pleased indeed that the hon. gentleman has asked me that question. It is quite true that there was no vessel in Halifax, or in the Canadian Navy, which could have coped successfully with this German submarine, but let me tell the hon. gentleman that what the naval authorities at Halifax should have done was this: They had, as this marine underwriter says, scores of boats lying in the dockyards doing nothing, but if Admiral Storey had gone down and said to the crews of those boats, "I know you cannot cope with this submarine but get steam up and start for Lux Blanca and the minute the German submarine sees the black smoke coming round the head it will submerge and go away," it would have been effective. The authorities might at least have done that. I do not say they could

have sunk the submarine, but I do say there were boys in the Canadian navy who could have gone out and driven that submarine away.

Mr. COOPER: Did the hon. gentleman give Admiral Storey the benefit of his excellent advice?

Mr. DUFF: No, Mr. Chairman, he had so many Englishmen around him there was no necessity for me to give advice. I will read about some of them before I am through. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I do not want the minister to take my word as to what happened.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does the hon. gentleman think it was a misfortune for Admiral Storey to have Englishmen around him while the war was on?

Mr. DUFF: Well, we had a certain class of Englishmen in Halifax, some of whom were not much good. For instance the captain of the Hochelaga was an Englishman. Here is what was said by the Halifax Herald in its issue of August 7, 1918:

> The outstanding feature in connection with the three hour battle outside the harbour that rivets attention with compelling force is the absence of any protecting ships while torpedoes sped on their deadly mission, shells fell thick and fast and the air reverberated with the crack of guns for a space of 3 hours.
>
> Where was the patrol fleet? The brave wireless operator of the oil tanker heriocally obeyed duty's call, but the patrol answered not. Had it been a ship in distress even in peace times succor would have arrived in less than that time.
>
> But at war, with the fiendish Hun pirates at our very door and known to be lurking in the waters off the coast, the brave crew of the allied ship fought single handed a monster pirate of the deep—and there was no response to the piteous calls for help from the patrols—which at least it would be thought would be busy scouring the waters that lap the shores of Halifax and all the other towns and villages from here east and west.

The Halifax Herald goes on to say:

> Where the patrol was, what they were doing, may be in the ken of the authorities—

And I presume it was, Mr. Chairman, and I want the minister to pay particular attention here:

> Where the patrol was, and what they were doing may be in the ken of the authorities—may be confidential, but the citizens of this city—who have already suffered from the greatest calamity ever visited upon any city on this continent by gross and criminal carelessness, and neglect of proper control by the constituted authorities, are vitally interested to know that the patrol is such that it may with all human probability save Halifax from another calamity.

If the patrol boats did such good work, why does not the minister produce their logs and tell us where they were on the coast of Nova Scotia during this time? That would be the proper evidence to lay before this Committee. But he gives us only sneering remarks about my knowledge of these matters, he tries to gloss them over—to put a coat of Sherwin-Williams shellac on the whole business.

The minister says that some of these boys were decorated by the King. Certainly they were. They were good Canadian boys lost in the Halifax explosion. They were on the Niobe at the time and volunteered to go out to the Mont Blanc, and they deserved to be decorated by the King or by anybody else.

I would like to call the minister's attention to what he said about the conduct of the captain of the Hochelaga in comparison with the conduct of the six boys who were sentenced as criminals to eighteen months' imprisonment in Rockhead jail. The captain of that steamer, as I said before, was discharged for gross negligence and cowardice in the face of the enemy. The hon. minister tried to make out that I said the captain was honourably discharged. Perhaps I did so express myself. But if the Naval Department discharged the captain of the Hochelaga, is there any man in Canada to-night who will say that the department is treating those six young boys as they should be treated, some of them lads from the city of Victoria—no doubt from the county represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Cooper) who interrupted me a few minutes ago? These boys are at present languishing in a criminal prison at Rockhead, forced to associate with vicious, degraded criminals. I assert that no man should dare get up and say that those boys got a correct sentence. Immediately the minister read my speech he should have taken steps to interview the Minister of Justice and have these young men discharged from custody. I say it is a disgrace that these six young men should be to-night undergoing the association of criminals while we are here sitting on our cushioned chairs; and I say emphatically that to-morrow morning the first thing the minister should do is to see that those young men are immediately released.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for a few moments I wish to make some further statements, as the minister did not quite believe what I said in my last speech. I noticed this afternoon that he spoke about the good work the Royal Canadian navy did on the British Columbia coast. That is quite true; but no credit is to be given to the naval authorities at Ottawa for that good work.

At Victoria, British Columbia, a few public spirited men got together in 1912 and put their hands in their pockets for the purpose of forming what is known as a Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve. They applied to Ottawa for permission to form this reserve and for help. The officials of the Naval Department turned those men down, and declined to give them any assistance. A petition accompanied the request. Shortly after a cold formal acknowledgement was received from the department saying "the matter would be given consideration," but nothing further was done by the department. Influential citizens of British Columbia were interested in this matter, and, as I said a moment ago, out of their own pockets they subscribed liberally, and as a result 400 boys joined what is known as the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve. Nothing was done until July, 1914. You will remember that the minister this afternoon took credit to his department for what was done in relation to these boys. The department was compelled to give them recognition, because in July, 1914, the Kamagata Maru arrived in Victoria with a large number of Hindus, and the city authorities, realizing the seriousness of the matter, telegraphed the Ottawa authorities and asked that those boys be given power to look after that ship and see that nobody landed from it. That was when the Naval Reserve was first recognized. No. 1 Company, Victoria, of the R.N.C.V.R. were the first to offer and to perform volunteer service in Canada when the war started in August, 1914.

Those boys at that time were sent to Esquimalt, and to show you the state things were in, for a few days they were given orders to dig trenches in the solid rock around the dock yards. Ammunition pits were dug and shelters erected, and general chaos reigned throughout. To show that nothing was contemplated, these boys were not fitted out with any equipment, clothes, rifles or anything else.

What happened on the Pacific coast? On or about August 10 the German cruiser Leipsig was known to be in the Pacific. The citizens of Vancouver, of Victoria and other coast towns were very much afraid that this cruiser might reach the British Columbia coast and shell them. In fact, the banks in the coast cities removed their gold to their inland branches. Our fighting strength at the outbreak of the war on that coast was represented by the cruiser Rainbow and the other two ships mentioned by the minister this afternoon. In addition, there were two fishery protection boats, the Galaino and the Malaspina and the two submarines which were purchased in Seattle about this time from an American shipbuilding firm. There was also a fleet of auxiliary yachts given to the Naval Reserve by wealthy men of Victoria and Vancouver. The Naval Department agreed with the Marine Department here to transfer those fishery protection boats to the Naval Service. These two boats were armed, but on being taken over by the Naval Service the guns were taken off and they were sent to sea without guns or ammunition. It is well known that the Galaino proceeded to sea without guns or ammunition of any kind.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Naval Department determined to do something, and they thought they had better help out one of their friends, I presume, so they arranged to charter the Grand Trunk Pacific steamer, the palatial Prince George. She was chartered on August 8, 1914, at $500 per day. Then the department proceeded to spend a lot of money on her for repairs and alterations to fit her as a hospital ship. Equipment was purchased, cots and sick bays and operating areas were installed, and a staff of female nurses and a medical officer were placed on board. These are a few of the things that were purchased:

Drugs and medical supplies	$505.40
Surgical instruments	287.16
Flags	115.65
Medical stores	127.27
Bowls, jugs, soup tureen, etc., etc.	109.78
Arrowroot biscuits, 500 lbs., etc.	135.00
Blue jackets, overalls dressings; gowns, 72 at $2.00 each; tooth brushes, towels, etc.	862.35
Bed spreads, 74 at $2.10 each; Blankets, 111 pr. at $5.25 per pair; Felt mattresses, hammocks, etc.; silver forks, etc.	2,214.89

—and hundreds of other items. This steamer, Mr. Chairman, was sent on the broad waters of the Pacific with lights out. Now, anybody knows that Red Cross boats or hospital ships should not be sent out in that way. It is well known that the Hague Tribunal provides that hospital ships shall be painted white with a green stripe and with the red cross displayed in four or five prominent places, and in no way try to conceal her identity. The Prince George proceeded on her journey, and had she been unlucky enough to have met with one of the German cruisers then at large, a terrible calamity would have occurred.

It is not the custom nor the procedure of the Admiralty of any country to send hospital ships sculling about, endangering the

lives of people on board; these ships are to follow after an engagement, not to precede it. During an engagement they remain at their base or in the safety zone. After a short but somewhat expensive career this hospital ship was recalled and dismantled, and on September 23, forty-five days after being chartered, was turned back to the Grand Trunk Pacific. This little farcical episode cost the country $49,805.05, plus some other items of expenditure appearing in the expenses of H. M. C. dockyard, Esquimalt. As I said before, the Government paid the Grand Trunk Pacific $500 per day for the use of the Prince George.

While this was going on on the Pacific coast a number of German trading vessels were proceeding from Japan to Pacific ports in America. It was known to every pilot on the Vancouver coast that these ships had sailed from the other side and were on their way to this side of the Pacific. Two of the lieutenants who were at Esquimalt—one of them was Lieut. Julian and the other, Lieut. B. L. Johnston, a Vancouver pilot—presented to the naval office at Esquimalt a list of the German vessels which were then on their way across the Pacific, and requested permission to take the Galiano or the Malaspina, place her guns back on board and use the boat in an effort to capture these German ships. The senior naval officer promised at once to communicate with the naval authorities at Ottawa, but a few days later the lieutenants were informed that permission was not granted. One of the trading vessels was the German barque Kurt, which arrived at the port of Astoria, United States, on September 11, 1914. If these young Canadians had been allowed to take these fishery protection boats out they would have captured the German barque Kurt, which was worth $600,000 in gold, had a full cargo of products from South America, and was without guns or ammunition of any kind.

There were other vessels which the commander at Esquimalt was told about, and concerning which, I assume, he sent word to Ottawa. One was the ss. Alexandria, which arrived in San Francisco from Samoa about this time with the entire personnel of the German staff of the South Pacific German possessions, and over a million dollars of gold in her strong-box. Other German boats which arrived safely at their destination on this side of the Pacific were the Arnoldus Vinnen, which arrived at Astoria on October 11, 1914, and the German ship Ottawa, of 2,542 tons register, which arrived at San Francisco August 21, 1914. If these young lieutenants had been allowed to use the fishery protection vessels to which I have referred they would in all probability have captured these three valuable prizes.

What was done to help these boys keep up this naval reserve? The climax was reached and the death knell sounded for the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserves on the arrival of the Director of Naval Service in Esquimalt, Vice-Admiral Chas. E. Kingsmill. Strong representation was made to him by the heads of the respective branches at Esquimalt to obtain the bare necessities for carrying on the R.N.C.V.R., and it was hoped that his arrival would in no small way herald the righting of things. It is to be remembered that Admiral Kingsmill called the entire corps of the naval volunteers to assemble in the drill hall and there addressed them somewhat along the following lines: He said he had been informed by the department at Ottawa that the Government had received instructions from England to devote all their energies to manning an army, not a navy. This is in contrast to the recruiting that was going on in Great Britain and in the Dominions overseas. Admiral Kingsmill stated: That the naval volunteers had been very badly advised; that the naval volunteers had been to a much greater extent poorly led; that there appeared to be great discontent throughout the
9 p.m. rank and file, and that it was not the intention of the department to go on with the volunteers as a fighting force, and, therefore, that as many as wanted could leave the yard forthwith. This was small recompense and very little thanks for the work done up to this time under the most adverse conditions by these men. They had been in the stokehold of the Rainbow when at sea; they had coaled ships in their civilian suits and had generally borne the brunt of things in the yard. Great consternation reigned after this speech. However, suffice it to say that over one hundred availed themselves of the admiral's advice and departed.

Needless to say, naval recruiting was at a standstill. The blow had been dealt, and the naval spirit that existed up to this time in Western Canada was practically dead. Many of the naval ratings joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force. However, it is to be noted that about sixty days later the Naval Department, evidently being in need of naval ratings, sent an urgent telegram to Esquimalt, using the words "Recruit! Recruit! Recruit!"

As showing the kind of stuff our Canadian boys are made of, I may point out that a large number of them, some 1,188, went across to the Old Country and joined the British navy. But let us see what The Sailor, a magazine published in Toronto, says about affairs in the Canadian Naval Service. It is headed "The Price of Inaction," and says:

Mention has been made editorially of the fact that Canadian officers serving in the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve strongly desire to be identified with a Canadian Naval unit. This desire has been expressed not once, but many times, and recently was voiced in a constructive manner by a young officer, who, in writing home, suggested that some plan be worked out whereby Canadians who are now serving under the White Ensign be formed into a Canadian Naval unit and loaned to Great Britain for the duration of the war. It may be parenthetically remarked here that the young officer in question has already been recommended for a foreign decoration and has been since appointed to a responsible post in the British navy. Therefore, his suggestion was actuated by the purest motives of patriotism, and shows plainly the spirit which animates our sea warriors; for no matter how high they may climb; no matter what their environment, they are Canadians first, last and all time; and they are proud of their Mother Country. It is a curious fact, however, that the suggestion was identical with the one made by Capt. the Hon. Rupert Guinness, R.N.V.R., to the Department of Naval Service in 1916. At that time he was in Canada armed with diplomatic credentials, and instructed to urge Canada to recruit 2,000 men for the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve, and to lend them to Great Britain, where they could be trained in various ratings. While he was pleading with the late minister, and his deputy minister, to take action in the matter, Commander Armstrong, R.N.V.R., was also in Canada and was energetically recruiting for his unit. The result was obvious, the apathy of the one side and the energy of the other, brought its own reward, and when Commander Armstrong left Canada he had secured about 400 of Canada's finest sons for the British branch of the service. Meanwhile the late minister and his deputy sat idly by, and watched the young men go. In fact, it took them from early spring until late autumn to break the monotony of their inaction, and then they decided to start recruiting for the R.N.C.V.R., in the depth of winter. This decision was indicative of only two things, of either the utter incompetency of the late minister and his deputy as departmental heads, or of their absolute indifference to the branch of the service which they were bringing into being.

These are not my words, Mr. Chairman, but the words of the editor of The Sailor. I think his name is Mr. Amelius Jarvis, of Toronto. At the time the German cruiser was on the Pacific coast and we had only the poor old Rainbow and the other little boat to do our work, what was the position that Canada was placed in? We had to accept help from the Japanese Government. Three Japanese cruisers—I forget their names—came to the Pacific coast, established a base at Esquimalt and did patrol work for the Canadian Government and the Canadian people during a great many months while there was danger on the Pacific coast.

The minister this afternoon endeavoured to convince the Committee that it was impossible for the Niobe to capture the German steamer Willehad, which sailed from Montreal.

Some one asked that question, and it was shown that she was going along the Nova Scotia coast the very day war was declared. My information is, and reliable information too, Mr. Chairman, is that the steamer Canada was at that time on the Atlantic coast. She carried two twelve-pound guns, and if she had been given instructions from the dockyard or from the authorities at Ottawa she could have captured the Willehad. There was no necessity to have the Niobe to capture the ship. Now, it was considered necessary to purchase an aggregation of boats for patrol, and in connection with this matter I do not think I need say very much. There were a number of boats connected with the Marine Department for the purpose of laying buoys, and looking after the bells on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. One of these boats was the Lansdowne. She was one of the largest steamers in the Marine Department, being equipped with derricks for the purpose of placing and hoisting buoys. This ship was taken off Marine work and put in the Naval Service, the cost involved being some $47,043. Instead of being put to useful work she was kept at the base in Sydney for the purpose of lifting and lowering the signals at the defence boom to allow vessels to come into Sydney—work which a small tug boat could have done rather than this large ship belonging to the Marine Department. Let us see what happened as a result of the boat being taken off the Marine work. As I said a moment ago, the work of these boats was to lay buoys along the Nova Scotia coast every spring. In winter some of these buoys have to be taken up owing to the ice, and during the spring and summer of 1918 a number of buoys were not placed because the Marine Department had no boat to lay them. The following are the buoys not placed in position:

Liscomb Fairway, gas and whistle.
Thrum Cap, gas and bell buoy.
Three Fathom, gas and bell.
Egg Island buoy, no whistle or light.
Thorn Shoal, bell.
Owl's Head, bell.
Ship Harbour, automatic whistling buoy.
Spry Bay, bell.

Sheet Harbour Passage, bell.
Basson Reefs, bell.
Lockwood Rock, automatic whistle.
Nixonmate, bell.
Bull Rock, bell.
Isaac Harbour, gas and whistling buoy.
New Harbour, whistling buoy.
Tor Bay, whistling buoy.
Flying Point, bell.
Whitehead, gas and whistling.
Cerebus, gas and whistling.
Grimes, gas and whistling.
Argus Shoal, whistling buoy.
Petitdegrat, gas and bell.
Beak Point, whistle buoy.
Haddock Rock, bell.
L'Archeveque, bell.
Fourchu, whistling buoy.
Guion Island, gas and whistling buoy.
Barr Reef, whistling.

Now, I suppose the Minister of Naval Affairs will say the reason these buoys were not placed is that the German submarines, if the buoys were in position, would find their way into the harbours. That argument will not hold water, because the German submarines had no need of the buoys or bells to enable them to get into the harbour. All the coast lights were burning, and if a German submarine wanted to go into a harbour from Cape Sable to Cape North it could have done so at any time, day or night. To show what kind of naval service we had, we were obliged to have a Japanese guard on the Pacific coast, while a similar condition existed on the Atlantic. It will no doubt be remembered that two Australian ships came to our coast to help protect our coastal waters. If I remember correctly, these ships were the Sydney and the Melbourne. One I am sure was the Sydney, which sank the German ship Emden in the Pacific and afterwards came to help us. So that it is obvious the minister could not rely on the service of his navy when we had to have Japanese and Australian ships assisting us. Then the hon. gentleman told us about the work of the mine sweepers. The joke about them is that they only swept the sea after the convoys had passed, and for this statement I have the most reliable authority. The duty of the mine sweepers is to clear the water before the ships carrying soldiers and other passengers go forward; but this patrol calmly swept the ocean after the convoys had passed and were out of sight. We did have some protection on the Atlantic coast in 1917, on the suggestion of Mr. Amelius Jarvis of Toronto. The Canadian Government, with money which I believe belonged to the Imperial Government, purchased seven or eight fishing schooners which were changed to represent camouflaged vessels. They were supplied with motors, and had guns. They also had on deck dories which were let down and disappeared in the waist of the ship. These vessels were bought in May or June, 1917, and as an illustration of the expedition with which the naval authorities in Halifax did their work, these seven or eight vessels were not made ready until October of the same year. Of course, as every one knows, in October the fishing fleet were home so that those ships did not do any work that season. However, they should have been kept for the next year and could have rendered excellent service. One of these little vessels fixed up to look like a fishing craft could be anchored or laying amongst the fishing fleet, and on a German submarine coming up, this "mystery ship," as it is known, would lower her dories and train her guns on the submarine, and before the latter had time to get her own guns ready, the camouflaged boat could damage, if not sink her. In the winter of 1918, I presume at the suggestion of the department, these vessels were sold at about half their price to any one who cared to purchase. I contend that they should have been kept, for they could have performed very valuable services in 1918. But, as I said, they were sold in February or March of that year. We have been told of what was done to protect the fishing fleet on the Atlantic coast. I do not profess to take any credit for what was done, but I may say that I did telegraph the Acting Minister of Naval Affairs last year acquainting him with the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia and asking him if something could not be done to protect about 150 fishing vessels at that time on the broad Atlantic. I received word from Ottawa—a very nice telegram, I must say—that they were doing all that they could in the matter. Of course, I knew what that meant, and I telegraphed back and requested that an endeavour be made to get either British or American cruisers to come and patrol the Nova Scotia coast. We have heard about the Stadacona and the advice to fishermen to leave their grounds and go into port. Now, I took the matter up myself when I could not get satisfaction from the minister, and on my responsibility I telegraphed every port in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland where vessels were in the habit of going and advised them to remain in, and by the time that either American destroyers or any boats which the Naval Department might have sent from Halifax got to the grounds, there were only two or three vessels on the Grand Banks. So that

when the gentleman who wrote the letter to the Montreal Star, as quoted by the minister this afternoon, said that there were 60 vessels notified, I will say that it must have been in the stokehold of the boat shovelling coal instead of being on the lookout. These vessels could not continue their fishing voyage owing to lack of protection by the Canadian authorities, and the advice I gave at the time was that they should endeavour to get home at the earliest possible moment and in so doing hug the shore.

The instructions which I gave them at that time were to try and get home at the earliest possible moment and hug the shore; that is, they were to leave the Newfoundland ports and come up around Cape North, down through the straits of Canso, and hug the shore from there to Lunenburg. This was done, but I regret to say that one of the vessels which was hugging the shore—this would not have happened if we had had the proper naval protection—on the sixth of September was blown on the rocks by an easterly gale, and eighteen men were lost owing to the culpable negligence and lack of protection afforded by the Canadian naval authorities. When these vessels arrived at their home ports I telegraphed to the Minister of Naval Service that some 150 valuable ships had arrived home with valuable cargoes ranging in value from $30,000 to $40,000. I asked if it would not be possible for him to send some patrol vessels from Halifax to patrol the coast off the mouth of Lunenburg and Lahave, but the minister has not yet done me the courtesy to reply to that telegram. Two days after the armistice was signed, on the 13th of November, into the harbour of Lunenburg steamed about a dozen patrol boats, the first we had seen since the beginning of the war. That is the kind of patrol service which the minister tried to defend this afternoon.

Early in the war a despatch came from Ottawa to the naval authorities at Halifax that the German cruiser Karlsruhe was shelling the town of Glace Bay. Of course, no such thing ever happened, but word came to that effect. The naval authorities hustled around. At that time the good ship Canada, a boat not much longer than this Chamber, was lying at Halifax. She had two twelve-pound guns, and that was the boat that was sent down to Glace Bay to engage the German man-of-war. At the same time, in order to give further protection to the citizens of Glace Bay, a crew with a couple of guns was sent by train. This crew was made up of sick-bay attendants and watchmen on the Niobe; there was hardly a naval rating among them. The joke was that the gunners went without any ammunition and without a breach lock. One of the guns sent by the naval authorities at Halifax was about twenty years old, and had been used as a hearse at sailors' funerals. The whole thing was a joke, and after setting up some wire at the town of Glace Bay, the sailors came back.

The minister did not think I was correct when I said that a certain gentleman had offered to give one destroyer to the Government if they built four others. That offer was made by Commander J. K. L. Ross. He gave his own boat, the Tuna, and also took charge of a vessel called the Grilse. The Grilse was the only vessel in the patrol service that could be said to be equipped with guns and ammunition, and would you believe it, after the Grilse had been bought in New York and brought to Halifax she was sent up to Gaspe Basin, in the St. Lawrence, to help convoy ships carrying Canadian soldiers. Her guns and ammunition on her first trip consisted of a half-barrel with a stick of wood painted gray lashed on top of it.

The minister also talked about the ships the Government bought. I notice that six of these small patrol boats cost something like $208,000 each, or $1,250,000 altogether. They could have been bought in England for at most half the price, and I say without fear of contradiction that somebody made $75,000 or $100,000 on each of these six boats. If the minister would grant me the investigation I ask I have no doubt this fact would come out. It is true that other boats were purchased, but all kinds of prices were paid for them and no attempt was made by the department to get value for the people's money. I have no hesitation in saying that our naval affairs were conducted by the department in such a way that every Canadian should hang his head in shame.

The minister said that my remarks with regard to the Mont Blanc were not correct, and he spoke of the beautiful harbour of Halifax. Now, if anybody should know about the beauties of Halifax harbour I should. It is one of the finest harbours in the world; I might say the finest, but the hon. members for St. John might not agree with me. The minister said that it was all right to allow this ship carrying high explosives to come into Halifax harbour. I do not know whether the minister knows this or not, but it is a fact that the Mont Blanc had her decks on fire before she reached Halifax harbour. Some oil had got

out of the casks on deck and started a fire. That ship was deliberately allowed to come up to Halifax harbour with her decks on fire. Is that the way to protect the citizens of this country? I do not want the minister to take my word alone; I am going to put somebody else on record. On December 20, 1917, the Morning Chronicle said:—

The public have the right to know under what authority the Mont Blanc was allowed to approach the Narrows, proceeding inward towards Bedford Basin at the very moment when the Imo was outward bound. The naval authorities, as we understand, control the movements of all ships inward and outward. It is imperative that the public should know by whose authority the Imo was ordered to leave her anchorage in Bedford Basin at a time when it must have been plain to the competent naval authority that the two ships would meet in or near the narrow channel which leads from the inner harbour to the basin. It is also imperative not only for the purposes of this investigation, but for the city's security in future, to ascertain why a proper patrol was not maintained by naval craft to keep the course clear for the munition boat. The naval authorities have a large number of boats of various sorts at their command in this harbour, but so far as we have learned none of them were employed in escorting the Mont Blanc on her way to Bedford Basin. Why? The public have a right to know why these and other precautions which we might mention were not taken and, above all, why the risk of allowing these two steamers to meet on this narrow waterway was taken.

The Morning Chronicle at that time was a supporter of the present Government and of the Minister of Naval Affairs. On December 22, 1917, the Chronicle says:—

Halifax has suffered a calamitous loss on account of the explosion on a ship which carried exceedingly high explosives. What we want to know is what precautions were taken to avert this disaster; why the Imo was allowed to go through the Narrows, where the waterway is comparatively narrow and a considerable current runs, at the same time as the Mont Blanc laden with munitions; why the course was not kept clear for the latter ship? And why warning was not given to all craft to give the munition-laden ship a wide berth?

The public want this whole matter thoroughly and searchingly probed, not alone to establish the responsibility for what has occurred, but to ensure that there shall be the most absolute safeguards possible for the future. They want to know if the regulations governing the movement of traffic in this harbour shall govern in the future, and they want to have it made absolutely certain, so far as human effort can make it, that no such risk of disaster will ever be taken again.

Now Sir, I will go a little farther to establish my case. I do not want the minister to think that I am the only person in Nova Scotia who complains about his bumboat navy. The Chronicle of December 26 (?) says:

Halifax harbour is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Government. It is officered and staffed by Federal appointees who act under Federal orders. Neither the province of Nova Scotia nor the city of Halifax exercises or can exercise any control over its navigable waters. It is evident, therefore, that neither of them bears any responsibility for anything which may be amiss in the management of those waters. They receive neither fees nor direct emolument from the shipping which enters the port. They have no power to regulate, much less to prevent, the movement to, from or within the harbour of undesirable or dangerous shipping. . . . . .

It seems to us that the Dominion is not only legally and equitably liable for the injuries occasioned by the explosion of the Mont Blanc in Halifax harbour, its entrance having been sanctioned, if not invited, by responsible federal officials, but that it is morally and conscientiously bound to indemnify, in so far as it can, the people of Halifax for the grievous loss and injury which has been inflicted upon them through the direct acts of its regularly appointed and duly authorized agents.

Would not any individual citizen of Halifax have a good cause of action against the Dominion Government for his personal loss? If so, should not the damage done to the city be borne without contest or murmurs by the whole people of Canada every one of whom has as much personal interest in the cargo of the Mont Blanc as had any citizen of Halifax, although all the loss caused by the explosion fell immediately upon the people of this city?

The Government and the minister admitted their responsibility when they paid the citizens of Halifax millions and millions of dollars. The Halifax Chronicle of December 28 said:

The inquiry which is demanded is an inquiry to establish the responsibility for the movement of the ships, the one from her anchorage in the lower harbour, the other from her anchorage in Bedford basin—why a death-carrying vessel was allowed to proceed up the harbour and into a narrow channel and there to come in collision with an outgoing steamer, with, so far as it is known, no precautions or safeguards whatsoever having been taken or provided. That is the crux of the whole question.

The minister said this afternoon that this ship was perfectly justified in coming up the harbour and that the naval authorities had done nothing wrong, and yet we have this Government organ, the Chronicle, condemning in unscathing terms not only the minister but his officials at both Ottawa and Halifax. But I am not going to rest my case upon what the Chronicle says. The Morning Chronicle once upon a time was a Grit paper and of course some of my friends might say Grit papers are not always reliable. So I am going to give a few quotations from another paper. This paper is known as the Halifax Herald, a newspaper edited by no less a gentleman than the Hon. Senator William Dennis, of the city of Halifax, province of Nova Scotia. What do we find the Herald saying on December 24?—

There is no need to try and disguise the fact that the citizens will not rest content until the blame is rightly fixed and it would be useless to deny that there is considerable unrest in the minds of the people, that the citizens require to have their faith re-established in the ability of those having the safety of the port under their care.

It is alleged that there is no effective harbour patrol, though the naval authorities have a number of craft at their disposal, many of them tied up when they might be keeping the roadway clear for ammunition-laden ships. That there is a scarcity of men to man those patrol boats does not seem apparent from the number of uniformed men which were seen day by day in the vicinity of the Acadian hotel, which by the way was a sort of hotel for naval men on the "waiting list."

Yet when the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) asked the minister a question about the number of men lying around Halifax he tried to make out that they were not there for any length of time. We will go a little farther and see what the Halifax Herald says on December 31:

The persistent demand made by the Halifax Herald is for a thorough investigation into all the causes that led to the explosion and the placing of official and personal responsibility therefor.

(a) Who permitted the Mont Blanc to pass up the harbour without being preceded by a patrol boat?

(b) Who permitted this foreign ship, heavily laden with a cargo of inflammables and the most deadly explosives and with a captain, officers and crew who couldn't speak a word of English and a pilot who couldn't speak a word of French? What naval, or other Canadian Government official permitted this ship to steam up to the Narrows not only without a patrol escort, but without even the ordinary and usual "red flag" danger signal?

(c) Who permitted the Norwegian steamer Imo, chartered as a Belgian Relief Ship, but now in ballast, to proceed down the harbour at an hour and minute that made it possible for the empty Imo—also without patrol escort—to collide with the Mont Blanc and her cargo of death-dealing explosives, through "error of judgment," "accident," "crass stupidity," "gross carelessness," "damnable cussedness" or from any other cause—to collide in the very narrowest part of the harbour—this wonderful harbour in which the greatest ocean leviathans can swing around at full speed and the navies of the Empire could ride in safety.

We will go a little farther with this investigation and see whether the naval authorities were doing their duty at the time this boat came through the Narrows and blew up with the result that some 1,800 people lost their lives and some 20,000 or 30,000 were injured and wounded. This was the greatest disaster that any city had suffered for a number of years and it was all due, as proved by the Chronicle and the Herald, to the carelessness of the naval authorities. On January 31, the Herald said:

There are rumours that there may be a complete reorganization of the naval department at Ottawa, but it is hardly likely that anything will be done until the findings of the Drysdale Commission are received. The feeling here is that there is "too much pomposity and too little efficiency among certain naval officers in Ottawa."

I address this in particular to the minister himself.

Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs Desbarats is admitted to be a competent official though, of course, he is a civilian and consequently lacking in naval experience.

The shake-up in Canadian naval affairs at Halifax is without doubt only preliminary to a more extensive carrying out of a much needed reform in the Department of Naval Affairs at Ottawa.

Let me go a little farther to prove my case: The Halifax Herald of February 5, 1918, says:

Notwithstanding the cruel manner in which—

And this is a reference to the minister:

—he was deceived by his officials when he made his deplorable utterance at Halifax some weeks ago in defence of men who have been shown to be utterly incompetent, and of a system thoroughly rotten, congratulations are due Hon. Mr. Ballantyne on the initial reforms he has made. No one to-day regrets that utterance more than he and the changes he has already made can be looked upon as an instalment towards a complete reorganization of the staff at this port—and which should carry with it as complete and as thorough a change in the department at Ottawa. An investigation of the conduct of naval affairs in Canada, apart altogether from the question of harbour control, will reveal changes that should have been made long ago; and if they had been made not only might the great catastrophe have been prevented, but much money would have been saved which has been expended for unseaworthy craft and their incompetent management.

I would like the minister to give careful attention to that.

Of that there will be more to reveal in the future.

Let us see what the Halifax Herald says further of the Department of Naval Affairs. On February 9 it says:

Yet upon this simple policeman's job the Canadian naval service, with all its frills and feathers—

Now who is talking about pink teas and furbelows?

The result 1,500 innocent men, women and children killed, thousands injured, and several hundreds blinded for life. The punishment, the preventive methods for the future must not stop with the prosecution of a pilot, a ship's master, and a subordinate examining officer. The horror is too appalling, the measure of official neglect too ghastly.

We will go a little further in the matter. In its issue of February 12, 1918, the Halifax Herald says:

So accustomed has Halifax become to startling developments in connection with the recent disaster and the matter of harbour control, there would seem to be nothing added which could further appal the people of this city, and further convince the country of the necessity of revolutionary changes. But once again comes a terrific shock. It is an actual fact that the great ocean greyhound, the Olympic, had, because of harbour mismanagement, a narrow escape, when freighted with thousands of human lives, from going on the deadly Sambro Ledges. The Commission appointed by the Federal Government to inquire into pilotage affairs was astounded yesterday afternoon near the close of the second session of the day at an announcement by Captain Latter of the pilot board. Captain Latter declared that "the naval people shifted buoys without warning, and vessels coming up in the fog narrowly escaped going on Sambro Ledges."

Then this appeared in the same paper on the same day:

Another development of the inquiry was the further proof of the "death sleep" and lethargy of the Marine Department at Ottawa given the evidence of J. E. De Wolf, one of the Halifax Pilot Commissioners. Mr. De Wolf said that some six or seven years ago the Marine and Fisheries Department asked the Pilot Commission to draft new by-laws. The Commission, assisted by Hector McInnes, K.C., did this and the new by-laws were sent to Ottawa. It is evident that they are still reposing in a dusty pigeonhole. No notice was taken by the department. "They treated us with contempt" said Mr. De Wolf. "We never heard a word and I urged upon the commission to resign in a body as a protest."

Now, the point I am making in connection with what I am reading now has reference to do with what happened after the explosion. The explosion occurred in December, and although the naval authorities knew all that happened in that regard, the officers of the Naval Department at Halifax made no attempt to better the conditions of that city. Therefore we read as follows in the Halifax Herald of March 12, 1918:

Further investigation by the Halifax Herald in shipping and pilotage circles yesterday has brought additional and conclusive evidence that there must be a shake-up of no meagre dimensions at Ottawa. The pilot's story that a steamer laden with high explosives was allowed to lay in the fair way of the harbour one day last week for seven hours, was fully confirmed, and in getting the confirmation other details of a most startling nature were disclosed.

The Halifax Herald is scrupulously careful to abide by the rules of the censorship and anything calculated to furnish information to the enemy is gladly withheld from publication. There is not a man familiar with marine affairs at this port, not a Nova Scotia captain, who has gladly given his services to the work of naval patrol, not a master mariner who regularly brings in and takes out a steamer, but what has a story to tell of stupidity, of pig-headedness, of bungling in connection with the affairs of the port, and, following up these stories, the trail leads directly to Ottawa and reveals a heterogeneous bunch of incompetents who may know the ways of society, who may be able to judge aright the merits of various blends of wines, but who certainly do not know the ways of ships and are not able to judge the competence of those whom they place in charge.

The coming in, the anchoring and the going out of ships is at all times a matter which should demand the attention of men familiar with the sea. Nova Scotia has produced some of the best seamen of all time—they are not at Ottawa, they are not in control of marine affairs, such control is left to men whose hands never gripped hemp, men to whom the use of a sextant is an absolute mystery, and their management of floating things limited to a slight knowledge, possibly of a varnished canoe on a still lake.

In times of peace we should not have such men at the head of affairs of a maritime nature. To have them in such position in these awful days of war is evidence of a laxity on the part of our people, a laxity which has already led to fatal consequences, and which should, perchance, a break be made through the British fleet, lead to awful disaster. God forbid that a change at Ottawa be withheld until such a time comes.

It took one of the greatest disasters the world has ever known to partially arouse those in auhority, but those who were in supreme authority then are still in authority. Britain, France, Italy, the United States, all have had a shake-up, and a betterment of their management of marine affairs. Canada, after appalling evidence of incompetence is without a shake-up. A Jellicoe was shifted, a Kingsmill reigns supreme.

I think I hear the minister whispering something to the Chairman. Perhaps he does not want me to read these extracts; but I would like to finish the task which I have undertaken, even if I am getting under the skin of the minister. In its issue of March 13, the Halifax Herald says further:

that so long as men who have notoriously outlived their usefulness as public officials, and some of whom are regarded as having become fossilized incompetents are retained in positions of great responsibility at Ottawa in marine and naval affairs there will be no harmony, co-operation or practical co-ordination among those upon whom the safety of this port depends and while this condition remains the people of Halifax cannot feel that "all that is possible for their protection is being done."

Then the Halifax Herald says on the same day:

The Halifax Herald has been informed by responsible citizens, in a position to know, that while the vessel was at anchor in the fair way, explosive matter was removed from her, that it was taken up the harbour, that not only tugs or barges, but a motor boat, with gasoline on board, was used in the transportation of certain cases from the vessel before she was taken up into the basin.

Yet the Minister of Naval Affairs this afternoon without endeavouring to criticise the charges I brought against the department, pronounced those charges inaccurate

Now I have established to the satisfaction of other members of the Committee that what I said in my previous remarks on May 7th was correct. I have also gone at great length into these matters to-night. I have more to say; and if the minister will grant me the investigation for which I have asked I will prove who is speaking truly and who is not. We are going ahead to-night with the Naval Estimates. On May 7th after making my charges, I made the assertion that under all the circumstances, after what had happened in the case of the Canadian Navy officials, we should not vote one dollar for naval expenditure this year. I repeat that statement to-night. After all has been said and done, after all that was heard on May 7th, and what has been said to-night, and after all that is current talk in the city of Halifax, and in every port of Nova Scotia, I say that this Committee should not vote one dollar to the present Administration for Naval Affairs in Canada. We are asked to vote a sum of $288,000 for the salaries of men whose incompetence has been proven not only by myself, but by the Halifax Chronicle and the Halifax Herald. Therefore, I urge this Commitee not to vote one dollar for the Department of Naval Service. It is quite unnecessary. It can do no good. There is no necessity for any vote of public moneys for men in Halifax connected with the Naval Department. They should be discharged as incompetent, and the vessels either sold for old junk, or else handed over the Minister of Public Works, filled with cement and ballast and then sunk for the purpose of making breakwaters at the mouths of harbours. We are not only asked to vote $288,000 for salaries for these gentlemen in the Naval Department, but the immense sum of $1,805,000 is asked for the maintenance and upkeep of the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt and the Royal Naval Reserve. I say, Sir, that no good can come from this expenditure especially in view of the present financial situation of Canada, and every representative of the people should decide against one dollar being voted for this purpose.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is the minister not going to make any reply to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Duff) has said here to-night? He asked for an investigation. A number of very serious charges have been made. Surely there should be some investigation into those charges. The minister, I submit, did not this afternoon satisfy the Committee; there are too many complaints against the administration of naval affairs to expect that the country could be satisfied with his mere denial. I do not want to offer any obstruction to the minister's Estimates, but I would like to get from him an answer to some of these charges that have been made by my hon. friend from Lunenburg. I think we are all indebted to that hon. gentleman for the research he has made into these matters, for he has brought to the attention of the Committee a great deal of information. Of course, we all want to be posted on these questions, and we are all grateful to any member who will take the trouble of giving us the facts.

The hon. minister spent a long time in answering the charges made by the hon. member for Lunenburg on a former occasion. But the minister did not tell us very much about the Naval Department. He did not tell us anything about what he was going to do for the ensuing year. We have no information at all as to what are the plans of the Naval Department. He spent all the time practically in referring to the speech made by my hon. friend from Lunenburg on a previous occasion, and we should have from the minister considerably more information than he has furnished so far.

We cannot settle this question by bandying words across the floor of the House and saying that so and so is not correct. The proper way to deal with it is by a competent tribunal to find out whether the administration of the Naval Department is or is not satisfactory.

The blue-book published by the department during the past year shows that the purchasing department spent over $10,000,000. Have we got value for that enormous expenditure? That is a matter the Committee would like to know something about before we vote another large sum of money to keep this department going.

I listened to the speech of my hon. friend from Lunenburg on the former occasion, and I listened this afternoon very attentively to the minister's reply, and I submit that some of the charges made have not been properly answered. Over and over again my hon. friend, the minister, said that the member for Lunenburg had stated that those seamen were incompetent, and he denounced the member for making that statement. But the member for Lunenburg never made any such statement. As far as I could gather he was defending the seamen against the administration. His criticisms were directed, not against

the men in the Naval Service, but against the department. He criticised some of the naval officers, but he certainly said nothing that was derogatory to the ordinary seamen; he had nothing for them but the highest praise.

But the question is: Is the administration of the Naval Department efficient or is it not? That is the question the House wants answered. The member for Lunenburg said in his former speech that at the time war broke out the Naval Department was unprepared for the event, and I suppose no one will doubt that. In endeavouring to answer that statement the minister made the admission that the only ship in the service that could be called a warship was the Niobe, and that the Niobe was not ready for sea until the 31st day of August. Everybody knows that war was declared on the 4th day of August; yet up to the 31st day of August our main war vessel on the Atlantic coast was not ready to go to sea. If the administration and the officers had been doing their duty the Niobe would have been ready for sea and could have taken some very rich prizes along the coast. There is no doubt at all that she would have captured the German ship that left the city of Quebec bound for Boston, on the 2nd day of August, and which must have been on the coast of Nova Scotia on the 4th day of August. Everybody was expecting that Britain would declare war. But no motion was made on the part of the Naval Department at Halifax, and the main ship of the service was unfit for sea when she should have been ready for active service.

Another charge made by my hon. friend the member for Lunenburg has not been answered, and that is the difference between the punishment that was meted out to the sailors and to the officers. It will not be disputed by hon. gentlemen that a sailor has as good right to fair play in this country as has an officer. What are the facts? As we get them from the statements the facts are that seven sailors belonging to a certain ship refused to go to sea because the ship was leaking so badly that they thought she was unseaworthy, and they refused to embark until she was repaired. That was the offence committed by those sailors, if I am rightly informed, and I think I am.

Mr. DUFF: That is right.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: They were court martialled and sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment. I suppose they are serving their sentence; at least we have not been told anything to the contrary. That may be all right—I do not know. It looks to me like very severe punishment. But admitting that it was all right, what was done to the commanding officer of the Hochelaga, Lieut. Robert D. Legate? He was in charge, and his orders were to destroy submarines. He saw a submarine at sea, but instead of attempting to destroy it, he turned tail and made for harbour. He was court-martialled. And what was his sentence? He was dismissed from the service. Now, those seven boys would have been very easily punished if they had been simply dismissed from the service. Perhaps that would have suited them very well. At any rate, this officer was simply dismissed from the service and not punished at all.

The minister said that if these seven sailors had been in the British navy and had got their just deserts under the laws of war they would have been court-martialled and shot. Under the naval laws of Great Britain would Commander Legate not have been court-martialled and shot too? If so, why was he not punished? I am informed that this is the first time in the history of naval warfare that the white ensign ran away from an enemy; I do not think such another case is recorded in British history. Why does this man go scot-free? Why were these sailors sentenced to eighteen months in prison while the commander of the Hochelaga was simply dismissed from the service, although his offence was much more serious than that committed by the seven sailors? That is the point which was made by the member for Lunenburg in his first speech, and it has not yet been answered. It ought to be answered by the minister before we go any further in voting salaries for his officers. The question was asked some days ago in the House whether the Canadian Naval Department had
10 p.m. the power to punish this man, and the answer was in the affirmative, though no indication was given as to why they did not do it. Will the minister give us that information? If not we shall have to come to the conclusion that in the Canadian Naval Service there is one law for sailors and another for officers.

The character of the ships employed in the service has been referred to several times in this discussion. The minister has not told us very much about the character of the ships. In the naval discussion we had a few years ago the late Liberal Government was reproached for what was described as a proposal to build a "tin-pot navy." The present political associates of the minis-

ter objected at that time to fast cruisers of the Bristol type. Ships like the Sydney, which did such splendid work in the war. This was the class of ships that was proposed to be built by the Government then in power, but the minister's friends objected to that class of vessel. Nothing short of dreadnoughts would suit them; Bristol cruisers they christened "tin pot." But if ever a navy deserved to be called a "tin-pot navy," it was the navy constructed by the department of my hon. friend. The only ships that were any good in this navy were the ones that were there prior to 1911.

No one can deny that there was a great deal of discontent in Halifax. Discontent prevailed in many places along the coast, but chiefly at Halifax. If, as the minister says, everything was rosy, where did all this trouble come from? Why were there so many complaints at Halifax? The fact that the Halifax Herald, though a strong supporter of the present Government, attacked the Government on this question, ought to be proof to the minister that there was something wrong. I suppose the Government was never so severely attacked as it was in connection with naval affairs by the Halifax Herald during the war. The Herald does not blame the officers at Halifax; it traces the trouble to the Naval Department at Ottawa; it blames the heads of the department here and it must be admitted that the contention of the Herald with regard to the inefficiency of the department was well founded. I do not expect the minister to give orders in regard to warfare or to naval affairs, and I do not throw the blame upon him. But the minister is responsible if he fails to surround himself with competent men. If he finds that his staff is incompetent and fails to take prompt measures, then we have to throw the responsibility on him.

The member for Lunenburg has been reading from the Halifax Herald; let me read a few extracts from the Halifax Mail. The Mail is the evening edition of the Herald; both papers are owned by a prominent gentleman in the other Chamber, Senator Dennis. In dealing with this matter the Mail opened its columns to complaints, and they came in so fast that the Mail did not know what to do with them. They had a special editor whose duty it was to answer complaints of all kinds, but these complaints poured in at such a rate that the editor was overwhelmed with them and admits that he could not answer them. But he makes a list of them in the paper day by day, and here are some of them:

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Question No. 1662—Why were the ratings on T. R. 30 court martialled in the Canadian navy last summer for refusing duty and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, when several so-called skippers and mates positively refused to take boats overseas last winter and were not court martialled or punished in any way? (2) How can discipline be maintained in the service, when such work is allowed to go unpunished? (3) Is there one law for officers and another for ratings under the present management of the Canadian navy? (4) Can you give the names of the officers comprising the court martial before whom the ratings on T. R. 30 were tried, and are they still in the service? (5) Had the officer in command of T. R. 30, at the time these ratings refused duty, sufficient experience to command men and was he a Canadian? (6) Is there any truth in the report of the wholesale discrimination against Canadians in the Canadian naval service? (7) Will there be a fair, impartial investigation by a committee of the House of Commons at the next session of Parliament into the naval affairs of Canada during the war, with full power to go into all matters of expenditure, promotions, granting of commissions, etc.? (8) Who, on behalf of the Government, looked after the building of boats known as C. D's? (9) Who accepted these boats from the builders as being fit for service?

Then the paper goes on to say:

Answer—Here are nine questions on a matter of which we have no particular information. The only place where you can be effective in eliciting replies is in the House of Commons. The navy make a rule not to answer questions, as attempts on our part have fully demonstrated. Hundreds of questions are received every week concerning the navy, the majority of them asking the questions put by our correspondent as above. It is evidently not a very happy or united family.

The above is an extract from a leading paper in Halifax, a supporter of the Government, published during the time these transactions were going on. I submit that the minister should answer them.

The only way in which they can adequately be answered is by granting the request of the hon. member for Lunenburg and giving an investigation. Let us take another extract from the same paper:

Note.—Questions continue to pour in concerning naval affairs. Many concern the men of T. R. 30, who are in prison for, it is alleged, refusing to go to sea in a craft unseaworthy. Others relate to P. V. 5 which it is alleged is in an unseaworthy condition. They say she is leaking aft around the rudder and also in her starboard bunker and the statement is further made that they were pumping from three to four tons of water per hour from her, that the conditions on board are unbearable. There is no getting away from the fact that there is seething discontent in the service. One correspondent says it is caused by "racial" distinction. He says he is a Canadian, wants to be a Canadian man-of-war sailor, but objects to be designated as a "native." The complaints may not all be founded on fact, but where there is so much smoke, there must surely be some fire. The imprisoning of the boys on T. R.

30, seems to be causing considerable indignation. The complainants all lay stress on the statement that the boys should not have been sent to prison for refusing to go to sea on an unseaworthy craft, when captains of other boats, who refused to go to sea on the same plea were passed over without a reprimand. It is impossible to find room for all the letters. We would advise the complainants to take the matter up with the secretary of the Navy League. The league has a paper of its own with a big circulation and is quite sympathetic to the men who have grievances. It is stated that out of 4,000 men in the service during the war, only a baker's dozen, when asked the question, if they desired to go on the reserve, answered "yes." If the service has become so unpopular, that men will not enter it unless by force, something drastic must be done at once.

That is the opinion of the chief organ supporting the Government in Nova Scotia, and I submit to the minister that it does raise a question for an investigation. If the officers at the head of the Canadian Navy are incompetent and inefficient, something ought to be done by the minister to see that this state of affairs is remedied. We are all anxious that the navy shall be properly managed and shall be such as all citizens of Canada may be justly proud of, and it is the duty of the minister to make this possible. I am sure he would be carrying out the will of the members of this Parliament and of the people of this country if he took decided steps in that direction, and I am quite sure he would have the support of every hon. member on this side of the House in such action. I am not here for the purpose of unduly criticising the minister, but it is my duty to ask him to take this question up seriously and make an investigation into the conditions of his department. And if he finds that there is truth in the allegations and that the officers responsible for the management of affairs in the Naval Department are inefficient, then it is his duty to see that they are dismissed and efficient men are appointed in their stead; if we are to spend millions of dollars in an endeavour to build up a Canadian Navy, let us have a navy in which the people of Canada can take a pride.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I took the pains this afternoon very carefully and categorically to answer every charge that the hon. member for Lunenburg made in his speech, delivered as I understood him to say, on May 7. I occupied the time of the committee for a period of about an hour and a quarter, and I really do not think it would be fair to hon. members to ask me to cover the same ground again. I made a full and complete answer in regard to the court martial of men on trawler 30 who refused to carry out the orders of their superior officers. I did not say that if these men had belonged to the Imperial service they would have been court-martialled and shot. What I did say was that if on the field of Flanders Canadian soldiers had refused to carry out the orders of their superior officers they would have been court-martialled and undoubtedly the sentence of death would have been passed upon them, and they would in all probability have been shot the following morning. I also very carefully explained to hon. members the full particulars about the captain of the steamer Hochelaga. I can traverse that ground again if hon. members think it necessary, but I must say that I endeavoured to the best of my ability to give a full, frank and complete answer—which was not difficult—to the hon. member for Lunenburg. The hon. gentleman has wearied this House to-night for some two hours, continuously reading extracts and comments of the press of Halifax. Now, I am not interested in what the press of Halifax may have to say regarding the Naval Service of Canada, neither does it interest me to know whether the owners of those papers belong to either the Liberal or the Conservative party. We are dealing with serious matters. The hon. member for Lunenburg, has treated the Naval Service of Canada in a light and frivolous manner, and I made ample reference to that phase of that attitude this afternoon. He rose in his place some weeks ago and made the statement that the steamer Hochelaga went to the Magdalen Islands to carry six lead pencils to that port.

Mr. DUFF: The Lady Evelyn.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Lady Evelyn then. Does the hon. member think for a moment that sane members in this House will take that statement seriously? Who on earth would send the Lady Evelyn or any other steamer on such a voyage as that—to carry six lead pencils to any port? All through the hon. member's two hours' talk this evening, everything he did say confirmed what I stated this afternoon in regard to his slighting references not only to the officers of the Canadian navy but also to all the men connected therewith. The hon. member was not content to do that alone, but he deemed it fit to cast slurring remarks upon officers of the British navy. If we are holding——

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say——

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Allow me to finish, please. If we are holding this session now,

it is due to the fact that the Imperial fleet and those brave and gallant officers have defended Canada and the British Empire for hundreds of years, and it ill becomes the member for Lunenburg to make the slighting and slurring remarks which he made during his last speech in his reference to English officers that were employed——

Mr. DUFF: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Chairman, I must protest against this interruption. I desire to complete my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has risen to a point of order. He must be given an opportunity to state his point of order.

Mr. DUFF: My point of order is that the minister is accusing me of reflecting on the British navy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. That is not a point of order, but a question of privilege, and the hon. member can correct any misstatement when the minister has concluded.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think I followed the hon. member very closely. He referred in very unparliamentary terms to the officers of the British navy that had been loaned to the Canadian Government, and his wearisome two hours' speech very largely consisted of long extracts and quotations from certain Halifax papers. Now, I am only too glad to give the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), or any other hon. member in the House all the information in my possession regarding the naval affairs of Canada. I was only attempting this afternoon to refute the charges of the hon. member for Lunenburg, and made no attempt then to go into details of the Naval Service. But as the items come up in the Estimates before the Committee now, I shall cheerfully and gladly give hon. members any information they desire; and if the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough wishes me to go over again the facts regarding court martials, I shall be only too pleased to do so. In the army and navy there are rules and regulations covering offences and courts martial that were held in regard to the men of Trawler 30, and also the officer in charge of the Hochelaga, and I am quite sure they were followed out. Hon. gentlemen surely would not for one moment suggest that under the rules and regulations of the Canadian navy, which are similar to those of the British navy, full justice is not meted out to the officers and men tried before a court-martial for disobedience or any other offence. I can assure my hon. friend that there is not one code for the seamen and a different code for the officers. Everything has been done according to the rules and regulations. It is to be regretted, of course, that these young men on Trawler 30 refused to obey orders. The craft was proven to be in a seaworthy condition; Canada and the Empire was at war; these men had been ordered by a superior officer to carry out certain duties; and surely, when these sailors disobeyed that order, hon. gentlemen could not possibly expect that we would let them go scot-free. Discipline could not possibly be maintained under those circumstances. The sentence was not a heavy one in view of the seriousness of the crime.

With regard to the captain of the Hochelaga, the charge of cowardice was not proven against him. The only charge proved against him was that he did not do all that he might have done. He was tried by a very competent board of British and Canadian senior officers, and when an officer is dismissed from the service and loses all that I stated this afternoon, that punishment cannot be looked upon as a light sentence. I do not want the House to think I am trying to hide anything in connection with the naval affairs of Canada. I do not suggest that the service is so efficient that no criticism can possibly be levelled against it, because it is certainly open to legitimate criticism. I took the trouble this afternoon to answer fully and completely every one of the charges made by the hon. member for Lunenburg, and I did not hear anything new to-night in his long two-hour speech. There is no necessity to my mind for a commission to be appointed to inquire into his charges, because I have clearly proved that every one of his charges was inaccurate. When we come to the Estimates I shall be very glad to give full and complete information.

Mr. DUFF: The minister in his reply a moment ago endeavoured to make the Committee believe that I had said something against the British navy. I want to deny that absolutely. In any remarks I made I did not refer to the British navy. Like every British subject I realize that the British navy was the only thing that stood between us and the German hosts. We know what the British navy has done in this and every other war, and I say it is not fair for the minister to insinuate that I, who am as good a British subject as ever he dared to be, would say one word against the British navy. The minister

gets up and says that this afternoon he answered all my arguments. Let hon. gentlemen read Hansard and see what paltry excuses he made this afternoon. His chief stock-in-trade was an endeavour to brand me with saying that the men on the Canadian ships were not good sailors and were not doing good work. Hansard will show that those insinuations are absolutely groundless. Now he tries to make the Committee believe that I am against the British navy. I say he should be ashamed to insinuate anything of that sort in regard to any British subject in this House.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Would the hon. gentleman deny that he made some slurring remarks on the English naval officers in the Canadian navy?

Mr. DUFF: No, I will not say that I did not make some remarks about English officers in the Canadian navy. I do not know any body of men in any line of business which is one hundred per cent efficient, and consequently, good as the English navy is, and better as the British navy is, composed as it is of English, Irish and Scotch, and Canadian, I do say that there were men in the British navy who were not one hundred per cent efficient, and that some of those who came to Canada were cast-offs from the British navy. They were put over men like Captain Manning, a native of my own county, and a better seaman than they in every respect. If the minister desires it, I can show him where English officers were put over good Canadian officers. Let him investigate the case of the captain of the Hochelaga. The minister talks of the captain's naval record. He had none, and I know it. It is not right for the minister to insinuate that I said anything derogatory of the British navy.

Mr. COPP: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the first minister I have heard who, on going into his Estimates, takes occasion to stand up and lecture hon. gentlemen opposite on how to conduct themselves, and to suggest what criticism it is proper for them to make. A few days ago my hon. friend from Lunenburg made some statements in the House that seemed to me, and I believe to other hon. gentlemen, to be of a very serious nature. The minister tells us that he has answered those charges fully and completely, and then he deplores the audacity of my hon. friend from Lunenburg in standing up again and wearying the House with a two-hour speech. What has the minister to say of himself for standing up for an hour and a half this afternoon reading extracts and reports prepared for him by officials of his department? We might as well have a show-down here and now as to whether the minister can stand up and lecture hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for venturing the criticise the Estimates of his department. Has the minister such a high and sensitive nature, and are his qualities so statesmanlike and of such a high order, that his department must be above criticism by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House? The minister expects his Estimates to pass. I have no desire to block Estimates in this House, but hon. gentlemen have a perfect right to criticise without being insulted by the minister.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is rather difficult for me to understand the remarks of my hon. friend. I have never ventured to question any hon. member's right to criticise the Naval Estimates. We have not as yet taken up the Naval Estimates. I have already said that I will cheerfully give all the information I have when we come to discuss the items. The discussion this afternoon and evening has related almost altogether to the charges made by the hon. member for Lunenburg. I certainly have no desire to lecture any hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am not aware that I have done so. I would be the last man to do it, because, of course, every hon. member has a right to ask what questions he pleases, and it is the plain duty of a minister to give the House all the information that is asked for. Last year when my Estimates were up and again this year I gave all the information I had, and I intend to follow that rule.

Mr. COPP: Then why complain that an hon. member on this side of the House is wearying the House?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I made no reference to hon. gentlemen opposite wearying the House. I just referred to the long speech of the hon. member for Lunenburg, but I want to make it perfectly clear that I find no fault with hon. members criticising to the fullest extent and asking any questions they like regarding the Estimates before the Committee. I had no such intention as the hon. gentleman has recently imputed to me.

Mr. COPP: Does the minister say that he will dole out to us how we shall criticise and how we shall ask questions and that he will answer them? While my hon. friend from Lunenburg was discussing this matter

this afternoon the minister did not pay much attention to what he said, but when he read extracts from the Halifax Herald, which supports this Government, he began to be weary of my hon. friend's argument. Hon. members on this side of the House have just as much right to take part in discussions, whether their remarks be long or short, as has my hon. friend the minister.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I need not say that the tone and manner of the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne) in his criticism of the speech offered by my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) surprised me very much. I had been in this House for many years before we had the honour of the presence of the distinguished minister, and I have also been here since he came. It seems to me that he has always been rather a high-minded gentleman and we always have treated him as such. But to-day he came into this House with a speech prepared for him by some piqued officer of his department, by some party who ought to know better and who is responsible to some extent for what has been going on in his department. That gentleman was piqued and hurt because there was criticism and he transferred his pique to the minister. It was so apparent to everybody who heard the remarks of the minister that the language and emphasis were not his own, but were absolutely foreign to his style. Hereafter, if he finds it necessary to criticise anybody on this side, let him prepare his speech himself and not be responsible for the pique, spleen and bad manners of somebody in his department.

I listened with the closest possible attention to the speech delivered on the 6th of May by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). I listened with all the attention of which I was capable to the speech of the minister this afternoon. I was looking for a calm and deliberate refutation of these charges if they could be refuted. I have heard no such argument. I have heard a tirade of scolding from the minister. That is all we have received—assertions on one side and denials on the other. We had assertions by the hon. member for Lunenburg about matters with which he is perfectly familiar and flat denials by the minister upon facts furnished to him by his department.

Let us take the one statement as to the failure to go to the assistance of the American tanker that was being sunk off the port of Halifax. It has been stated by the Halifax Herald and other papers, and by business men in Halifax, that when called upon the commander told them that he could not go out, that he had nothing to go out with. That is a statement of fact published in the newspapers. We have members sitting in this House representing the city of Halifax. I would like to hear from them what defence they have for the conduct of the department. The statement is made in the newspapers, and by the hon. member for Lunenburg, that there was no assistance sent out to this vessel. The minister makes a statement that this is all false, that a ship did go out, and that she was lost in the fog. It is most extraordinary that such a thing could happen. There is a square issue of fact. Surely the controversy might be settled by some person who was present in Halifax as to whether the truth lies in the statements which have been made in regard to this incident or in the reports which the department has got. If the people are paying millions of money for the upkeep of the Naval Service, surely there can be no dispute about an important question of fact such as this which should be settled beyond all controversy.

We have always understood that nothing will be stated as a fact by a naval or military officer in the service of this count unless it is absolutely a fact. Here we have a dispute on a bare, bald question of fact; and I think, although it does not make very much difference now when the matter is over whether it is true or false, we should know what the fact actually is. A seaman knows the place to which he has to go before he leaves port; he knows the latitude and longitude of that spot; he has his compass, his log, and he knows how fast his vessel is steaming. He ought to be able to get to that point along the coast of Nova Scotia without stopping in the fog to consult some poor fisherman whom he encounters a few miles from the shore. A more absurd statement was never made in this House—that a warship should stop on her course in order to allow the officers to consult a poor fisherman as to her latitude and longitude and where and how she should sail. That is the most absurd proposition and the most damning evidence as to the incompetency of the men who say that they did go out when other people say that they did not go out at all. These are the answers we have to these charges. Reputable newspapers and men in the city of Halifax say that they did not go out at all; now they say that they did go out in the fog and that this fisherman gave them some directions as to how

they should go, but that he did not give them the proper direction. I do not think the minister should waste one minute in defending an officer of that kind.

Then, leaving that, evidence is produced to show that bungling of the worst kind took place in Halifax harbour in connection with the vessel's explosion there which resulted in the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property and in the loss of hundreds, if not thousands, of lives. There is not a word in the nature of a satisfactory explanation. We are not told the name of the officer in charge, we are not told who he is, or what he did or whether he did anything. But we have the newspapers and citizens of Halifax condemning the actions of the naval officials. The minister simply stands up and abuses my hon. friend from Lunenburg for daring to bring this matter before the House. There are these two things, the failure to rescue that vessel and the bungling in Halifax resulting in this accident. Does the minister explain how that accident took place? The people of Halifax and the newspapers say that it was simply due to the bungling of his officials and we have no answer to that.

The minister becomes very wrathy because we say that a certain steamer went to the Magdalen Islands with a small cargo of pencils. If that is not so why does not the minister tell us what the vessel went with? He is absolutely reticent and non-communicative about what the cargo was. Surely the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Duff) could be made more untenable and perhaps ridiculous if it could be shown that this vessel went for a good cause and was carrying a good cargo, and refused to do other duties in order to discharge her mission to the Magdalen Islands? There are scores of other reasons why an investigation of some sort should be granted into the matters which have been brought forward.

I regret exceedingly that the minister found it necessary to resort to a contemptible practice that has prevailed in this House and in this country for the last five or six years, viz.: directing charges of disloyalty at hon. gentlemen on this side. I am surprised that a gentleman of the standing of the minister should stoop to such a course. He knows very well there is not a single man on this side who would indulge in any fling at the British navy or at any British officer; he ought to know that if anything that could be construed into an accusation of that sort slipped from the lips of any body on this side it would be merely a mistake, and something that was uttered unintentionally. Nobody in this House who is in the possession of his sound senses would do such a thing, and nobody knew better than the minister that no such thing was intended. Let me say that any hon. member—no matter on which side of the House he sits—who interrupts a speaker may very well expect to get a retort he was not looking for. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) was interrupted by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Cooper) who asked him in a sneering way whether he gave orders to a certain Admiral Storey in Halifax. All that the hon. member for Lunenburg said was, "No, I did not advise him, he had plenty of Englishmen about him to do that." On that very meagre statement, which did not amount to anything at all, a minister of the Crown thinks it proper for him to start a cry in the country that an Opposition member insulted the British navy. The minister is welcome to all the glory he can get out of it; he has laid himself open to being stigmatized in this House, as a man who is capable of descending to low, contemptible tactics. That is my judgment of any man, I care not whether he is a minister or an ordinary member, who would stoop to such miserable, contemptible proceedings.

Let me tell the minister that I hold in my hand a letter dated at Esquimalt on the 11th day of the present month, and which is therefore of recent date. It was written to me by some men out there who say that they are anxious to get clear of the Naval Service. The letter states:

> We have come to the conclusion that they are holding us so as to hold their positions as long as possible. If we were doing some useful work which necessitated our being kept on, it would not be so bad. But we are just stalling round, painting the cars of the officers at the Government expense. Could you give the matter your immediate attention, and oblige?

That is an extract from a letter from men who were engaged in the Government service around Esquimalt and on the warship Rainbow. Like requests came to me from Halifax. I brought the latter requests as speedily as I could to the minister, and I am very glad to say that two days afterwards he moved in the matter, and those very men were allowed their liberty. I suppose the men in Esquimalt found that their friends in Halifax were allowed to go, and now they complain that they are being kept there for the purpose of making positions for superior officers. They say they are not

doing anything that is useful for anybody except painting cars for their officers.

I must also draw the attention of the minister to the case of those men who are suffering imprisonment in the Rockhead jail at Halifax. They are not Nova Scotia men, every one of them is from British Columbia, and their names are: Frederick L. Jones, Robert G. Bissett, David A. Curry, Oscar T. Metras, George Gibson, Archibald M. Green, and John C. Hewson. I would expect some of their friends from British Columbia who sit in this House to take an interest in them. I know something about marine law, and a great deal about sailors and their difficulties and their lawsuits; I have lived for thirty years as a lawyer in a seaport, and have had much to do with a great many such cases. It is true that I have no knowledge of naval rules. We never had any occasion to deal with the Navy, or with naval men who were in difficulties, we would not have an opportunity of so doing; but I do know that our young men of the sea are brought up under the rules of the Merchant Shipping Act. They are not educated to know very much about naval rules, but they do know that in the case of those men in question, who were possibly sailors, and who had gone to sea from Canada, that if there was anything wrong with the vessel it was the duty of the captain to send them ashore, and for them to make complaint before a magistrate and a harbour master. It would then be the duty of these officials to hold a survey on the vessel, and the finding of that survey would be conclusive as to whether the men complaining should go to sea or not on the vessel. But there was nothing of the kind in this case. The absurd practice was followed in the case of certain miserable craft that had been moving along the shores, vessels that are no good to anybody, and run to land when anything like danger threatens, of applying to them the austere rules of the British navy. When these boys complained that the deck was leaking, that their beds were full of water, and that any food they would take into their quarters was soaked with salt water, they were not allowed to leave. The moment they did that, there was no word of calling in the proper authority to inquire as to whether the ship was seaworthy or not; they were brought before men who turned up the authorities in order to ascertain what constituted insubordination in the British navy. I suppose that if a ship were just going into action and one of the gunners refused to take charge of his gun, it would amount to insubordination. A charge of that kind was applied to these poor boys who were accustomed to the right of making complaint and going before the harbour master and magistrate, and having the actual conditions determined. The naval rules were rigidly applied to them and they were sent to jail for eighteen months; whereas a man who had for the first time in the history of Great Britain, or in the history of our navy, disgraced the white ensign, as has already been stated, got off scot-free. Probably he was able to attend those pink teas in Halifax with the rest of the officers who were there doing nothing, and eventually perhaps his passage home was provided for. But let me in all seriousness say to the minister that he cannot put his finger on one single thing that his miserable navy did for the defence of the Atlantic coast that was worth tuppence ha'penny. Where is it? Not a single thing, except shovelling out hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money. Is it not most marvellous, Mr. Chairman, that year after year we were spending large sums of money, and yet we had nothing that could do anything to defend us? Could there be a more deplorable confession than that when this American vessel was within a short distance of the port of Halifax and appealed to the headquarters of our naval and military forces, in the province of Nova Scotia, in the Dominion of Canada, the officer in charge had to say: "I am absolutely helpless; there is nothing I can do"? And that was after three years of war. Surely if there was any efficiency in the department something could have been done, even if we had to borrow an American craft or get one from overseas to defend our own shipping. There was nothing done.

Now, if in humility and honesty the hon. minister had come here to-night and said: "I regret exceedingly that there was nothing we could do. We had nothing when the war began, we had nothing when the war was half way through, and we had nothing at the time of the armistice," we would sympathize with him and say: "Possibly in view of the circumstances that is the best thing you could do." But instead of that he allows some zealous official in his department to create a howling speech full of abuse for everybody in sight who dares find fault with the efficiency and standing of the navy and what it did for this country. I repeat again that the only time when a submarine appeared off Sydney harbour the vessel that went out to deal with her fled cowardly, and the master was discharged

because he did so. Off the coast of Nova Scotia an American vessel was being smashed and sent to the bottom, and we had to acknowledge that we could do nothing. Where is the efficiency, where was anything done in connection with the war of which we can be proud, and from which we have any return for the money spent? I would be glad, indeed, to be informed what naval service was rendered and by whom, and I would be delighted to give credit to the minister and to his department for anything accomplished for our protection during the war.

I am not going to say very much about the little craft on both coasts that he hired, because he has steered absolutely clear of them. Those craft were hired to no purpose whatever. Every man of a certain line of politics from Cape Sable to Cape North simply ran to headquarters with his little boats and hired them at the highest possible prices that they could ask. Those boats were engaged all the time, but what they were doing nobody knows. It would be quite in order for the minister to give a list of the craft of every kind and description that he engaged for service on the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick coasts, together with the names of their masters and the amount of money that was paid out in connection with the "secret" services performed. What they were doing, as I have already stated, nobody knows.

Now, in view of the fact that there was inefficiency from start to finish, the minister should not get on his high horse and hurl epithets at hon. members on this side of the House when they dare to question the services rendered by our Naval Department. I would ask the hon. minister and his department to give us the best possible account of what was done for the lavish expenditure of the people's money.

For myself and my friends on this side of the House I am not at all satisfied with the tone of the minister in replying to the criticisms of the hon. member for Lunenburg, nor am I satisfied that any defence worthy of being called such was made to the charges put forward by the hon. member. However, a great many of these things cannot be helped, I suppose. But the minister can help those boys who are pining in jail at Halifax, and he can let them go home to their friends, where I am sure they will be more useful to the country than they can possibly be kept in confinement at Rockhead. Rockhead is the site of the old penitentiary in the province of Nova Scotia before Confederation, but I am glad to say that so law-abiding and excellent are our people that we have no penitentiary there to-day. But Rockhead is still there, and it still carries the same disagreeable odour that was associated with it while used as a penitentiary. To that old penitentiary those boys were sent. I hope that the minister will be perfectly satisfied that they have sufficiently condoned for any little shortcomings they may have been guilty of. I am sure, Sir, that now the war is over nothing is to be gained by afflicting the sore hearts of this country, and this is one little thing we can do, or rather the minister can do to allay irritation, having amply punished any insubordination on the part of those young men. I trust, therefore, that before many more days have passed over our heads the minister will be able to tell us that he has done one good thing—allowed those boys to depart to their homes in British Columbia.

I have not had an opportunity, Sir, of looking through the Estimates to any extent but I presume they are somewhat along the lines of the other Estimates, and we shall be very glad to give fair and honest consideration to every item in them. I am sorry that this is the first time that a minister of the Crown, this year at all events, has started out with a storm, which has been visited back upon his own head, and which has kept him for over three weeks before getting a single item through the Committee.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I might be allowed to say a word or two in answer to the hon. leader of the Opposition, for whom I have the greatest regard. With regard to the young men referred to, it was my intention when the peace treaty was signed to give orders for their release. The hon. leader of the Opposition has stated that when orders are disobeyed in the navy it would be proper to call in the harbourmaster and refer the matter to the Marine Department. That of course could not be done in naval affairs, because the Marine Department has nothing to do with the navy, and in this case we necessarily had to follow the regulations. But I will be very glad to look into the matter again and see if these young sailors may not be let out even before the signing of the peace treaty.

The hon. member has stated that I made no explanation to the Committee in regard to the Lux Blanca. I will very briefly repeat what I stated this afternoon. There were off the coast at that time one division of patrol vessels, comprising sixty-four ves-

sels, and two United States submarine chasers. The former had just left their convoy; the latter were still in company with a convoy. A wireless message was immediately sent to both divisions, and this message was coded, despatched, decoded and acted upon by 2.30 p.m., which shows considerable promptitude. The patrol vessels were uncertain of their position in the fog. I do not claim to have any great knowledge of navigation, but I have crossed the ocean several times and have talked with mariners, and I know that it is not unusual for a man to be uncertain about the position of his vessel, especially during a thick fog. These trawlers went as quickly as they could to the assistance of the Lux Blanca.

With regard to the service generally, the hon. member says that it has not done anything. As I said this afternoon, having regard to the fact that aside from the Rainbow and the Niobe the Canadian naval service is made up of trawlers and drifters, it rendered good and efficient service for Canada. The trawlers acted as escorts to the convoys, and also as scouts and mine-sweepers. So that considering the craft that were at our disposal, the service was as efficient as could be expected.

11 p.m.

I made reference this afternoon to the services of the Niobe and the Rainbow. If there is any further information that I can furnish to hon. members, I shall be only too glad to give it.

With regard to the men out on the Pacific coast who, the hon. member says, have nothing to do but certain painting, I have no knowledge of that, but I will immediately send a wire out there to ascertain the facts and shall be glad subsequently to give my hon. friend more information than I am able to give him now.

I thought that I covered the ground pretty well this afternoon. I did not say during the course of my remarks that we had modern ships in the Canadian navy. When I became Minister of the Naval Service I had to do the best I could with the ships that the Canadian navy had. Hon. members know all about the Rainbow and all about the Niobe. These trawlers and drifters were new ships. I understood the hon. member to say a moment ago that Trawler 30 was an old ship. I wish to correct him on that point; this was a new trawler and, according to expert officers, was perfectly seaworthy, although she was leaking a little, as all new vessels do. As we proceed with the Estimates I shall be glad to give any additional information that I can.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister has kindly invited us to bring to his attention anything we heard of that was not satisfactory in the Service. I wish to direct his attention to a matter relating to the claim of a sailor in Halifax by the name of James C. Lavandier. I received the following letter from him on February 17 last:

> I beg to acknowledge to you that I am out of the naval service, and what about I cannot tell, as I was steward of the ship Hopper Barge No. 1 and was getting my food from H.M.C.S. Niobe, and was getting food for 18 of the crew, and as it happened that the Captain, John Barr, had on board his wife and daughter, and the mate also had his wife, I was short of food. This was on Friday, January 24th. I thought that there was nothing else for me to do but to tell the Captain, and I did so, and he said if I should speak to him again he would report me to the Niobe, and I told him to do so, and he did, and on Friday night at 8.30 he told me to get my clothes and go ashore. I did so, and on Monday the 27th of January I went down to the Niobe, and they said I had run away from the ship, and they gave me 17 days' leave and 17 days' pay cut off, and although I had two witnesses they did not take my word. Of course, if I had been a Captain I would have been all right, but as a slave I was cast down, and on February 10 I was let off and I did not get my discharge yet.
>
> That is what I got after being in service from August 20th, 1914 till February 10th, 1919, and we were under fourteen days' notice. I was discharged without a cent, and all those that did nothing and have joined the service from this last year are going away with three months' pay or six months and I have nothing to show for my services.
>
> I hope you will take charge of this case and see what you can do for me. I have four years' service and five months.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> James C. Lavandier

When I received that letter I wrote to Mr. Desbarats, the Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs, as follows:

> I am enclosing herewith a letter just received from one of your employees in Halifax, James C. Lavandier.
>
> Be kind enough to look into this matter and let me know if this man has a reasonable complaint, and if anything can be done to adjust it, and oblige.

I received the following reply from the deputy minister:

> I am in receipt of your letter of the 24th enclosing copy of a letter from James C. Lavandier complaining of certain treatment in the Naval Service. He does not give much information in his letter, but I am having his record looked up and should be able to inform you of the facts of the case.

That was on the 28th of February. I waited for some time for an answer, but there did not seem to be anything doing,

so I decided to write to Colonel Thompson, the Commanding Officer of Military District No. 6, Halifax, to see whether I could make any progress in dealing with this sailor's case. I received the following polite reply from Colonel Thompson, dated March 15:

I am in receipt of your letter in reference to a sailor's grievance, which I handed over immediately to Commander D. Tatton-Brown of H.M.C. Dockyard, Halifax. He advises me that he has instructed the Commanding Officer of the Niobe to look into the case and take the necessary action. I asked him to communicate with you direct.

If you hear nothing in the course of a day or so you might please write the Commanding Officer of the Niobe yourself.

I trust you will be able to get a full explanation of this matter. Should there be any delay and should you consider I could help you further I shall be pleased to hear from you.

Colonel Thompson referred the matter to the commanding officer of the Niobe. Colonel Thompson wrote me a further letter on March 17, as follows:

With further reference to my letter of the 15th instant, I attach herewith copy of communication this day received from the Assistant Superintendent H.M.C. Dockyard regarding the complaint made by Mr. J. C. Lavandier.

This is the letter that he enclosed. It is addressed to Colonel Thompson and reads:

The Admiral Superintendent has directed me to inform you that if Mr. J. C. Lavandier has any complaint he should have made it to the Commanding Officer Niobe or to the Admiral Superintendent.

If Mr. Sinclair requires any information with regard to men in the Naval Service he should apply to the Department of Naval Service.

Yours faithfully,

D. Tatton-Brown,
Commander, R.N.

This gentleman is evidently more anxious about the due observance of rules or red tape than he is to see that justice is done to the sailor. He gives no explanation of the sailor's charge that he was dismissed from the service because he ventured to tell the captain that the food had run short. As will have been observed in his letter, the man was a steward on this vessel and was getting food from the Niobe to feed eighteen persons. The captain took his wife and daughter on the ship, and the mate also took his wife; and the number of those on board multiplied so that the man could not feed them on the supply he was receiving from the Niobe and when he brought this fact to the attention of the captain he was reprimanded and dismissed from the service and he has been at No. 2 Hurds Lane ever since that time waiting to get a settlement of his case. In the meantime, I have been writing letters and waiting for replies from the commander of the Niobe or from the deputy minister in regard to the matter. This dismissal occurred in January and it is now the 26th of May; and while I have had a number of polite letters from different officers in the department there has been no settlement or explanation. The sailor has not received his wages. I have done my best to obtain a settlement from the minister's officers and have failed, and I submit that this is only another illustration of the inefficiency of the Department of Naval Affairs. The question is what next? After the impudent letter I received from commander D. Tatton-Brown, R.N., I do not feel like going back to Halifax for any solution of this matter, and I trust that the minister himself will see that the necessary steps are taken to have a satisfactory adjustment made.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be glad to look into the matter to-morrow and let the hon. member have a prompt answer. I understand that the man to whom he refers was not a member of the Naval Service, but was a civilian on board a ship called the Speedy, all the crew of which had been demobilized. This is the first time the matter has been brought to my attention, and I shall see that the hon. member receives a satisfactory and prompt reply.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister an experience I had similar to that of the hon. member for Guysborough. Last fall I also received a rebuke from a gentleman who was, I think, the master of the N.R. 30. I do not happen to remember his name. One of his sailors came ashore in my town and found illness in his family. He came to me as the member for the county to see if I could intervene with the officers of the ship with a view to getting him leave to stay at home with his sick wife. His wife was a nervous wreck on the verge of confinement, without any help, and she simply clung to her husband and refused to let him go. In an endeavour to help the man I wrote as politely as I could to the commanding officer. He wrote back to me informing me that I should mind my own business, and suggesting that I should know better than to write a letter like that to a man in his position. He said that if anything was required I ought to know where to look for the information. He signed his name and never mentioned the sailor at all. Now, Sir, we are a simple Canadian people, unaccustomed to such conduct as that. In future years we may

know how to deal with such high and lofty officers, but I desire, on the floor of Parliament, to bring to the notice of the minister the fact that such conduct engenders in the hearts and minds of the best people of Canada nothing but the most extreme contempt for such officials or any one who may stand behind them; and the sooner they learn that this is a democratic country and that we are a democratic people, the better. We are willing to stand behind efficient service and give our hearts and souls, and our blood, in support of such service, but we will not tolerate snobbery or contemptible behaviour of such a character.

Fisheries Protection Service—To provide for the repairs and maintenance of Fisheries Protection Steamers, $400,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How does the minister intend to spend this money?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This item shows an increase of $120,000 over the Estimates of 1918-19 and an increase of $45,000 over those of 1913-14. The increase is due wholly to the fact that most of the vessels engaged in fisheries protection work were also engaged in patrol duties under the Royal Canadian navy. As such their expenses were defrayed from the war vote and not out of this item. This condition will now cease, and vessels will return to peace basis. The increase of $45,000 as compared with the pre-war estimate is due to the fact that three of the smaller vessels, those employed in fisheries protection duty, have outlived their usefulness and have been disposed of. To fill their places the department has transferred from the Naval Service, the Hochelaga, and two new trawlers, and also the patrol vessel Stadacona.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many ships have we now in the fisheries protection service, and where are they?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have the Canada, the Hochelaga, the Petrel, the Gulnare, the Arras, the Arleux, the Vigilant, the Malaspina, Stadacona, the Armentieres, and the Givenchy. They are distributed as follows: On the east coast the vessels are: Canada, Hochelaga, Petrel, Gulnare, Arras and Arleux; on the west coast, Stadacona, Malaspina, Armentieres, and Givenchy, and on the Great Lakes the steamer Vigilant.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I wonder whether we are not spending too much money at the present time in fisheries protection service. There is really nothing special to protect. We are allowing American fishermen to come into our harbours freely to purchase

supplies, etc., and are not in the same need of protection we were in a few years ago when we had to watch the American fleet and when the regulations called for more care than at present. It strikes me the minister might make some reduction in the cost of this service if he looked into the matter carefully. I think he could find we could do with fewer boats thereby reducing expenditure.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have been looking into the matter carefully and we have been increasing the revenue especially in British Columbia which will make up for any deficit shown in previous years. The fishermen call constantly for the protection we are now giving them, and while I have gone carefully into the matter I do not see how we can very well cut it down any further. We have not got a very large fleet. These vessels are protecting our fisheries and seeing that American vessels do not fish within our limits.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There was a proposal made recently by people engaged in the fishing industry that a special deputy be appointed to give special attention to the fishing interests on our coasts. Does the minister approve that idea, and is it likely to be carried out?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I was going to go into that when the fishery Estimates are before the Committee. I have been favoured with a delegation from the Fisheries Association. I realize that great opportunities exist for increasing the fisheries of Canada, and I hope before very long to be able to separate entirely the Department of Naval Service from the fisheries. In the meantime I am taking active steps to develop to the utmost the fisheries of Canada, and to make that branch as efficient as possible. I shall be glad to go more fully into the matter when the fishery Estimates are up.

Radiotelegraph service—to provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations, $285,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this for new stations, or repairs to old ones?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is mostly for the maintenance of our present stations, but also for the construction of some new ones. We intend to construct one on the east coast at a cost of $7,500, one on the west coast at a cost of $48,700, and another on the Great Lakes at a cost of $1,000. The balance of the item is for the maintenance of our present stations.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where is the one on the east coast going to be built?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At Grosse Isle.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there not a wireless station there now?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, but we have to rebuild the present station.

Mr. McKENZIE: How many Government-owned wireless stations are there on the Atlantic coast?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government owns all the wireless stations on the east coast except the one at Pictou.

Mr. McMASTER: Has the minister in his Estimates any item dealing with the wireless equipment on Government boats? If he has not, I am going to ask permission of the Committee to raise a matter concerning wireless equipment on Government boats, information concerning which I have been unsuccessfully endeavouring to get from the Government since the opening of the session. If there is an item in the Estimates dealing with the matter I shall not interrupt the work of the Committee to deal with it now.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My Estimates do not contain any item for wireless equipment on any boat of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I must apologize for the delay in giving my hon. friend the information he has asked for. I have personally inquired about it several times, and the information is now in preparation, but in these busy days it seems difficult to get information as speedily as we would like. I hope in a few days, however, to give my hon. friend the information he has asked for.

Mr. McMASTER: I thank the minister very sincerely for his kind promise. It is now several days since I received from the gentleman who occupied the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries during the regretted sickness of the present minister a letter which led me to suppose the information would be forthcoming about the 20th of May. I am glad to know that I shall have it in the course of a few days.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not know that the large wireless station at Glace Bay was owned by the Government, but I understand from the minister that it is. There is a small wireless station at North Sydney and a large one at Glace Bay, which I thought was private property. Will the minister tell us how many stations there are altogether, and where the others are located?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The following stations are owned by the Government but operated under contract by the Marconi people: Belle Isle, Nfld., Pt. Amour, Nfld., Pt. Riche, Nfld., Harrington, P.Q., Heath Pt., P.Q., Cape Ray, Nfld., Cape Race, Nfld., Grindstone Island, P.Q., Fame Pt., P.Q., Clarke City, P.Q., Father Pt., P.Q., Grosse Isle, P.Q., Quebec, P.Q., Three Rivers, P.Q., Montreal, P.Q., Cape Sable, N.S., Partridge Island, St. John, N.B., Cape Bear, P.E.I., Camperdown, N.S., Sable Island, N.S., Halifax, N.S., Pictou, N.S., North Sydney, C.B.

Mr. McKENZIE: Glace Bay is not included in that list.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is a private station, owned by the Marconi people.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister told us that Pictou was the only private-owned one, but I understand now that both Pictou and Glace Bay are private-owned.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is correct.

Mr. COPP: Has the Government any interest in the wireless station at Newcastle?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is a private-owned one.

Mr. COPP: But the Government have controlled it for the past two years?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: During the war only.

Mr. COPP: Is it in operation now?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It has been handed back to the company, the Marconi Company, I believe.

Patrol of the northern waters of Canada, $40,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is being done in these northern waters. Is this in connection with the Stefansson expedition?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is to pay the balance incurred in connection with the Stefansson expedition that was sent north some years ago.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the word "patrol" the proper word? Patrol has a certain significance, and I did not know there was any "patrol" of these waters.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the hon. member's point is well taken. The word "patrol" should really not be there. This

amount is required in connection with the northern expedition that was fitted out at the expense of the Government in 1913. Mr. Stefansson's report is now under way, and I understand from conversation I have had with him that it is going to be of considerable scientific and practical value to Canada.

Life saving stations, including of rewards for life saving, $100,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who is the superintendent of the life saving stations on the coast of the Maritime Provinces? Some two or three years ago Mr. Nickerson occupied the position of superintendent, and I would like to know who succeeded him.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No one was appointed to succeed Mr. Nickerson, and we have no officer performing his duties.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I think it is very unsatisfactory that nobody should visit these stations.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not want to convey the impression that no one visits the stations. The officers of the Fishery Protection patrol, as they are in the vicinity, visit these life saving stations.

Royal Naval College of Canada, $100,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This appears to be a new item.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am very glad to see it. I think it is a move in the right direction that the Royal Naval College should be supported. If we are going to have a Canadian navy, we must support the institution that teaches the boys the very important lessons necessary to give them a start. The accusation has been made against the department that they have not acknowledged young Canadians who have devoted their lives to the naval service. A considerable number of young men have been trained in the Naval College at Halifax. I am not familiar enough with the matter to say whether the charge is substantiated by the facts or not, but it is that Canadian cadets who were trained in the Naval College were not given positions in the Canadian naval service during the war. I would like the minister to give me a list of the young men who were trained in the naval service and who were put in charge of Canadian vessels during the war.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am very glad to hear the commendation of the hon. member regarding the Naval College cadets, a very large number of whom have joined the Imperial service, and their record has been a most admirable one. The object of the present vote is to buy a site. It will not be sufficient to put up a good, modern, well equipped naval college, but it is sufficient for the time being, and next year we will probably come back for an additional amount.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it true that none of these young men were employed by the minister in the Naval Service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, a few. I will be glad to send the hon. member a list that he has asked for. A large majority joined the Imperial Service in preference to the Canadian because they would see more active service and also get a better idea of the duties of a naval officer.

Mr. COPP: Where is the college to be built?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At Halifax.

Mr. McKENZIE: What opportunities for training will the naval cadets or students have in connection with the college at Halifax? Will there be a ship in which they can learn something of naval seamanship generally and put into practice the theory which they are receiving at lectures?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I quite agree with my hon. friend that they ought to have practical training as well as instruction in theory through lectures. While our cadets have done well and made creditable records for themselves I am in hopes that they will get a still better training than they have had in the past and that they will also get the training on board ship such as the hon. member suggests.

Mr. COPP: Has the site been purchased?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not yet.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Tuesday, May 27, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

ASCENSION DAY ADJOURNMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday the 28th instant, it do stand adjourned until Friday the 30th instant.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be put by leave of the House.

Motion agreed to.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 96, to amend the Criminal Code so as to provide for the revision of excessive or inadequate punishments.—Mr. Tweedie.

Bill No. 120, for the relief of Eleanor Margaret Webster.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 121, for the relief of Jean Donaldson Sifton.—Mr. McMaster.

LABOUR UNREST IN CANADA.

THE SITUATION IN THE WEST—STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg): In view of the serious situation in my constituency, would the Prime Minister be good enough to state the Government's attitude with regard to "collective bargaining," which I am informed is the basic cause of the sympathetic strikes now on in Winnipeg?

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I should like to give an answer to his question which will be more comprehensive than the strict scope of the question might demand. The Government are thoroughly conscious that there is throughout the world a condition of industrial unrest which in some countries has reached a very acute stage, and I am very sincerely hopeful that the condition in this country will not go so far. I might remind the hon. gentleman and the House generally that the Government some months ago had under consideration what might arise in this country in the change from war conditions to peace conditions, and by reason of the demobilization of some hundreds of thousands of men who putting aside in a time of great need their civilian activities, had taken up military duties and served with great distinction for years in the world theatre of war. It was thought at one time that the return and demobilization of the Canadian forces would occupy at least a year, and, perhaps, longer. It was even suggested that it might take eighteen months or two years, but owing to very active and energetic measures the task of demobilization will be accomplished in a much shorter time. Having regard to all these conditions, the Government, during my absence, passed on the 4th day of April last an Order in Council by which authority was taken for the appointment of a Royal Commission to report to the Government on the following matters:—

First, to consider and make suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employees.

Second, to recommend means for ensuring that industrial conditions affecting relations between employers and employees shall be reviewed from time to time by those concerned, with a view to improving conditions in the future.

It was further provided in the Order in Council that the commission should first make a survey and classification of existing Canadian industries; secondly, that it should obtain information as to the character and extent of the organization already existing among bodies of employers and employees respectively; and, thirdly, that it should investigate available data as to the progress made by established joint industrial councils in Canada, Great Britain, and the United States.

Following that, on the 9th day of April last, these gentlemen were appointed to be members of the commission: Chief Justice Mathers, of Manitoba (Chairman); Senator White, of Montreal; Mr. Charles Harrison, M.P., a member of this House; Mr. Carl Riordon, president of the Riordon Pulp & Paper Company, Montreal; Mr. F. Pauze, lumberman, of Montreal; Mr. T. Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; and Mr. J. W. Bruce, of Toronto, member of the Labour Appeal Board.

These Orders were adopted upon a report to Council by Senator Robertson, Minister of Labour. This commission is still actively at work, and no doubt it will have to consider (if it has not already done so), and in the end report to the Government upon the particular question which my hon. friend (Mr. Andrews) has raised. He will therefore realize that any observations I may make in direct reply to his question must be in very guarded terms, although I shall have something to say about it in a few moments. The terms of the Order in Council did not necessitate, and on the other hand they did not preclude, legislation for the purpose of carrying out the report.

I have no doubt that in this country as well as in other countries the stress and strain of the war have made the adjustment of difficulties between employers and employed more difficult than it would perhaps be under ordinary conditions. I do

not think there is one among us who has given any consideration at all to the subject, who will not agree that taking any nation as a whole which has participated in the war—including not only those men who have fought at the front but those who have remained at home and sought to do their duty there—the people are not quite the same, so far as mental poise and balance are concerned, as they were before the war.

I hope that both employers and employed will bear fully in mind the conditions I have alluded to, and especially the employers not overlook the principles which were adopted by all the nations represented in the Peace Conference at Paris, and which are included in the peace treaty as presented to the Germans. I regard these principles as of sufficient importance to justify me in reading them, with the indulgence of the House:

The High Contracting Parties, recognizing that the well-being, physical, moral and intellectual, of industrial wage earners is of supreme international importance, have framed in order to further this great end the permanent machinery provided for in section 1 and associated with that of the League of Nations.

They recognize that differences of climate, habits and customs, of economic opportunity and industrial tradition, make strict uniformity in the conditions of labour difficult of immediate attainment. But, holding, as they do, that labour should not be regarded merely as an article of commerce, they think that there are methods and principles for regulating labour conditions which all industrial communities should endeavour to apply so far as their special circumstances will permit.

Among these methods and principles, the following seem to the High Contracting Parties to be of special and urgent importance:—

First. The guiding principle above enunciated that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce.

Second. The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers.

Third. The payment to the employed of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life as this is understood in their time and country.

Fourth. The adoption of an eight hours day or a forty-eight hours week as the standard to be aimed at where it has not already been attained.

Fifth. The adoption of a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hourse which should include Sunday wherever practicable.

Sixth. The abolition of child labour and the imposition of such limitations on the labour of young persons as shall permit the continuation of their education and assure their proper physical development.

Seventh. The principle that men and women should receive equal remuneration for work of equal value.

Eighth. The standards set by law in each country with respect to the conditions of labour should have due regard to the equitable economic treatment of all workers lawfully resident therein.

Ninth. Each State should make provision for a system of inspection in which women should take part, in order to ensure the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the employed.

Without claiming that these methods and principles are either complete or final, the High Contracting Parties are of opinion that they are well fitted to guide the policy of the League of Nations; and that, if adopted by the industrial communities who are members of the League, and safeguarded in practice by an adequate system of such inspection, they will confer lasting benefits upon the wage earners of the world.

Now, it has been alleged in some quarters that as regards the strike at Winnipeg the Government has taken sides. The Government has taken no sides in that dispute, except in so far as necessary executive action, to which I shall allude in a moment, may be looked upon in that light. I believe it will be obvious to all the members of the House, and, I hope, it will be equally obvious to all the people of Canada, that if the needs of the people as a whole are to be regarded we cannot have in this country a complete dislocation of public services founded upon such reasons as have been put forward by the postal employees of Winnipeg.

The Government of this country is in an entirely different situation from a private employer. The Government employs persons who are servants of all the people of the country. It differs from a private employer in many respects, but especially so in two important respects. In the first place, the duties for which public servants are employed have a direct relation to the maintenance of law and order and, as well, a direct relation to the operation of public services which are necessary for the convenience of the people. But in addition to that, it does not employ these people for any purpose of private gain or private interest; it is acting merely as the representative of the people as a whole, under the mandate, and only so long as it has the mandate of the majority of the people's representatives in Parliament. Therefore, certain considerations which must obviously be taken into account in dealing with the relations between a private employer and those whom he employs are utterly wanting when we come to consider the situation of persons who are employed in the public service. As the Government of the country has and can have no private interests to serve, inasmuch as it represents the people as a whole and acts under the authority of a mandate from

Parliament, by whom its acts can be corrected at any time, if they seem to be improper or unjust, one would naturally suppose that in these circumstances the Government might be trusted to act fairly in respect of the remuneration of public servants and in respect of the conditions of their employment. But I should be prepared to go further than that and say that in appropriate cases the public servants of the country—persons usually known as members of the Civil Service—might ask for and obtain a sort of appeal against the Government of the country by arbitration or some such method; but always subject to final approval by Parliament, which is the ultimate authority so far as the Government is concerned.

In dealing with the situation at Winnipeg, there are certain fundamental considerations to which this Government is committed and which, I hope, will commend themselves to the people and to their representatives in this Parliament. In the first place, we are absolutely determined that law and order should be maintained; and, in the second place, we are of the opinion that members of the Civil Service cannot be permitted to disregard their public duties and to dislocate the public service under the conditions which have arisen in the city of Winnipeg.

On the one hand the Government directs them to discharge a public duty, a duty to the whole of the people of this country; on the other hand another authority directs them to disregard that duty. They must make their choice as to whether they will serve the public as a whole, or whether, by disregarding that duty, they will abandon once for all the public service.

So far as "collective bargaining" is concerned, since my hon. friend who has asked this question spoke to me on the subject yesterday, I have made a good many inquiries as to precisely what that term conveys, and I am thoroughly satisfied that it has not any definite and final meaning which is recognized in all parts of this country. I am further satisfied that in some parts of Canada, in some cities in this country, it may be understood by some persons in one sense, and by other persons in another sense. I want to make it perfectly plain that so far as my opinion goes, and I think it is the opinion of all the members of the Government, every possible facility should be given for discussion between employers and employed, and for the making of arrangements which will bring about industrial peace and maintain and stabilize industrial conditions to the end that wasteful unemployment, used as a coercive measure, may be put to one side, and other methods—methods which must be so established as to do complete justice and remove any inequality—may be substituted in its place.

I should like to read, in this connection, the statement which has been made public by a minister of the Crown, Senator Robertson, and which is to be found in the morning press of this city. I knew Senator Robertson for some time before he came into this Government, and I have known him very intimately since he has been a member of the Government. No one can entertain the slightest doubt as to his absolute and complete sympathy with all the reasonable ideals of labour—there can be absolutely no doubt on that subject. No one who knows the man, or has been associated with him, can entertain the smallest atom of doubt as to his complete sincerity or as to his full sympathy with all the reasonable aspirations of labour. The statement which he has made public is this:

> "Conditions for the right of collective bargaining which are stated to be the cause of the Winnipeg strike seem to be generally misunderstood.
>
> The employers, parties to the original dispute; the president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and the Citizens' Committee as constituted since the strike occurred, all agree to the principle of collective bargaining as it is interpreted, namely, the right of any individual to belong to a labour union if he so desires and the right of employees to bargain with their employers concerning matters affecting any individual plant or industry.
>
> The central strike committee interprets the right of collective bargaining to mean that the central body shall have the power to approve or reject any agreement that may be satisfactory to the employer or classes of employers and their employees, which, if granted, would have the result of enabling any central committee entirely outside the industry or craft affected to dictate the acceptance or rejection of any agreement. Instead of giving to the workmen in any individual plant or industry the right of collective bargaining with their employers, the present plan deprives them of the right and places them entirely in the hands of a central body, which principle, the Citizens' Committee of Winnipeg, Provincial and Federal Governments, agree cannot be accepted."

Now one can easily see that what is called the right of collective bargaining, if interpreted in a certain way and carried to an extreme length, might have an unfortunate effect so far as the public interest is concerned. More than that, as is suggested in this public statement, it might have the effect of placing labour men and labour unions themselves in such a situation that they could not make their own bargains except with the approval of some body that

might be situated thousands of miles away. Before the phrase "collective bargaining" is insisted upon, we ought to have, and we must have, an exact definition as to precisely what is intended by it and as to precisely what the results might be if that principle, so defined, should be adopted. On that point the Government will probably have suggestions or recommendations in the report of the Industrial Commission, which we hope to receive not later than the fifteenth day of next month. My hon. friend who has asked this question will realize that it would be out of place and, indeed, invidious for the Government to attempt, by way of anticipation, to pronounce upon questions which are properly within the scope of the duty imposed upon that commission.

I repeat once more that I hope in this country we may be able to arrange between employers and employed some understanding and such relations as will prevent the awful waste, the dislocation of public service, and what is worst of all, the intensely bitter feeling which is engendered by such incidents as are now occurring in some parts of the country.

The nations of the world have at Paris set about the task of establishing such a society as will prevent war in the future. Would it not be rather a mockery if the nations engaged in that greatest purpose of all, should, in respect of their domestic affairs, permit a condition to continue, and to be perpetuated which, if it reaches the stage of a general strike, must obviously involve the employment of some of the methods which are in use in modern warfare?

I most earnestly hope that the report of this commission, and appropriate action of the Government, may eventually bring about between employers and employed in Canada such better understanding, such more perfect realization of the viewpoint of one and the other, as will prevent incidents such as are now transpiring. If we cannot accomplish that all-important purpose in respect of our domestic affairs, there cannot be very much hope for that wider purpose which has been attempted in the constitution of the Society of Nations. In this country we have a common citizenship; we live under the same form of government; we have the like ideals; we have practically the same aspirations; although sometimes different interests and sometimes prejudices may appear, but there ought to be a much more favourable condition for assuring industrial co-operation and peace in this country through the effort and co-operation of employers and employed fully realizing their responsibilities than is to be discovered in the foundations of the Society of Nations from which we confidently anticipate a great service to the world.

I do indeed hope that the strike at Winnipeg may be terminated amicably. I should also allude to what has taken place at Calgary and at Edmonton, and read the communications which have been addressed to the postal authorities in those cities. On the 24th instant the Postmaster General sent this telegram to the postmaster at Calgary:

> Regret to learn everything points to sympathetic strike with Winnipeg on part of postal workers. Government considers such action wholly unwarranted and in violation of the plain duty of postal employees. The prompt handling of His Majesty's mails and the maintenance of the public postal service at this time is the first obligation of every employee under the Post Office Department. For such employees to seek to embarrass or prevent the prompt handling of His Majesty's mails by a sympathetic strike is entirely incompatible with loyal service to the country and all postal employees joining in a sympathetic strike will be deemed to have resigned their positions in His Majesty's service and their places will be promptly filled. All loyal employees will be supported and protected by the Government. Make known to employees and keep Department promptly informed.

As far as Winnipeg is concerned, I should add that a report reached me, before coming to the House, that seventy of the postal employees have returned to work, and that no difficulty has been experienced in filling the places of those who have not returned.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Labour a question that does not conflict at all with what has already been said. Is the Government taking steps to restore the balance between the cost of production and the cost of consumption in Canada; or does it intend to leave that matter to be fought out by the people?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is rather difficult to answer so comprehensive a question. I can only repeat what I said a few days ago, that the cost-of-living officers of the Labour Department are daily engaged in watching the particular matter to which my hon. friend refers. In the course of a few days the Labour Estimates will be taken up and there will be opportunity then for discussing the matter at greater length than I can now go into it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that why eggs are 70 cents a dozen?

Mr. MURPHY: In connection with the explanation the Right Hon. the Prime Minister gave to the House, may I ask the Right Hon. gentleman if he is in a position to state what proportion the postal employees on strike at Winnipeg bear to the total number of persons on strike there?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am speaking from memory when I say that those on strike in the postal service number between 500 and 600.

Mr. MURPHY: Does my hon. friend know what proportion they bear to the total number on strike?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As five or six hundred is to twenty-five thousand.

Mr. MURPHY: It is a mere fraction.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: So the explanation of my right hon. friend relates to a mere fraction, and not to the vast majority of the people on strike.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I endeavoured to cover the whole situation. My explanation as to the number of people who have returned to work obviously referred to the postal employees.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): The right hon. the leader of the Government has given us the result so far as between the postal authorities and their employees and that 70 of the latter had gone back to work. Would the Prime Minister be able to give us any idea as to what progress is being made in regard to a settlement of the general strike? What negotiations are going on in that behalf?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can only tell my hon. friend that possibly later in the day we may have some more detailed information to lay upon the table of the House. For the present, I must confine myself to saying that the news we have received this afternoon is of a distinctly reassuring character.

Mr. MURPHY: Before asking any further questions, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that, as my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, would say, certain members of the Government are not synchronizing. Yesterday afternoon I inquired what information the Government had with reference to the strikes that were said to be pending at Calgary, Edmonton, and other places in the West. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), speaking on behalf of the Government, said: "There is no official information as to the probability of a strike in Calgary and other places in the West." That statement was made, although the Ottawa Evening Journal published that afternoon the following item of news on its front page:

> It is understood that the Ottawa Ministers have received formal notification of the threatened action in the western cities.

That afternoon my right hon. friend read certain telegrams that passed on Saturday last, the 24th inst., from the Postmaster General, a member of the Cabinet, regarding these strikes. Now I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) whether the Postmaster General is likely to have any other information on these matters that he has not communicated to my hon. friend or to the other members of the Government?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My answer was perfectly correct. My hon. friend asked me if a strike had actually occurred in certain cities of the West. In reply, I stated that there was no official information up to that time that there actually was a strike. Of course, I knew that a strike was probable, as indeed the papers actually stated threats had been made to that end.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend said the Government had no information as to the probability of a strike.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not remember the word "probability."

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): I would call the attention of the Government to an important resolution introduced in the United States Senate by Senator King, of Utah, regarding the Georgian Bay canal. I read from the Associated Press despatch.

> The resolution proposes that the waterway be constructed by way of Lake Nipissing and the Ottawa river, and that costs be paid by Canada and the United States jointly. It also would authorize the United States to acquire a port on the southern bank of the St. Lawrence, opposite Montreal.

I would like to know if the Government is aware of such a resolution, and if it is their intention to co-operate with the United States Government regarding the construction of such an important canal that would benefit the whole country?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government has no official information on the subject. As far as co-operation is concerned, from what my hon. friend has read, I do not

think there is any intimation that the United States Government would be prepared to co-operate. I can only say at the moment that we shall ascertain just what the proposal is and give it our consideration.

EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

Mr. Wm. D. EULER (Waterloo North): I noticed a report in the press a few days ago that as one means of abating the unrest in the country it is the intention of the Government to bring down legislation to enact an eight-hour day. I would like to ask whether such is the case?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not within the legislative jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada to enact such legislation.

MILITIA PENSION ACT AMENDMENT.

COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS AND MEN.

On motion of Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence), Bill No. 118, to amend the Militia Pension Act, was read the third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OVERSEAS FORCES.

STATEMENT BY SIR EDWARD KEMP, MINISTER OF THE OVERSEAS MILITARY FORCES.

On motion of Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) to go into Committee of Supply:

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of the Overseas Military Forces): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House for a short time in order that I may have an opportunity to make a statement with reference to the administration of the overseas military forces of Canada. I was obliged to go across the water before the elections took place in 1917; and in making a few observations on the subject to which I have referred I ask the indulgence of the House the more readily because of the fact that I was unable to take my place in the House last session, and also because I have not taken up very much of the time of the House this session.

When in 1914 we decided to participate in the war to the last man and the last dollar, I fancy that none of us, none of the people of this country, fully realized what the obligation we then assumed really meant. We did not hesitate; we did not stop to bargain; the one point which was uppermost in the minds of all was: What would happen to the world; what would happen to the Empire; what would happen to Canada, if Germany could force her will upon the world, as she intended to do? But Germany was unable to carry out her scheme to change the map of the world. It is the intention, I understand, of the Peace Conference so to change the boundaries of European countries as to make it impossible for all time to come for any European nation to undertake, with any hope of success, such an enterprise as Germany entered upon.

I venture to say that few of Canada's soldiers, who enlisted so readily and with so much enthusiasm, particularly in the earlier days of the war, anticipated that they would be away from their homes so long or that they would be subjected to such privations, such hardships, and such sacrifices as overtook them. Neither did we expect that we would require to send such a large force overseas. If any one had predicted in the early days of the war that we should send 50,000 or 100,000 men overseas, the estimate would have been considered a large one. Yet we have sent overseas in all 420,913 of the best blood and sinew of Canada.

This, however, does not by any means represent the whole effort of this country. Many things were done by the people—the House is familiar with them—to help win the war. I shall not attempt this afternoon to enumerate them; in fact, I would be unable to do so, because these efforts were so varied and branched out into so many different directions and had such a far-reaching effect in bringing about a successful conclusion of the war, that it would be an impossibility to state them in detail.

It is desirable, Mr Speaker, that the people of Canada should familiarize themselves as much as possible with the activities of Canada's army while it was overseas. I realized some time ago that it would be an almost hopeless task for me, as a minister of the Crown representing the Canadian Government overseas, to convey to the people a picture which would accurately represent the activities of our army across the water. After the armistice came about on the 11th of November, we commenced to get out a report on the subject, and we succeeded in having that report completed. We could not do very much work on the report before the armistice, because the officers and men who were in a position to assist in the work were fully occupied. I had the honour of laying this report on the table of the House a couple of weeks ago. While it is a large volume, comprising over 500 pages, I think it is fair to say that the volume could have

been much larger—indeed, that there might have been two or three volumes just as large—and yet contain, without padding, matters of very great interest in connection with the overseas forces. My task to-day is to touch upon, as briefly as I can, a few of the most important points in which I think the public may be interested; of course, I cannot do more than touch upon the fringe of the subject.

At the request of the Prime Minister, I went to England in November, 1917, to accept the position of Minister of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada. I accepted the position, with some misgivings, knowing to some extent what the responsibilities were. I realized the difficulty involved in being so far from the seat of Government and from the people of Canada, and of explaining to the people and to my colleagues the necessity for such action as was required from time to time in connection with the carrying on of the war. In fact, from first to last it has been difficult to convey to the people an explanation of the many necessary things that had to be done.

The war was conducted on a tremendous scale. It was difficult for the people of Great Britain to understand the many things that had to be done. The war was, you might say, one surprise after another to the people of Great Britain, and perhaps more so to the people of Canada, who were so far removed from the scene of hostilities. I do not know that any one has prophesied what the effect would be upon Canada of sending such a large part of our population on this mission overseas, of holding these men in restraint, of subjecting them to military discipline for such long periods.

No one, it seems to me, has carefully studied the effect which this phase of our participation in the war will ultimately have upon Canada—in fact, the effect which it is having upon Canada to-day—or the political effect, using the word "political" in its broadest sense—which it will have upon this country. It would be well for us to stop, to consider, to reflect upon the difficulties which we shall have to face in the future in relation to the great task which we undertook under the obligation which we entered into in connection with the war.

The soil of Belgium and of France will always be sacred to Canadians, particularly to those whose loved ones lie there. But out of 420,913 men whom we sent overseas, 364,599 are alive; and for that we should be duly thankful. We rendered great service in the war; our achievements were great. Surely we may hope that this magnificent country will reap some benefit from these sacrifices, aside from the benefit which comes from our having helped to win the war. Surely we may hope that the result will be to make Canada a better country to live in; to make our people a better people, if that be possible.

It is not my intention this afternoon to attempt to deal with the operations of the Canadian corps at the front, because in the time at my disposal it would be impossible for me on the floor of this House to do justice to the magnificent way in which our soldiers conducted themselves in active service. From time to time in the press a record has been given of the operations that were carried out, and in the report which I placed on the table of the House there is a lengthy record of the operations of the Canadian corps during the last one hundred days of the war, which period constituted its crowning effort. The report to which I refer is a preliminary one in the view of General Currie, who was chiefly responsible for it, and who had it written. I understand from General Currie that he has some one now engaged on writing a complete history of the operations of the Canadian corps in the war, including the last one hundred days, and that history will be available at a later date.

The tasks of the Canadian corps were most difficult; the Canadian Corps was always to be found where the fighting was most fierce; and by its valour, patience and skill it brought renown to Canada; its record will endure for all time in the history not only of Canada, but of the world. Its commander, General Currie, has made a high place for himself in history; he measures up to a proud standard as compared with other great generals of the war; he was ever considerate of the men under him, and always exercised patience and foresight in dealing with problems which came before him.

Demobilization is the question which is particularly before the people of this country at the moment in connection with the overseas forces, and I intend to take this question up a little later on, but before doing so, I should like to mention certain matters connected with the administration of the Canadian overseas forces before the armistice.

The question as to what control is exercised over Canadian troops at the front, and

in fact over all our overseas forces abroad, has always been one of interest to hon. members, and it has been frequently referred to on the floor of this House. The inquiry has often been made: Were they under British or Canadian control; or, what was the control? As regards Canadian soldiers in training in the British camps, the control, so far as Canada was concerned, was perfectly satisfactory; we controlled them completely. As regards the Canadian corps, and Canadian troops in France outside of the corps, the situation was somewhat different, and when I went overseas I found that that particular part of our relations with the British authorities had not been so well defined as I should have liked. I, therefore, took the question up with the Secretary of State for War and with Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig at the front, and I had several conferences on that particular subject. We found that recommendations for promotion and advancement, recommendations for new establishments and organizations and many other things which had no particular reference to immediate military operations, were sometimes delayed by going in a roundabout way from general headquarters in France to the War Office, and from there to Canadian headquarters in London. We accordingly devised a scheme of having, at general headquarters in France, a Canadian section, through the establishment of which the Government of Canada got as closely as possible in touch with the commander-in-chief of the British armies in France, and it was arranged that all matters in connection with Canadian soldiers, except those having for their end military operations, would be referred to this section, and that this section would com-

4 p.m. municate direct with Canadian headquarters in London for final approval. At first the British authorities demurred in respect to this organization, but after it was formed and began working, it proved to be a success, and they were grateful that it was established, because it enabled the Canadian representative at general headquarters in France, namely, General Embury, to have conferences with different officers under Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig and to get together a staff which was desirable and necessary.

Mr. MURPHY: Who composed that section?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: General Embury was the head of the section. He organized the section, and his work proved very successful. General Embury has been appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan.

Mr. MURPHY: Were there any other members?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Yes, there was a regular staff including a representative of the Adjutant-General, a representative of the Quartermaster-General, a representative of the Director of Medical Services and representatives of the other branches.

Mr. MURPHY: The minister has not the names at the moment?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I have not the names of the members of the section in France, but they are available. It may not be generally known and understood that outside of the Canadian corps in France, we always had from 40,000 to 50,000 troops in various formations and units. At the time of the armistice the numbers were not quite as large as they had been, we having altogether 1,608 officers, and 37,174 other ranks not under the control of the corps commander. The following are the details:

	Officers.	Other Ranks.
Corps of Canadian Railway Troops	491	14,390
Canadian Forestry Corps	376	11,375
Canadian Cavalry Brigade	141	2,719
Canadian Army Medical Corps	360	2,467
Canadian Army Service Corps	57	1,675
Canadian Engineers Reinforcement Pool	49	1,214
Canadian Labour Pool	—	1,881
Canadian Base Signal Pool	8	432
Canadian Army Veterinary Corps	9	438
Canadian Army Dental Corps	52	104
Miscellaneous Details	65	479
Totals	1,608	37,174

These were troops that were operating partially under the British commander and partially under us, but they were not under the Canadian Corps Commander, and the Canadian section was, in my judgment, extremely necessary, not only to assist the corps commander, in carrying on operations, but to control these troops more efficiently.

As regards the necessity of taking action with reference to new organizations within the corps, it was the desire of the Imperial authorities that our army organizations should, as far as possible, be similar to theirs, but it was found by our commanders that in certain formations reinforcements which did not exist in the Imperial forces were desirable.

In the last hundred days of the war our Army was stronger than at anytime previously, because we had largely rein-

forced existing Establishment and organized new establishments, and I shall put this on record for the information of the House. Between January 1, 1918 and November 11, 1918, the following organizations and increases were carried out:

	Officers.	Other Ranks.
1. Organization of two Corps Tramway Companies	6	528
2. Organization of three Forestry Hospitals	19	62
3. Reorganization of Canadian Engineers, involving in addition to absorption, of four Pioneer Battalions, and three Field Companies of 5th Division, an increase of	163	3,822
4. Reorganization of Machine Gun Companies into Machine Gun Battalions, involving increase of	8	1,100
5. Formation of one additional Company for each of the four Machine Gun Battalions and necessary increase of Battalion Headquarters	80	1,953
6. Organization Canadian Corps Survey Section	4	162
7. Organization two Sections Divisional M.T. Company for 5th Canadian Divisional Artillery	2	78
8. Reorganization 1st Motor Machine Gun Brigade, and creation of 2nd Motor Machine Gun Brigade, involving, in addition to absorption of three Machine Gun Companies of 5th Division, an increase of	7	263
9. Organization No. 9 Employment Company	1	425
10. Organization H.Q. Corps M.T. Column	4	13
11. Increase of 100 O.R.'s, per Infantry Battalion	—	4,300
12. Organization Canadian Corps Veterinary Evacuation Station	1	30
13. Organization Nos. 1 and 2 Forestry Companies	12	370
14. Organization Anti-Aircraft Searchlight Company	5	130
15. Organization Marne Group H.Q., C.F.C.	3	19
	315	13,759

In addition to general reinforcements it has been necessary from time to time to organize new units, and the following schedule gives in detail the strength of complete units despatched to France between January 1, 1918, and November 11,1918:

Complete Units Despatched to France.	Off.	O.R.	Date of Despatch.
10th Canadian Siege Battery	6	175	14/3/18
13th, 14th, and 15th Field Companies	17	614	16/3/18
H.Q. and Signal Sub-Section 3rd H.A. Brigade	6	45	19/3/18
17th, 18th, and 19th Machine Gun Companies	30	531	23/3/18
13th Battalion Canadian Railway Troops	36	977	28/3/18
11th Canadian Siege Battery	6	175	2/4/18
69th Wagon Erecting Company	3	269	9/4/18
5th Canadian Aircraft Section	2	41	6/5/18
12th Canadian Siege Battery	6	175	31/5/18
14th Canadian Field Ambulance	12	233	5/6/18
5th Canadian Sanitary Section	1	27	5/6/18
12th and 13th Companies Canadian Forestry Corps	10	370	27/6/18
No. 11 District H.Q. Forestry Corps	8	41	4/8/18
9th, 10th and 11th Companies Canadian Forestry Corps	15	555	30/8/18
Squadron R.N.W.M.P.	6	154	6/10/18
7th and 8th Companies Canadian Forestry Corps	8	364	10/10/18
	172	4,746	
Total increase in existing Units in the Field	315	13,755	
Total complete new Units despatched to France	172	4,746	
Grand Total	487	18,501	

These latter were entirely new organizations for which there was generally no corresponding organization or unit in the Imperial Forces. They amounted to sixteen different units, and were composed of 172 officers and 4,746 other ranks. In other words, from January 1 to November 11, 1918, the strength of the Canadian corps was increased by reorganization and new units, for most of which there was no counterpart in the Imperial Forces, by 487 officers and 18,501 other ranks.

After I had been in England a very short time, I found that it would be of advantage

to the minister in carrying on his work to have an Overseas Military Council formed on the same principle and having the same functions as the Militia Council at Ottawa. This Overseas Council, which acts in an advisory capacity to the minister, was organized in the spring of 1918, and was composed as follows:

The Minister; the Deputy Minister (who at present is Col. G. S. Harrington); the Chief of the General Staff, Sir Richard Turner, V.C., K.C.B., etc.; the Adjutant General, Major-General P. E. Thacker; the Quartermaster-General, Brigadier-General D. M. Hogarth; the Accountant General, Col. W. R. Ward; the Director-General of Medical Services, Major-General G. L. Foster; the Paymaster-General, Brig.-General J. G. Ross.

Meetings of the Council have been regularly held, and much benefit has resulted from the exchange of opinions and views, and from the adoption of a uniform policy. When General Currie moved his headquarters from France about five weeks ago, to make his headquarters in London I asked him to take a seat on the Council in order that we might have the benefit of his ripe experience in all matters which still had to be dealt with. He consented. The name of Lieut.-Col. T. Gibson, Assistant Deputy Minister, was also added to the Council.

Mr. DEVLIN: Were these men acting on the Council purely from patriotic motives or were they paid a salary?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The men whose names I have mentioned are the members of the staff and are the heads of different branches of the service at headquarters. They receive the regular pay of officers, but most of them were engaged in professional or business life in Canada before the war, and they sacrificed the earnings from their professions or business from patriotic motives.

The Chief of the General Staff, Sir Richard Turner, and his immediate staff was responsible for the training in Great Britain. It might interest the House if I refer briefly to certain loans of officers to the Imperial authorities for special duties in connection with what was known as the Mesopotamia party, the North Russia party, including the Archangel and Murmansk Forces, the Palestine party, and as instructors for the American Army. In January, 1918, the British Government asked us to loan them certain officers and non-commissioned officers to proceed to Mesopotamia. Fifteen officers and twenty-seven non-commissioned officers were selected from the Canadian forces and left England during the same month. These men were sent out for the purpose of training and organizing an army of the natives to the north and northeast of the area where the British forces were operating at that time, to help the British meet the Turkish forces. Only 14 of this party remained to be returned to England at the end of March, 1919, and I think by this time all have been returned.

Mr. POWER: Can the minister give us any information as to the instructions that were given to the men that went to Mesopotamia? I understand they went on a very, very secret mission.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It was a very secret mission. The British authorities sent out a considerable number of men, and we sent the force I have mentioned, which formed only a small proportion of the total force, for the purpose of training the Armenians and other nationalities occupying the territory to the east and northeast of where the British forces were operating, in the direction of the Caspian Sea. A very mixed race occupies that territory, and it was for the purpose of organizing them if possible into an auxiliary force that these men were sent out.

Mr. POWER: Is it true that the officers were obliged to pledge themselves not to communicate with their relatives for a period of one year or more?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I could not say as to that; I do not think any special instructions of that kind were given. All telegrams and mail were subject to the censorship, and the officers and soldiers become pretty familiar with the rules and regulations, and as a general rule do not try to break them. The men in Mesopotamia were volunteers, as were also those in North Russia, at Archangel and Murmansk. The Archangel force was composed of specially selected personnel of five officers and eleven other ranks; the Sixteenth Brigade Canadian Field Artillery consisted of eighteen officers and 478 other ranks, and in the special mobile force on the Murmansk coast there were eighteen officers and seventy-four other ranks, making a total of forty-one officers and 563 other ranks. Archangel harbour I believe is still frozen, and on the Murmansk coast, which lies to the west the men are engaged in holding the Murman peninsula and railway which reaches to the all-year open port on the Arctic ocean. We intend to get these men back to England and to Canada as soon as possible.

Our men have been the backbone of that expedition, because they were physically fit and understood their work, and I have no hesitation in saying that they were the best of the troops sent there. There were a great many thousands sent there, including British, French, and American troops. Then in the summer of 1918 volunteers were called for a bridging party to Palestine, and six officers and 250 other ranks proceeded, all of whom have been returned.

There has been an impression abroad, and I have heard some echoes of it, that officers whose duties called them to carry on work in England tried to remain there as much as possible in areas where training was going on and where other necessary work preparatory to going to the front was being done. It is alleged that these men preferred to remain in England rather than to go to the front. This impression is entirely erroneous. Out of 1,000 officers I do not think you will find one who did not prefer service at the front, rather than in England, particularly in London. Soon after I took office I instituted a policy with respect to the exchange of officers between England and France, which resulted in a continuous circulation of officers between the two countries, no matter what positions the men occupied, unless under special circumstances where one or two might be found to be of greater service in England.

During the period we have been at war it is gratifying to record that our soldiers have been awarded 17,000 medals, honours, and awards, including 53 Victoria Crosses, 1,885 Military Crosses, 19 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 1,204 Distinguished Conduct Medals, and 6,610 Military Medals.

Mr. GRIESBACH: You say that there were 17,000 decorations. Do those which you have enumerated comprise that number?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Looking at the figures here, I do not think they make that total. However, the official record is that the forces of Canada, since the time they first went into action, were awarded upwards of 17,000 medals and honours, in the proportion I have mentioned. The figures as they are here do not lend themselves to addition, but I do not think they total 17,000. I see that the Distinguished Service Order is omitted from this, also C.B.'s and C. M. G.'s so I presume that may account for the difference. However, I can get that information for my hon. friend.

After it was decided by the Government to grant a liberal gratuity to soldiers, particularly those who had served overseas, it became apparent to us that it would be necessary to have some regulation with respect to discharges in England. The matter had always been more or less under restraint, but it was felt that there would be an anxiety on the part of soldiers—and indeed it was soon manifested after the armistice—to get home and be demobilized. So that in order that we might deal justly with all soldiers who wished to be demobilized in England, we embarked on a policy, and the conditions on which a Canadian soldier may be demobilized in England under that policy are that:

(a) He was born in the British Isles.

(b) He has no dependents in Canada.

(c) He has dependents or relatives in the British Isles in such circumstances as warrant his retention there for financial or domestic reasons.

(d) He has a bona fide offer of employment or has independent means of support irrespective of any pay or gratuity payable by the Government.

In that way, we were able to discharge those soldiers in England who justly could not be asked to come back to Canada, but it did not lead to a wholesale discharge of Canadian soldiers in England, nor could soldiers be demobilized out of their turn.

Mr. POWER: Do those soldiers lose their war service gratuity?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No, they do not. A matter of great importance to the Canadian people at the moment is the desire of relatives and others to see the graves of men who have been buried in France and Belgium, and I have received a great many applications for passes to visit these graves. Shortly before I left England I paid a visit to France and Belgium to see for myself what was the condition of the graves of our soldiers there, and I think it might be well to explain to the House what the situation is.

Those who have lost relatives in the war derive a great deal of comfort and consolation in being able to visit the graves of their dead, and as time grows on such a pilgrimage will become increasingly the custom. On the 13th of April, 1917, an organization known as the Imperial War Graves Commission was constituted by resolution passed by the Imperial War Conference, which consists of a large number of representative men. Canada's representative in that organization is the High Commissioner for Canada, Sir George Perley. There are 160,000 isolated graves on the battlefields of France and Belgium, and the total number of graves of British soldiers

in those areas is comprised as follows: United Kingdom, 452,730; Canada, 43,631; Australia, 35,131; New Zealand, 11,393; South Africa 4,450; South African Native Labour Corps, 535; Newfoundland, 888; India natives, 5,665; and British West indies, 956. This represents a total of British graves in France and Belgium of 555,379.

There are, as I have said, a hundred and sixty thousand isolated graves on the battlefields of France and Belgium, and for some time before the armistice was signed, and ever since that date, soldiers from the Dominions of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and Imperial soldiers, have been exhuming the bodies of the soldiers in those graves, and placing them in cemeteries. I am glad to say that Canada has done her full duty in this respect, and I believe Australia has also. I fancy that the British authorities have had more difficulty in carrying out their duty in this regard, owing to the fact that there were a far larger number of bodies of British soldiers than of overseas soldiers buried in these isolated graves. I would like to say that we have a corps of approximately six or seven hundred soldiers who since the armistice have devoted themselves to the work of exhuming bodies and placing them in regularized cemeteries. That duty fell largely to the soldiers who came over to Great Britain under the Military Service Act. It is greatly to their credit that they were willing to do this work and that they have done it faithfully and well. About the time I visited France the intention was to relieve these men of the work, and call for volunteers to take their places from the soldiers who were in England and had come over under the Military Service Act, promising them that they would not be detained any longer on account of this work, and that they would be demobilized when their turn came and their time would be occupied while they were awaiting demobilization. I have since been told that the thousand men that were asked for readily came forward and have since been sent over to France and are carrying out this duty. A great many of the cemeteries which I have visited were in excellent condition; others were not in such a good state. I fancy that after the soldiers have all returned from France it will be necessary, in some way or other, to employ civilian labour to assist in carrying on this work.

As any one who has studied the question at all will realize, the disposition of the property and equipment belonging to the Canadian Government was one of considerable concern to myself and to the members of the staff in England. In time of war, and when the fighting has ceased, especially in the case of this particular war, considerable quantities of stores are piled up, and when hostilities are at an end they are of very little value indeed. They are in such tremendous quantities that they constitute a burden; there is no place in which to store them and if they are left out in the open they rust and decay. We had to take this question up and see what was the best thing to do under all the circumstances.

In the first place we had a considerable surplus of ordnance stores—clothing, equipment, and all the articles that the soldier uses and wears, and that are necessary to the carrying on of war—which run into thousands of different things. About the month of July last, or at any rate several months before the signing of the armistice, I felt that the time must come when we would have to face this question, and the Government would be under considerable loss unless some system for the disposition of these stores was organized. Therefore, I communicated with the Secretary of State for War with respect to it. We had, for instance in connection with ordnance stores, in England a corps of about six hundred men to attend to these stores. I asked the Secretary of State for War if the Imperial authorities would take these stores over and allow us the value. Then we would draw our supplies from the Imperial ordnance stores, and release the six hundred men referred to for other duties, or release them altogether. After considerable negotiations the proposition was assented to, valuators were put on the work, and stock was taken. When the armistice was signed on November 11th last, the transaction had been practically completed and a good deal of work had been done upon it. It was not, however, altogether closed, and it looked to me at one time as though the situation would take on a different aspect. However, as we were dealing with the Imperial Government, and as negotiations had so far advanced and so much work had been done, they took over our ordnance stores in England amounting in value to several million dollars, and allowed us one hundred cents on the dollar for them, with the exception of a few things which had deteriorated, and which we valued at from fifty to eighty-eight or ninety cents on the dollar. Accordingly that amount of money will be on credit with the Imperial Government to us against any in-

debtedness, or we will get the cash for the articles, in accordance with whatever adjustment may be made.

Mr. McKENZIE: When the minister speaks of being allowed one hundred cents on the dollar, does he mean the valuation that the appraisers made of the stores, or the cost of them to the Dominion Government?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I mean the value if we bought the stores from the Imperial ordnance stores of Great Britain; the figure they would charge us when we needed such stores; the price which they had fixed by valuation.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am afraid the minister did not understand my question. In stating that he obtained a valuation of one hundred cents on the dollar, does he mean the value of the stores he had on hand, based upon what those stores cost the Dominion Government, or the appraisement put upon them by the officials of the Imperial Government?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I am under the impression that the appraisement was based upon the cost to the Imperial Government of similar stores which might have been in some cases more, and in other cases less, than the stores had cost us.

Another problem which confronted us was the disposition of twenty-four thousand horses and mules which were in France and Belgium on service with the different units. As there were a great many such animals in the British army, and in all the other armies, there was a surplus of horses and mules which were not needed, and to have brought them back to Canada would have cost double what the animals were worth. We were therefore asked to pool all our horses and mules in France and Belgium with the British authorities and take our chance as to what we could get from the disposal of them. The cost of keeping a horse at the time, owing to the scarcity of fodder, was about a dollar and a quarter a day, so that hon. gentlemen will see that it was not a matter which could be allowed to drag along for any very great length. In addition, there were seventy-two officers and seven hundred and fifty-six other ranks looking after these horses and mules. In addition there were twelve hundred and fifty sick horses in hospital, needing the services of four hundred and sixty-seven men of other ranks. Accordingly we entered into negotiations with the Government of Belgium for the sale of these horses and mules, and after considerable negotiation we closed with the Belgian Government for the sale of the animals at £40, or roughly speaking, $200 per head. There were a few very excellent animals among the horses, and a great many of the others were not in first class condition; and certainly the mules were not quite as valuable as the best, or even as valuable as some of the remaining horses. Although we had some difficulty in getting the matter finally settled up, I am glad to say we received receipts for all the horses before I left, which receipts are now in the safety deposit vaults of the Bank of Montreal in London.

Mr. POWER: How is the purchase money being paid?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: We are taking the debentures of the Belgian Government at five per cent interest. The debentures are due in ten years, but the Belgian Government has the right to liquidate at any time within that period if it so desires.

There is another question in connection with the matter of equipment, and it relates to property in France. We had accumulated a tremendous amount of property in France in the way of transport, transport vehicles, field guns, and everything that goes to equip an army.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Rails?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Rails are not included in these stores. They were supplied by the British field authorities.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understood that rails were also supplied by the Canadian Government.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I remember the debates in this House on that question. I should imagine that those rails were sold to the Imperial Government. But that is not a matter that came to my attention at all. How to deal with the enormous equipment was a very difficult problem, because, as I have said, we had no place to store it. Therefore we entered into an arrangement with the Imperial authorities whereby they took over all this material from us, and we delivered it to them in France and Belgium at specified points. Some of this material we require in Canada. We have the privilege of drawing from Imperial stores in England material of a similar quality to that delivered in France as soon as we asertain what we require here and can find transportation for it from Great Britain.

Mr. MURPHY: When such sales or purchases are made as the hon. gentleman has indicated, where are the accounts kept; in

England or in Canada? And if any money passes, who is the custodian of it?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: General Ross, the Paymaster General in England, takes charge of the finances. The money passes direct from Government to Government.

Mr. POWER: In connection with the taking over of these stores by the Imperial authorities, is any rental being paid to the Canadian Government for the use of rails or for any other equipment that is now in the possession of the Imperial Government?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: As I explained a moment ago, the question of rails is one that did not come under my notice at all. These transactions are direct between the British Government and the Canadian Government.

Mr. POWER: Is any rental paid for any other equipment which is now in the possession of the Imperial Government awaiting decision of this Government as to its disposal?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It is stored in British Government buildings. We are not paying any rental.

Mr. POWER: Are the Imperial authorities making any use of it?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No. The equipment comprises guns and equipment for the most part—not material that is useful in peace times.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What share have we of the war trophies?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I will come to that in a moment. It will be interesting to the members of this House—although a great many of them already are aware of it—to know that all the mail for our soldiers both in England and France was handled by the Canadian postal corps. That mail was handled by them first in London, and then sent to the Canadian forces in France and in England and distributed by other branches of the corps there. In 1918 it is estimated that the number of letters handled by the corps was 68,174,000; newspapers, 10,226,100; parcels, 5,332,670; registered letters and parcels, 433,600—making the stupendous total of 85,166,370 pieces of mail.

I will take up now the question of war trophies about which my hon. friend asked me. That is a matter of considerable importance, and the document which I have in my hand contains a little later information than that in the report which I laid upon the table of the House. I will take the liberty of reading this memorandum which is signed by Colonel Folger, who has the responsibility in connection with securing war trophies for Canada:

Memorandum on War Trophies

(1) On the 5th July, 1917, the Colonial Secretary informed the Governor General of Canada that it had been decided to allocate Trophies captured by the Dominion Troops to the Dominion concerned.

(2) It was also laid down that the Trophies would become the property of the Dominion Government and allocation of these Trophies would rest with them and not with the Military Authorities.

(3) The Imperial War Trophies Committee was formed to control all War Trophies, and, on the 11th July, 1917, Sir George Perley, Acting Minister, appointed Colonel Folger as the Canadian representative on this Imperial Committee.

(4) Canadian War Trophies may be classified under three heads:—

(a) Guns, Machine Guns, Tanks, etc., which are actually captured and labelled by individual Units.

(b) Smaller articles of interest to War Museums such as German equipment, armour, shells, shell cases, munitions, etc.

(c) War aeroplanes and aeronautical equipment.

(5) Trophies captured by individual Units are labelled by these Units and turned in to the Imperial Ordnance Department in the field. These are eventually transferred to the Imperial Ordnance Depot at Croydon, where the claims of Units are investigated and, on such claims being substantiated, the Trophies become available for shipment to Canada.

(6) Trophies classified under sub-head (b) are those which are collected by the Salvage Corps and troops generally and by the Canadian Inspector of War Trophies in the Field.

(7) Trophies under sub-head (c) are those which have been obtained by application from the Air Ministry.

(8) Trophies under sub-head (a), claims for which have been substantiated are shipped to Canada as shipping becomes available, and, up to the present, the following have been forwarded:—

	Field Guns.	Trench Mortars.	Machine Guns.	Misc.
August, 1917. ..	7	6	6	67
Oct., 1917	3	6	6	63
Feb., 1918.. ..	—	—	—	6
June, 1918.. ..	6	7	20	124
Sept., 1918.. ..	—	—	141	270
Jan., 1919.. ..	5	—	75	99
March, 1919.. ..	21	—	—	—
April, 1919.. ..	65	—	—	—
	107	19	248	629

(9) Trophies under sub-head (b) are being sorted in this country—meaning England of course—at the present time and have yet to be packed and shipped.

(10) Trophies under sub-head (c) are being prepared for shipment and will consist of approximately 40 German aeroplanes with a considerable quantity of component parts. In addition, the Italian and French Governments

have been asked for donations of aeronautical equipment.

(11) The Canadian Inspector of War Trophies has collected a large number of smaller articles of interest to a Canadian War Museum, which have been taken from the battle fields where the Canadians have fought. These consist of trench signs, buried machine guns, field telephones, searchlights, rifles, etc.

(12) A special allotment of 5,000 German rifles and bayonets has also been made to Canada as well as 5,000 empty brass shell cases of various sizes.

(13) A large assortment has also been obtained from the Ministry of Munitions of Shells, Fuses, Grenades, etc., which will show the progress made in munitions, inventions, etc., during the war. These are also useful for instructional purposes.

(14) A varied collection of German proclamations, posters, propaganda literature, flags, German uniforms, decorations, etc., has also been collected.

(15) The total of the above results in a very large collection which will require a large building to accommodate them satisfactorily. Arrangements should be made in Canada for the housing of these articles before shipment from this side and some definite organization appointed for the handling of these articles. When all these trophy collections are gathered together, Canada will have a display which will be second to none in the British Empire.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend any suggestion to offer as to the location of those trophies?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: An organization, headed by Dr. Doughty of the Archives, has been formed here for the purpose.

Mr. GRIESBACH: Will all war trophies captured by our forces become the property of the Canadian Government?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: That is the intention.

Mr. GRIESBACH: What will the trophies amount to in round numbers, that is, field guns, trench mortars and machine guns?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I have here only a statement of those trophies which have already been shipped to Canada; others are in process of being removed from France to England, and they have not all been received in England yet; but in a very short time we will know exactly what we have got.

Early in 1918 the British authorities requested that the organization of the Canadian corps be somewhat changed. Owing to casualties, the British army had been so reduced in numbers that they had either to cut down the number of men in a division or reduce the number of infantry brigades in a division. They decided to reduce the number of infantry brigades in a division. That was done I believe in the German army as well as in the British. We were asked to do likewise, but after giving the matter very careful consideration it was thought desirable not to agree to the proposal, but to maintain our organization of four divisions, three brigades to a division, and four battalions to a brigade. The idea was to break the Canadian corps up into six small divisions instead of four large, strong divisions. It was thought that the Canadian corps had rendered such splendid service under its existing organization that it would be a great mistake to accede to the request of the Imperial authorities. It was thought better to try to strengthen the corps, if possible, in other ways. The adding of 100 infantrymen to each of the 48 battalions was one method we adopted for strengthening the Canadian corps. We strengthened it also by the introduction of many other units for which there was no corresponding unit in the British army. Besides the disadvantage of the effect upon the morale of the Canadian corps which would be brought about by such a change as was suggested, the expense would have been tremendous.

Mr. POWER: Were our four divisions equivalent in rifle power to six British divisions?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I think so, quite, at that time. The change would have necessitated six new brigade staffs, two new divisional staffs, one additional corps staff and possibly something in the nature of an army staff to direct the two corps, all of which would have involved great expense and a heavy drain upon the available supply of trained staff officers. So that we decided to keep the corps as it was and strengthen it as I have explained. We have since had no reason to regret having adopted that course.

Another thing we always aimed at was to keep the Canadian corps together. It required a good deal of negotiating at times to prevent one or more divisions from being taken out of the corps and placed in some other part of the line. I frequently approached the War Office and the Secretary of State for War on this subject; on more than one occasion I spoke to Sir Douglas Haig about it. I had the pleasure and the honour of speaking to Marshal Foch with regard to it, at a time when he was anxious for reinforcements. I told him that if he wanted reinforcements from Canada he should not break up the Canadian corps and in a case of emergency place a division twenty, forty, fifty or a hundred miles

away from the corps. I assured him that the best results would be obtained if the Canadian corps was kept intact. Through the representations of General Currie and his officers to general headquarters, supplemented by anything we could do in England, we managed to keep the corps pretty well together, except on that occasion when the Second Division had to go down the line and was kept away longer than we desired.

Mr. GRIESBACH: The action of the British authorities in moving a division about arose out of their policy of regarding the division as the unit of manoeuvre; it was not through any desire to move the Canadians about improperly. In the Canadian corps, however, it was dsired to keep the four divisions together under the corps.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Whatever the reasons may have been; whatever the conditions were from their standpoint, we always took the ground that it was desirable to keep the Canadian corps intact, not to move one division after the other away from time to time.

The Canadian Cavalry Brigade, which brought such credit to Canada, did not come under General Currie or the corps; it was a separate organization and operated with the British cavalry in France. General J. E. B. Seely, a very distinguished officer, a member of the British Parliament, and formerly Secretary of State for War was the first commander of the Canadian Cavalry Brigade. But the time came when we embarked upon the same policy with regard to the Cavalry Brigade as we had adopted with regard to all other establishments and units—that of placing a Canadian officer in charge as soon as a competent one was available. In this case the command was given to Brigadier General R. W. Paterson, D.S.O., of the Fort Garry Horse. The Canadian Cavalry Brigade was composed of the Royal Canadian Dragoons, Lord Strathcona's Horse, Fort Garry Horse, Royal Canadian Horse Artillery, Machine-gun Squadron, Cavalry Field Ambulance and Mobile Veterinary Section.

I would like to say this with regard to General Seely. His services were greatly appreciated; his record was one of great credit to him in connection with the Canadian Cavalry Brigade. The reason why General Paterson was made commander of the brigade was because it was our policy to place Canadian officers in charge of such units in all cases where they were available.

[Sir Edward Kemp.]

I should like to say a word with regard to the air force. More than eight thousand Canadians have held commissions in the Imperial Air Force. As the burden of the fighting and the danger falls almost entirely on officers, this is a record of which Canada may well be proud.

Mr. McMASTER: How many were in the Imperial Air Force altogether, and what proportion were Canadians?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I have not the figures at hand, but we could secure them. The question of what the proportion was has always interested me. At one time I was under the impression from figures which I received that about thirty per cent of the officers in the Imperial Air Service were Canadians. I am still under the impression that the percentage was at least quite twenty-five per cent; it may have been fully thirty per cent. As soon as it was possible for me to take the question up I discovered that it was desirable that we should have some better control of the record of these Canadians in the Royal Air Force and in the Royal Naval Air Service. I negotiated with Lord Weir, Minister of the Air Service, and we succeeded in obtaining important concessions with regard to records. The Canadian officers in the Royal Air Service are classified as follows:

1. Officers seconded or attached to the R.F.C., R.N.A.S., and R.A.F. up to December 31, 1918..	1,239
2. Other ranks of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada transferred to the above from June 1, 1916 to December 31, 1918..	2,721
3. Cadets enlisted in Canada by the Imperial Authorities and despatched to the above Services..	4,280
Total..	8,240

These were transferred to or enlisted direct by the British authorities in the Royal Air Force.

I might, perhaps, say just a word as to the repatriation of these young men. Those that were seconded from us to the Royal Air Force came back to us and were repatriated with our forces. The young men enlisted in Canada in the Royal Air Force, and also a certain number who were transferred outright to the British authorities, did not come back to our forces, and they are the young men who, it has been stated in the press, have not been able to get steamer accommodation to return to Canada. It is the responsibility of the Imperial Government to repatriate these officers. However, we did all we could to get steamer accommodation for them, but when

50,000 of our own troops are being returned monthly, it is impossible to accommodate everybody and somebody has to wait. We have been able to transport 1,000 of them to Canada recently, but I should not like to say that that does not mean that some of our troops have been held back a little.

Mr. POWER: By whom were these officers paid?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Officers who were enlisted in Canada by the British authorities and officers transferred outright by us were paid by the British, but officers, seconded by us to the British were paid by Canada.

Mr. POWER: Does that include flying pay?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It includes everything.

Mr. POWER: We pay the full pay?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: We pay the full pay if they are seconded by us. We finally succeeded in getting the British Minister of Air to furnish us with the following information regarding Canadians in the Royal Air Force:

1. The Royal Air Force agreed to furnish the minister with a nominal roll of Canadians in the Royal Air Force, and to advise him from time to time of all accretions to and deductions from it.

2. All Canadians in the Royal Air Force were to be permitted to wear a Canadian badge either on their shoulder straps or on their sleeve.

3. It was agreed to give Canadians representation on the Royal Air Force Headquarters and Staff.

4. A monthly statement of the exploits of Canadian airmen was to be furnished to the minister, with a view to its dissemination to the Canadian public.

5. It was agreed in principle that Canada should have a Flying Corps of her own, which, while distinct in its organization and administration, would form part of the Royal Air Force for the purpose of operations in the field.

I should now like to take up for a moment the matter of the Canadian Air Force. It was found there was a great desire on the part of the people of this country and of some of the officers themselves in our forces overseas that we should have a distinct air force and it was felt that we should eventually have a nucleus for an air force, more particularly in view of the future development of this branch of the service, not only in a military, but in a commercial sense. We negotiated on this point with the British authorities, and it was very difficult to work out a plan whereby, if we organized a Canadian force, it could operate in connection with the Royal
5 p.m. Air Force at the front. After a good deal of negotiation, however, it was arranged that we were to have an air force of our own, but the men did not have time to become thoroughly trained organized and equipped before the 11th of November. There are, in England two squadrons of the Canadian Air Force, these squadrons being formed in accordance with this memorandum:

1. That the formation of two Canadian Air Squadrons should be proceeded with forthwith.

2. That these squadrons should be organized in England by the Overseas Military Forces of Canada in conjunction with the Royal Air Force.

3. That the type of Unit and equipment should be decided by the Air Council.

The fourth item is quite a long memorandum which I shall not attempt to read, but it deals with the way in which we should get the personnel. I feel very strongly upon the desirability of, at any rate for a time, retaining intact these two flying squadrons in the service of Canada. Canadians have shown themselves adaptable for this particular branch of the service; to use a commonplace expression, they have taken to it as a duck takes to water. They have made a great record in France, and it would be a pity if we did not do what other nations are doing in connection with a Flying Branch of the Military service, not only with respect to military operations which might be considered a secondary matter, but with respect to commercial air flying in the future. In view of all these considerations and also the pride our Canadians have taken in flying, and their splendid deeds, it would be a great pity if, when these men return to Canada, they should be just demobilized and sent to the four corners of the country, without our having a nucleus for a flying corps. I hope this matter will be taken into careful consideration and that something will be done in this regard.

We have quite a nucleus for an air force. Nineteen of the latest and best air machines were presented to us by the British people, sixteen through the Overseas Club and three through the Imperial Air Fleet. In addition to that we expect to get from the British Government ninety-two aircraft, made up as follows:

30 only Avro two-seater biplanes.
12 only single-seater-camels (Scout fighters).
50 only two-seater D.H. 9. Day Bombing Machines.

92

This is a gift from the British Government whenever we wish to accept it, and, in fact, I understand it has already been accepted. There are many other aircraft

which are available for Canada. Of captured enemy aircraft there are 21 Fokkers, 39 various other enemy aircraft and 5 Gothas, which, including the nineteen to which I referred to before, make 84. Then we have an expectation of getting 14 machines from the French Government, 16 from the Italian Government and 24 from the British Government and, I believe, there are already in Canada 50 Curtis machines from the British Government. Therefore, I sincerely trust that all this equipment and the training of our airmen will be made use of, not only in a military but in a commercial sense.

Mr. NICKLE: Has the minister given any consideration to the lines along which this air force will be developed, whether it is to be an independent force or is to carry out work in conjunction with the military and naval branches of the service?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I cannot say as to that, as my work has been in England. Perhaps the Minister of Militia might be able to give my hon. friend some information on that point.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I noticed in the Montreal papers last night that a German submarine had reached Montreal on its way to the Great Lakes, having been handed over by Germany to the British authorities and by the British authorities to the United States Government. It has created a great deal of interest amongst the people of Montreal, and no doubt it will be exhibited in the different towns and cities on the Great lakes. Is Canada to be honoured in this way?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: My duties did not extend to the naval forces. I would say, however, that as this submarine must pass through Canadian waters, there should be no difficulty in having her visit cities on the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes.

Mr. MARCIL: Does not the minister think Canada should be presented with a gift of this kind?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: If my hon. friend would put that question to the Prime Minister, who has been to the Peace Conference, he would no doubt be able to answer more definitely than I can as to what is going to be done with the German warships and submarines which are now in British ports.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Mother Country received so many of these vessels on one day last Fall, that I think she might give some to the colonies.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Would my hon. friend be in favour of receiving them on condition that they become a part of the Canadian navy?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I stand for the Canadian navy still, and I believe one, if not two, of the minister's colleagues do. Can the minister tell us how many Canadians were enlisted in the British navy during the war?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I have not the figures for the naval forces. The work of the Canadian railway troops should not be overlooked. In 1915 the Canadian Pacific railway organized, at the request of the Department of Militia and Defence, over which my hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) then presided, the Canadian Overseas Railway Construction Corps, composed of 500 picked men of the construction forces of the Canadian Pacific railway. This corps proceeded to France in August, 1915. In May, 1916, the War Office asked the Dominion to furnish another unit, approximately 1,000 strong, for railway construction work. This unit was organized by Lieut.-Col. J. W. Stewart, who afterwards became Major-General J. W. Stewart, C.B., C.M.G.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that Mr. Stewart, of Montreal?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No, Mr. Stewart, of Vancouver, who is well known in Canada as a railway contractor.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They say he did excellent work.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Through the methods he introduced in France he rendered very great service, and he doubtless helped to bring the war to an earlier conclusion. In the summer of 1918, after occupying the position of Deputy Director of Light Railways, as well as being in immediate command of Canadian Railway Construction battalions, Major-General Stewart was appointed Director of Construction, his duties embracing all construction of a railway engineering character in the zone of the British armies. The following table shows the comparative strength of the Imperial and Canadian Railway Construction Forces on the western front as at the dates given:

Date.	Nominal Strength Imperial Railway Construction Troops.	Nominal Strength Canadian Railway Construction Troops.
Dec. 31, 1915	2,440	512
Dec. 31, 1916	4,900	1,617
Jan. 30. 1917	7,340	11,562
Dec. 31, 1917	7,340	13,772
Nov. 11, 1918	7,340	14,877

The control of all the railway construction operations in France was largely in the

hands of Major General J. W. Stewart. In addition to the railway troops I have mentioned, there were four Canadian Railway Troops Operating Companies, with a strength of 1,087 on November 11, 1918. The total strength of Canadian railway troops in England when the armistice was signed was 3,364. During their career at the front the personnel of the Corps of Canadian Railway Troops were awarded 489 honours and decorations.

Mr. PEDLOW: Did the minister keep a record of the men who returned during the fall of 1917 to engage in the elections in Canada?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I did not happen to be minister at that time.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would not a record be kept of these men?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I could not say offhand.

Mr. PEDLOW: The figures are not embodied in this report?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No. The record of the Canadian Forestry Corps is one we have every reason to be proud of. Their service has been very highly appreciated and favourably commented upon by the Imperial authorities, including the Secretary of State for War.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understood the minister to say that he was overseas from 1914 onwards.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: My hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) was Minister of Militia at that time. Later Sir George Perley was the Minister of Militia Overseas. I went over late in 1917, just before the election.

Mr. PEDLOW: The reason why—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Hon. members seem to overlook the fact that the House is not in committee. There has been a series of questions and interruptions which were certainly out of order, and I must ask hon. members to refrain from further interruptions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a friendly chat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Friendly chats across the floor are absolutely out of order.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I endorse your ruling, Sir, most heartily. I was going on to say that the Canadian Forestry Corps under the command of Maj.-General Alex. McDougall, C. B., deserves very great credit, indeed, for the splendid service it has rendered. The time at my disposal does not permit me to make as lengthy remarks on these organizations as I should like, but I wish to give these figures On November 11, 1918, the total strength of the Canadian Forestry Corps in France, including prisoners of war attached to units, was 18,240.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Prisoners of war attached to Canadian units?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: We had thirteen companies of prisoners of war, totalling 5,021 men, attached to the Forestry Corps in France when the armistice was signed. In the British Isles at the same date the strength oi the Forestry Corps, including 1,265 prisoners and 1,182 other attached men, was 13,207. The grand total in France and the British Isles of the Canadian Forestry Corps when the armistice was signed was 31,447.

The Forestry Corps saved the situation to a great extent in regard to shipping. Lumber is a very bulky freight and through the efforts of the Canadians, who understood forestry work and knew how to attain the best results, an entirely new situation was brought about. In 1913 Britain imported 11,600,000 tons of timber and lumber. This was reduced in 1916 to 6,000,000 tons, in 1917 to 2,775,000 tons, and in 1918 to 2,000,000 tons. So that the difference between 11,600,000 tons in 1913 and 2,000,000 tons in 1918 is almost entirely due to the work of the Canadian Forestry Corps who supplied the difference from home-grown timber. If they had not been as enthusiastic as they were, besides being capable and efficient, that much more shipping would have had to be engaged in the carrying of timber and lumber instead of being released for the transfer of foodstuffs, etc. As my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Griesbach) will no doubt tell you, a great amount of timber is necessary in connection with trench work and for many other purposes. The hon. gentleman knows more about this than I do, but I may say that it was through the efforts of the Canadian Forestry Corps that this situation, of which we have reason to be proud, was met.

Mr. POWER: Did the sawmill machinery, etc., belong to the Imperial Government or to the Canadian Government?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The Imperial Government. Now, I shall turn to the Canadian Army Medical Corps, which arose out of a permanent organization in Canada. In June, 1915, it had a bed capacity of 3,000 and in November, 1918, a capacity of 40,000. Our medical service in England and

France was of greater capacity than the British medical service at the time of the South African War, and the great efficiency which this service attained was owing to a very considerable extent—and we need have no hesitation in giving full credit to those to whom it is due—to the services of Canadian civilian doctors, the best of whom sacrificed their practices and went overseas to render splendid service for Canada. I suppose we scarcely realize how much the doctors sacrificed. I sometimes argue with other professional men on the question of sacrifices in the war, and while I do not want to draw comparisons here, I think that a doctor of middle age makes a great sacrifice who turns the key in his door and leaves for England and France. He knows that from that time his income stops, and the results are not quite the same as in the case of a man of another calling who may have a partner or any one to assist him. I consider that the medical profession of Canada made great sacrifices for the work they did in the war, and it was through their splendid service that we accomplished such great results overseas. In order to put this matter fairly before the House, I desire to read a short extract from the report I laid on the Table in regard to the work of the doctors. What I shall read epitomizes the situation.

> Just as there is "the man behind the gun," so there is the doctor and the man behind the lancet, and the nursing sister and the true Canadian woman behind the grim paraphernalia of her office. And great have been the souls and stout the hearts and deft the hands, not merely of the doctors and the nursing sisters, but all those "other ranks" who give the great machine of healing its life and its humanity. Unflinching in danger, resolute in duty, unremitting even in the drudgery of their voluntary crusade against disease and death—to these devoted men and women go but the thanks of scores of thousands of Canadian soldiers, and the heartfelt gratitude of hundreds of thousands who loved the men maimed in the defence of Canada upon the fields of Flanders and of France.

So much for the doctors.

Just a word for the nursing sisters of Canada. Those of us who watched the great service they performed cannot fail to appreciate it at its full value, and in connection with the nursing sisters, whenever one talks of or refers to them in any way, one's mind irresistibly goes to the three frightful outrages perpetrated on them—the bombing of the Canadian hospitals at Etaples and Doullens, and the sinking of the Canadian hospital ship Llandovery. Castle The Germans made no mistake in regard to the bombing of the hospital at Doullens and Etaples, the former was isolated from any military camp; they sent their flares down and saw the great red cross; and numbers of the nursing sisters as well as the doctors and patients at the hospitals were wantonly murdered Nothing that I can say would adequately express my outraged feelings on this subject, and I am sure that every hon. member feels the same sense of indignation. In the sinking of the Llandovery Castle fourteen Canadian Nursing Sisters were sent to a watery grave in the depths of the sea 116 miles from land, and in trying to cover up the outrage the Germans endeavoured to sink the remaining life boat in order thereby to obliterate all traces.

I might refer to the splendid assistance rendered our hospitals by the municipal governments throughout Canada and many voluntary organizations, especially the Canadian Red Cross and the St. John's Ambulance Association, besides the universities of Canada which did such magnificent work in sustaining our hospitals. I might read a list of them.

McGill University—No. 3 Canadian General Hospital.
Toronto University—No. 4 Canadian General Hospital.
Laval University—No. 6 Canadian General Hospital.
Queen's University—No. 7 Canadian General Hospital.
Saskatchewan University—No. 8 Canadian General Hospital.
Dalhousie University—No. 7 Canadian Stationary Hospital.
St. Francis Xavier College—No. 9 Canadian Stationary Hospital.
The Western University—No. 10 Canadian Stationary Hospital

These universities have done nobly and have rendered tremendous assistance to the medical service.

Mr. NICKLE: Before the minister leaves the subject of the medical service, may I ask him a question? We have had some disquieting reports and rumours in reference to an alleged insufficiency of hospitalization in England, and it is said that Canadians in hospitals suffered through what I might call a lack of elasticity in the administration—a lack of sympathetic coordination between headquarters and the outside administration. Is there any justification for these reports?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I have not heard of such reports. May I ask the hon. member where he saw them?

Mr. NICKLE: Certain gentlemen returning to Canada made damaging and disquieting criticisms.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The administration of the Canadian Army Medical

Corps has from the first been as good as if not better than any other. Indeed, I think our hospitals on the whole have been better conducted than any others.

Mr. NICKLE: Then, we had an excellent medical service?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: There is no doubt about it in my mind. In every way it was the very best there was.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I should like to offer a correction in the information regarding Laval hospital. At page 396 of the Report it says:

No. 6 (Laval) Canadian General Hospital, Opened Troyes, January 23, 1917.

The unit of Laval started from Montreal in March 1916.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I am very glad the hon. member has made that correction and I shall have attention drawn to it. In further copies the necessary correction will be made.

In dentistry we also took a forward step, and in the two years, 1917 and 1918, the total number of dental operations performed in France and England by the Canadian Army Dental Corps was 2,255,442. As a result of this work a great many men were saved from being placed in lower categories and were made fit for A-1 service.

The chaplain services were of very great importance in the army. The Canadian chaplains rendered splendid service under the director, Colonel J. M. Almond, C.M.G. We had in all 280 chaplains and the following statistics in regard to them may prove of interest:

426 Chaplains have served with the Overseas Military Forces of Canada.
2 have been killed in action.
1 died of wounds.
1 died while serving on Hospital ship.
2 died of sickness.
21 chaplains have been wounded while discharging their duties at the front.
20 chaplains were usually selected to accompany the troops into action.

There are services which the chaplains perform on the battlefield to those that are dying and to the sick and the wounded, which I need not describe, because nearly every one is conversant with them.

I would like also to refer to the work of the Army Pay Corps. Earlier this afternoon some hon. gentlemen asked what duties the Army Pay Corps performed, and I would like now to give that explanation.

Broadly speaking, the Canadian Army Pay Corps performs three cardinal functions:—
(1) The paying of all debts incurred by the Canadian Government with contractors, with Imperial and other Dominion Governments, etc.
(2) The making of all payments to the troops of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada and their dependents.
(3) The adjustment of reciprocal accounts between the Imperial and other Governments, and the maintaining of records and statistics in reference thereto.

Now as to the Record Office. There is a Record Office in England whose duties are as follows:

Soldiers' Documents.—The collection, custody, verification and distribution of soldiers' documents involving:—
(a) Collection and checking of documents of Drafts arriving from Canada.
(b) Collection and forwarding to France of documents of Drafts proceeding to France, and receiving and distributing documents of men evacuated from France.
(c) Checking Casualty Forms of Drafts proceeding to France.
(d) Custody of various documents during the whole period a soldier is on the strength of Overseas Military Forces of Canada, and custody of his documents while he is in France or in Hospital in England.

Casualties.—The reporting of Casualties and tracing movements while in Hospital. Under this head are comprised:—
(a) The compilation, after verification, of Daily Casualty Lists from reports received both from France and from the different centres in England. This includes the reporting of transfers of Casualties from one Hospital to another.
(b) Notification of the next-of-kin when resident in England.
(c) In case of death in England or France registering the location of the grave, and obtaining details of the circumstances of death.
(d) Making enquiries for a period of six months in respect to men reported "Missing."
(e) Compiling and distributing lists of men invalided to Canada and returned to Canada.

Mr. POWER:—Would the minister be kind enough to tell me whether it was at his request that after the armistice Lieutenant Colonel Piché of Montreal was transferred to the Record Office in London?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The officer referred to was sent over to London by the Minister of Militia.

Mr. POWER: Was it impossible to find competent officers in England to do that work?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The Minister of Militia informs me that that question has already been answered by him in the House.

The Director of Military Estates is Colonel Robertson, and this office has handled the wills of 300,000 soldiers during the war.

When I reached England I organized an Overseas Purchasing Commission, some-

what upon the lines of the Purchasing Commission in Ottawa. Although not very much purchasing was needed in England I thought it was better to organize a commission for the purpose, and the members of it were officers in connection with our forces who were conversant with business conditions, and purchases were made by tender. Most of such purchases were from the Imperial Government, so the commission over there had not such heavy work to do as the Purchasing Commission in Ottawa.

I would like to refer for a moment to the Canadian War Records. We have a War Record Office, of which Lord Beaverbrook has had charge, which has recorded the history of the war since its outbreak. I think that owing to the efforts of Lord Beaverbrook we have the finest collection of historical documents, war paintings and photographs of any of the Allied nations, and the collection has been made at very little cost to Canada, the only expense incurred having been in connection with the payment of a few officers and O. R's., who assisted in placing these paintings and photographs on exhibition and in assisting in the work at different points. The paintings and photographs have been exhibited in London, and a prominent point in connection therewith is that the proceeds have gone towards defraying the expenses of painting the pictures. We have had the services of the best artists in connection with this work.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many paintings are there?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: There is a catalogue of them, but I could not give the number of paintings offhand. At the Royal Academy a large extent of the wall space was taken up with Canada's war pictures, which formed a considerable part of the total exhibit. Besides that, we have a number of enlarged photographs which have been on exhibition not only in England, but in France and in the United States.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the minister mean to say that the cost of these paintings was defrayed by these exhibitions?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Yes, by the receipts from that and other sources; for instance, we had exhibits of cinematograph films. In addition to the paintings there are also the enlarged photographs and any one who is not a connoisseur of paintings might regard them as even greater works of art, although one would not feel safe in laying down any such canon as that. However, the photographs were very attractive and thousands and tens of thousands of persons viewed them at the recent exhibition in the Grafton Galleries, London. These photographs, as well as other evidences of Canadian activity at the front, have been displayed in France, the United States and England, and have served to advertise Canada to a remarkable degree.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the Canadian War Records Office kept any track of the monies that have been paid out?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The report for last year has already been tabled, as will be the next report as soon as it is ready.

Mr. MURPHY: The money in question was Canadian money, was it not?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No, the receipts came from persons who saw the pictures, and were not by any means all Canadians. The cinematograph films, for instance, were viewed by thousands of people in England, France and the United States. They proved a great advertisement for Canada, as showing our efforts in the war, and they have caused the American people to greatly admire us for what we have done. As I say, the proceeds went to defray the cost incurred in making the paintings and taking the photographs.

Mr. MURPHY: If they had not been used those proceeds would have been the money of the Dominion of Canada ?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: As to that, I do not know. I would not want to argue the matter with my hon. friend if he takes a view which differs from mine. Lord Beaverbrook put considerable energy into the matter and has secured a collection of which this country should be very proud. By and by these paintings and photographs will come to Ottawa and we will need a large building in which to store them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister has spoken about Canadian paintings. Would he kindly explain if the collection contains a painting representing a Canadian crucified by the Germans? The statement that there is such a painting has caused a lot of controversy in the press, and I would like the minister to give us the facts in that regard. If the statement is true, well and good, but if not it should not be allowed to remain uncontradicted.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I know to what my hon. friend refers, but it is not a picture. It is a statue cast in bronze about three

feet high and two feet wide, which has been enclosed in a frame.

I saw the representation to which my hon. friend refers. The Germans took exception to this picture or statue—I forget the text book name of it—and they sent out a wireless from Germany criticising the position we had taken in exhibiting the representation and denying that such a thing ever happened. This was noted in the press, and I gave instructions that every effort should be made to ascertain if what we had represented could be substantiated. We succeeded in getting affidavits of two soldiers who witnessed the scene, and we got on the track of others who it was thought had seen it. We secured two affidavits at any rate.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Were they positive?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: They were affidavits by soldiers who saw the actual scene. One wore the Victoria Cross, and the father of one of them was employed in a position of importance in London. So after that denial was made by the Germans we issued a counter statement containing the particulars we had at that time. I do not think there can be any doubt but that the Germans were guilty of this atrocity.

The Canadian War Records have also performed splendid services in issuing a little paper called the Daily Record to the troops. No doubt you have all heard of it. It contained news items from Canada and was circulated daily.

The casualties in the war up to the 31st of March have been as follows:

Killed in action, 38,767; died of wounds, 12,355; died of other causes, 4,755; missing, 415; prisoners of war, 22.

Since the 31st of March I have ascertained that of those 22 prisoners of war all have been accounted for except 10. Those are the only cases we have been unable to trace of the very considerable number of Canadian prisoners of war in Germany.

I had an officer detailed for the purpose of taking down statements of Canadian prisoners of war on their arrival in England after being repatriated from Germany to find out whether the stories told about the cruelties practised by the Germans were correct. That officer and his assistants interviewed most of those repatriated prisoners, and in looking over a memorandum which came into my possession I took this extract of a statement by Captain Thomas:

The verbatim statements of these men show that hundreds of British prisoners—

He refers, it will be noticed, to British prisoners, not particularly to Canadian prisoners.

—were murdered deliberately and in cold blood in working behind the German lines in France —starved till they ate rats, cats, moles, putrid horse flesh, potato parings from garbage heaps —sent to hospital only when they were half dead. In one specific instance a Padre, a Canadian lad, whose statement I took, knows of 117 deaths out of 150 who were sent back to a parent camp by the Germans for their comrades to pull them through if they could.

We had in Germany something like 2,688 other ranks and 130 officers at the time of the armistice, and they have all been repatriated except the ten that we cannot find.

The Khaki University has done splendid service both in France and in England, and has helped many of our soldiers in their studies. I presume my hon. friends have heard all about that excellent work, so I will not attempt to take up the time of the House with a full description of the activities of that university.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many boys have availed themselves of the courses?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: For the month of December, 1918, there were from the 1st Division, 2,000 men; from the 2nd Division, 2,018 men; from the 3rd Division, 2,197; men; from the 4th Division, 2,137 men—making a grand total of 8,352 men who availed themselves of the courses in France. I need not go into the different branches of study. In England the attendance for the same month was 11,755. The total attendance at lectures from July to December, 1918, was 231,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Are those in charge civilians or soldiers?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: They are largely university professors of Canada who volunteered their services, and to enable them to go into the army we made them honorary officers for the time being.

Mr. MURPHY: Drawing the pay of their rank?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I do not think so. Most of the money for this work was raised by voluntary subscription in Canada. They have libraries and all sorts of educational equipment.

Mr. EULER: Were there any conditions placed upon the soldiers as to their entrance into this Khaki University?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Do you mean in regard to fees?

Mr. EULER: No, in regard to their educational qualifications.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I think they could take any courses they pleased. The rules were not very strict. I am under the impression that it would take that much time off their courses in similar studies when they returned to Canada.

Mr. EULER: Was it necessary that they should have been university students?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I do not think so. Although called university courses, I fancy some of the subjects were really elementary.

I scarcely feel like closing my observations without referring to the splendid work done by the Canadian Red Cross Society, the Canadian Military Y.M.C.A., and the non-military organizations which provided hospitality overseas. Those organizations were: The Canadian War Contingents Association, the Canadian Field Comforts Association, the Maple Leaf Clubs—these clubs in London furnished beds for our soldiers, who otherwise would have had to sleep on the streets, the accommodation being so scarce—the I.O.D.E. Clubs, the Canadian Officers' Club, the Royal Automobile Club, and the St. Dunstan's Hostel for Blind Soldiers. This last named organization owes its origin to Sir Arthur Pearson, who is himself blind. He has had about eighty Canadian blinded soldiers under his care. I visited the place some weeks ago, and although I often wonder what passes in the minds of the blind, to all appearances those men were quite happy. They were learning various trades. Sir Arthur Pearson himself is a wonderful man and has done splendid work for Canada in connection with St. Dunstan's Hostel.

In connection with demobilization, we have had some difficulties. While the men have been anxious to get back to Canada at the earliest possible moment, yet it has required numerous organizations to prepare and get them back. The staff requirements in all the camps, the cooks and clerks, absorb the activities of an army of men, and we have had very great difficulty naturally in persuading those men to sacrifice themselves for the benefit of others. We have had to appeal to them on patriotic grounds to do this work for their comrades, although they had just as great a right to get back as any one else. To the permanent cadres the thanks of this country are due for the splendid services they have performed in connection with the return of our soldiers to Canada.

When the armistice came we had 268,000 Canadians on our hands overseas. We realized at once that we had a difficult problem to deal with. Every one felt that the war was over, even though peace had not been signed. These men enlisted in Canada, and they had an objective—that of getting at the Hun and fighting him. They were full of enthusiasm, and they were easy to handle. Indeed, they have always been easy to handle, and they are easy to handle even to-day. But when the armistice came their objective was changed; their one desire was to get home as quickly as they could. Men who had been under restraint for long periods ranging up to four years, or even longer, and who had been subjected to conditions of privation, suffering and sacrifice, were tired and homesick, and we found it more difficult to handle these men after the signing of the armistice than up to that time. They were not inclined to inquire very carefully whether or not ships were available, or how many ships had been sunk by submarines, and so on; they wanted to get home, not next year, but next week. We had to get the machine reversed, so to speak. We had the machine working fairly smoothly, carrying troops to the German lines; now we had to see how best we could get them back to Canada. Had there been only 5,000 men to bring back, the problem would not have been difficult. But before I went on board ship on the other side I witnessed the magnificent spectacle of the march past in London of 12,000 Dominion troops, eight deep. It took this body of men an hour and-a-half to pass His Majesty the King; you can imagine what an army of 268,000 is. Well, we tried to do the best we could. Demobilization came upon us in the fall of the year, just before winter. I have heard that you had the mildest winter that Canada ever had, but the people of England, France and Belgium say that last winter was the most disagreeable they have ever known—much cold and wet, and a lack of sunshine. There would be periods of a month when you would not see the sun at all in England. We had these men to house and to take care of under these conditions. Moreover, a fuel famine came upon the country after the winter had set in, and we had to supply the men with extra blankets. However, I am glad to say that the repatriation of our men has proceeded very well.

Some months before the armistice was signed I organized a demobilization committee to consider how to work out this problem when peace came, and the work of

that committee was of great service when the armistice actually did come. The Prime Minister said this afternoon that some people thought it would take two years to get the soldiers back, having regard to the number of ships that were sunk by submarines and to the great demand for tonnage. I have heard people say that it would take three years to get our soldiers back, in view of all the circumstances. I am happy to be able to say that if peace is not signed pretty soon, all our soldiers will be back in Canada before peace is signed. There will be in England after the end of this month about 80,000 Canadians. Nearly all our troops are out of France. The troops that went to the Rhine returned to Belgium some time before they went back to England. My latest report, which is dated May 19, says that at that time there were 4,516 Canadian troops in France.

Mr. PEDLOW: Does that include Canadians in the Imperial Service in France?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Only those in our own forces. The 4,516 were made up as follows: Three hospitals, 1,000; details at Etaples and Rouen, 600; Infantry Works Companies, 1,300; burial party, 1,000; patients in hospital, 616. I should think that by this time most of them are in England.

We have moved from France to England since the armistice 140,000 troops. By the end of May we shall have embarked for Canada 185,216 troops. We expect that the 80,000 Canadians who will be in England at the end of May will almost all be returned to Canada by the end of July, though there will be a small remnant still to return after that date.

The matter of steamship accommodation has presented a very difficult problem. I speak with feeling on the subject, because I have had some very warm interviews with the Imperial authorities regarding it. The principle that had to be settled in respect to the transportation from England of Canadian troops was whether the Canadians should have priority over American troops, and if so, to what extent. The relations between Great Britain and the United States are very intimate, and it is desirable that they should be; but I found it necessary to establish the principle that Canadian troops should have priority over American troops, and I succeeded in having it established. We have in the service of Canada all the great Canadian liners as well as those plying on the North Atlantic whose home port on this side of the water is in the United States. Unless something goes wrong, we shall have brought back to Canada during the month of May 52,000 Canadian troops.

The Americans will, no doubt, bring back a good many during this month, but they will not be able to bring back, I am informed, more than 5,000 on British ships. I thought, perhaps, I could finish my remarks before six o'clock, but as I have still a few things to say which I think may interest the House, if the members will bear with me for a few minutes after eight o'clock, I will then conclude my observations.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Overseas Military Forces) (Resuming): When the House rose at six o'clock I was dealing with the question of demobilization so far as it affects the Canadian troops in England. I pointed out that although the weather conditions were unpleasant, the monotony of the troops was broken by diversions in the way of sports and education, and in other ways everything was done to help them pass the time as pleasantly and profitably as possible. The conduct of the Canadian soldiers during this very, very trying period has been excellent—better, I venture to say, than the conduct of any other of the British forces. If there have been slight lapses, as one might expect in such a large force, those lapses have been better advertised than similar occurrences on the part of any other of the British soldiers either in Great Britain or in France. To those of us who are conversant with the situation that has existed in France and England since the signing of the armistice, it has been amusing to read in the press of Great Britain and Canada some of the things which the Canadian soldier has been accused of. I repeat, I believe that the conduct of no other troops of the whole British Empire has been equal to that of the Canadian soldiers. I have no reason whatever to criticise the conduct of the vast majority of them. These men had been away from home for many years and were anxious to get back, and during the waiting time I think we might have expected some slight lapses, and possibly small disorders, occasionally to occur. These lapses, however, have not been any worse, in fact, nor so bad, as those that

occurred in other forces. I am not in a position to state all that is in my mind on this matter, because certain information and certain news items with respect to the conduct of other British forces have been withheld from the public, while the occurrences amongst the Canadian soldiers have been very broadly and widely circulated.

Probably hon. members have already been told by the Minister of Militia and Defence of the mode of demobilization. We have two systems, running along side by side, which makes the problem much more difficult than where there is but one system. That, however, has been unavoidable. First of all, the soldiers in Great Britain and France, outside of the Canadian Corps and the Canadian Cavalry Brigade—that is to say, Forestry Corps, Railway Troops and Lines of Communication Units—are being demobilized according to length of service, those with the longest service being demobilized first. They are taken from various camps according to their length of service, and sent to a camp which is divided into wings or areas corresponding to the different military districts in Canada. The men are sorted according to the dispersal areas at which they will be demobilized in Canada, and all their documents and records are prepared before embarkation, so that on arrival at the dispersal station in Canada they are ready for instant demobilization. The result is that when a man reaches the dispersal station in Canada nearest to his home or where he wants to go, he is at once discharged and returns to civil life.

The second system applies to troops included in the Canadian Corps and Canadian Cavalry Brigade whom it was found more advisable to deal with as units and who were accordingly demobilized and returned to Canada as far as possible in the units with which they fought at the front. Special sections of our camps in England were set apart for these Canadian Corps troops and the system of sorting out and documentation for them was, with certain modifications, the same as I have previously described.

I have referred at some length to the shipping situation. The disappointments and the difficulties of the shipping situation were very real and very trying. References have sometimes been made to the bunching of the ships in Halifax, and I have been asked why that has happened. The answer is very simple. We have to take the ships that are available and if, immediately after a ship has just sailed for Canada with four or five thousand troops on board, we are told that another ship is ready to sail which will cross the Atlantic at about the same speed, we cannot refuse that second ship or she would be used by the Americans. So for that reason the bunching of ships on this side of the Atlantic on occasions has been absolutely unavoidable. There is the further reason that the sailing of a ship is often delayed one or two days, and sometimes one or two weeks. I have known ocasions where we were advised that a ship would sail on a certain day, all the papers and records would be prepared for a certain number of men for that ship, and when they were about to embark on the train the day before the ship left, we would get word that the ship could not sail and she might be delayed for a week. Furthermore, ships nowadays are pretty well worn out, and often at the last moment they have to go into dry dock. There have also been a great many strikes at the docks in England. I was told by the captain of the ship I came over on this time that there are about six different organizations, a strike in any one of which would prevent the sailing of a ship.

The House can have some idea of the difficulty with which we had to contend when I say that the nominal roll for a ship carrying from three to five thousand troops involves a tremendous amount of work. I hold in my hand the copy of a nominal roll of a certain sailing,—a small one,—the number of troops being 460. One of my officers came into my office one day with a great pile of documents of this character, which contained the names of all the soldiers comprising that nominal roll. He said: "There are 460 names, and you can see what it would mean in the case of a ship carrying 5,000 troops, particularly when such a ship's sailing is cancelled; in such an event we have to take pen and ink or pencil and run a line through them and prepare the whole thing over again in order to make the roll for the sailing."

I have also referred briefly to the scarcity of ships, and in addition to what I said before recess, I would like to add this further fact: Canada is not the only country to which soldiers must be returned. There are Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, and there is a movement of troops from Egypt to India, and troops returning from Mesopotamia and Palestine and the Mediterranean, while to the United States vast numbers are coming back. In view of this, I think I might reasonably direct the attention of the House again to what has

been accomplished in the matter of repatriating the Canadian army, especially when one considers the scarcity of ships as a result of submarine warfare and the tremendous demand which exists for shipping at the present time. The programme outlined by the authorities in Canada in regard to the number of troops that could be repatriated contemplated 20,000 for December and January, 30,000 for February, March and April, 40,000 for the month of May, and 45,000 a month after May. I presume that it was considered that as December and January were winter months, and in view of the uncertainty as to the kind of winter we should have and the fear of a blockade of the railways by reason of snowstorms, it would not be safe to attempt to repatriate more than the number mentioned for these months. It was very easy to obtain ships at that time because other countries and the other dominions had not got as far advanced in the work of demobilization as we had. We carried out the programme for these two months, and in February 30,000 was the number fixed in the programme. We dispatched a considerable number of men in that month, but there was a falling off due chiefly to strikes and, to a limited extent, to the fact that we refused to take some ships to carry men considering they were not adequately equipped for the transportation of troops in winter on the North Atlantic owing to insufficiency of heating and lavatory accommodation and poor ventilation. We had to discard these ships, but the difference was made up. To stop 3,000 men from embarking on a ship interrupts the system, because the men were all moving towards the shipping ports; and sometimes it was necessary to stop the movement of troops as far back as Belgium to meet the situation caused by sudden shortage of shipping. In March, however, we caught up more than we had lost in February. We discovered that the authorities in Canada could take more than 30,000 a month and we sent about 42,000 to Canada in March. In April, there were again bad strikes in England and we fell short. But in the month of May we have more than made up the shortage by sending some 52,000. On the whole, therefore, we have lived up to the programme, and have exceeded it on the average. It was thought that troops could be repatriated rapidly by way of the St. Lawrence route after the opening of navigation, but as a result of careful examination of the matter we found that there were not vessels capable of navigating the St. Lawrence that would carry more than ten to fifteen thousand troops into the St. Lawrence ports. After taking into consideration "military dependents"—the wives and children of soldiers—and a certain proportion of civilian passengers, we could not get into the St. Lawrence more than ten or fifteen thousand troops a month. Repatriation would therefore chiefly take place, even in summer, by way of Halifax, because that port can take in vessels capable of carrying large numbers. In addition to this, these vessels that come to Halifax go on to New York for cargoes and there take passengers back to England. I would call attention to a certain press notice which will throw some light on the careful manner in which we have endeavoured to guard the interests of our soldiers in connection with repatriation, and the fact that we have tried to give them satisfactory sleeping accommodation on board ship, proper meals, etc. The press despatch to which I refer reads:

> One of ten troopships due yesterday with more than 26,000 returning American soldiers, the Leviathan had a total of 14,416 souls aboard when she made her pier at Hoboken. Of these 12,274 were troops.
>
> The rest were officers and members of the crew.
>
> In order to accommodate this unprecedented number of passengers, the troops aboard received only two meals a day, but there were no complaints.

Now, we have not deemed it wise to crowd men into ships to the same extent as some of the Allies have done in connection with repatriation. We do not put the same number of troops on ships as others do. I presume the extract I have just read is a correct account of what took place with reference to the Vaterland, now called the Leviathan, one of the largest of the former German ships. It will be seen the men on board this ship had only two meals a day because there were no facilities for providing more; and I can say more than is contained in this article. Some of the soldiers of some of the Allies have slept in eight-hour shifts on board ship because of lack of sleeping accommodation. On the other hand, so far as the Canadian troops are concerned, we have tried to furnish comfortable accommodation for the men so that all of them could sleep at night and not in relays. There are always in some of these vessels a few hammock berths that are more or less uncomfortable, and we try to make conditions in respect to them as comfortable as possible. With regard to the question of meals, this is a matter which has been carefully thought out. Under our regulations,

instead of two meals a day as the men received to whom this article refers, our soldiers were given what I might term four meals a day. They received three regular meals and at bedtime were given a substantial bit of food to sustain them through the night. I have already quoted some figures, but I think I may repeat them again. We had, when the armistice was signed, about 140,000 troops in France, practically all of whom have since been moved to Great Britain. Out of 268,000 Canadian troops that were overseas at the signing of the armistice, we will have moved across the Atlantic by the end of the present month no less than 185,216. That will leave in round numbers 80,000 still to be brought home, nearly all of whom, unless something unforeseen happens, will be returned to Canada during the months of June and July. There will be a few odds and ends to clear up after that, but I cannot give the exact figures as to these because there is always a certain number of discharges in England under our policy.

I did not refer, when making my statement this afternoon, to a question as to which I think nearly every member of the House has had some personal experience, I refer to that of compassionate leave. One of the most difficult and trying matters that I, and the members of the staff in Great Britain, as well as the Corps Commander and other officers, have had to deal with has been the question of compassionate leave. As I stated this afternoon, no one thought this war was going to last for such a long time, nor did the parents of our young men anticipate that their sons would be absent for such a lengthy period. All sorts of things can happen in a family in the course of three or four years. The heart rending and heart breaking appeals we had from parents and relatives were many, and it was very necessary that we should decide on some policy and endeavour to carry it out as justly as we could. It was also necessary to try and answer every communication we received in a sympathetic manner and explain, as well as we could the working of the system which was decided on. I have had parents come from distant parts of Canada to my office in England who pointed out and urged reasons why their sons should be repatriated without regard to anybody else. Such a situation is very trying, because the parental affection enters into the case and there are always very affecting circumstances connected with it. I have tried to administer the policy decided upon in that regard in as fair and just a manner to all concerned as was possible under all the difficult circumstances that arose.

I would like to refer for a moment to another important thing which has caused us a good deal of work in England, but which has apparently been necessary, and that is the documentation of the soldiers. When demobilization took place on a large scale it required at the place of demobilization a full and complete record of the soldier as he is returned to civil life, this being needed for the purpose of pensions, for war service gratuity, and for many other purposes. When a soldier went from Canada overseas this documentation, or a very large proportion of it, was not necessary at all; but before he could return to Canada —unless he was to be demobilized in England—as we did demobilize soldiers in England in certain cases—the work to be performed overseas was very considerable, I can assure the House. The only documents the soldier had to take with him when he was leaving Canada were:

1. Attestation Paper or Particulars of Recruit. (Made out on enlistment).
2. Casualty Form. (Giving full particulars of Service in Field).
3. Medical History Sheet. (Kept up to date from enlistment).
4. Field Conduct Sheet. (Giving particulars of any "crimes" or punishments).
5. Pay Book. (Always carried by soldier).

We were not only required to re-sort the men before we could send them back to Canada into units according to the dispersal stations in Canada to which the soldier wished to go, but we had to carry out this documentation to which I have referred. The procedure was laid down in Canada in respect to this additional documentation, and no doubt it was necessary. I am under the impression that if the armistice had not come upon us suddenly as it did, and if demobilization had not been upon us, we could have simplified the matter of documentation; but we were in the midst of demobilization and there was not time to argue the matter out between the Minister of Militia and myself and the officers under us in both cases. So we had to proceed with this rather heavy duty. The procedure which was laid down by Canada involved preparation Overseas of the following ten documents, in addition to those already in existence:

1. Proceedings of Final Medical Board (showing medical condition of man immediately prior to demobilization).
2. Dental Certificate (showing dental condition).

3. Proceedings on Discharge (A cover for all documents bearing endorsement of reasons for discharge and acknowledgment by soldier of receipt of discharge certificate).
4. Discharge Certificate (enclosed in special envelope—to be signed in Canada and handed to soldier).
5. Copy of Discharge Certificate (retained for record purposes).
6. Dispersal Certificate (in triplicate—particulars of address of soldier after demobilization, where he wants War Gratuity sent, etc.).
7. Equipment and Clothing Statement (Receipt by soldier for all items of clothing and equipment taken to Canada).
8. Last Pay Certificate (showing state of soldier's pay account up to end of current month).
9. Duplicate Last Pay Certificate.
10. War Service Gratuity Form (declaration by soldier of essential facts required for purposes of this grant).

These are all in addition to the documents and papers that the man had to have when he came from Canada overseas. Two of these documents to which I have referred had to be prepared in duplicate and two in triplicate. There may also have accumulated overseas sundry documents which may be as many as 20, to cover such items as:

Regimental and Company Conduct Sheets.
Particulars of family.
Particulars of marriage.
Proficiency Certificates.
Statement of Service of Warrant Officers and N.C.O's.
Birth Certificate.
Proceedings of Courts of Inquiry.

Canada, I venture to think, possesses probably the most complete system of documentation of all the Allies; and whilst, as I say, we might have simplified the system if we had had the time, yet there was not an opportunity to do it. In order to give the House some idea of how long it takes to get through with this documentation I had a calculation made and I discovered that if the work for the whole force were to be done by one man who devoted eight hours a day to it, it would take him sixty-eight years to carry it out. This would not include the time required to complete preparation of last pay certificates and to adjust pay accounts, which would double the period. Nor does it include time occupied in getting men on parade, or time spent on parade, for registering name and full regimental particulars. This also would double the time.

Taking into account the 268,000 Canadian soldiers overseas at the armistice there would have to be answered in the duplicate and triplicate forms 100,710,357 questions, and the number of signatures which would be required would be 2,219,512. So that there was the necessity of keeping a regular staff of officers and clerks in England to do this work,—men who were entitled to return to Canada just as much as the soldiers they are working for, and when this is considered hon. gentlemen will understand this was quite a task. In that connection I want to pay a tribute to these men who have stayed in England, and who have carried on this work for the purpose of getting their comrades back to Canada—those who have had no extra pay but who have had to be appealed to on patriotic grounds to continue at work, the army of clerks, cooks, and men of that character who are doing duty in England, and are doing it faithfully, those who have had to keep all the camps going, and perform all the labour in connection therewith,—all have done their work well and have done it very faithfully too.

Now I would like to speak for a few moments in reference to the Headquarters Staff in London. The appointment of an overseas minister was a unique procedure, and I do not venture to express any opinion at the moment as to its advisability. It was the programme that was undertaken by the Prime Minister, and it was thought, no doubt, by him that the responsibility in connection with this tremendous work should be thrown upon the shoulders of some one person who would look after it and see that it went all right. Well, it was a pretty stiff task for the fellow who undertook the work. The powers of the Government, for the purposes of the administration of the Overseas Military Force, were vested in him. He had to stand all the hard knocks and overcome all the difficulties, to consider the aspirations of the officers, and to try if possible to satisfy the ambitions of some.

In many cases I admit that he failed in this regard. Sometimes one would almost feel after the day's work was over, on account of the miscellaneous character of the many things that came up for decision, that after the war was over he would have no friends at all left in Canada. The final court of appeal for the Government in respect to the overseas service was the minister. The task which I had to undertake would at any rate have been impossible so far as I am concerned had I not been fortunate in having men of ability associated with me, Canadians who were broad-minded and painstaking. I refer to the headquarters staff, who on behalf of Canada carried on this work in the city of London. All these men had seen active service in

France and Belgium with the exception of a very few, and they were highly trained or technical men whose services could not be spared for service at the front. The members of the headquarters staff in London, both junior and senior, under our policy were, with these few exceptions, required to have served at least six months at the front; and, as I stated this afternoon, I was always being appealed to by headquarters officers to allow them to return to the front. The lot of the headquarters staff in London was unsatisfactory to them. The hours were long, frequently for seven days a week, and the work was performed under the most difficult and trying circumstances. I was assisted by those gentlemen to such a degree that I feel that the manner in which this work was executed will appeal to the people of Canada as being both effective and efficient.

I am going to take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, of running over the names of some of the principal officers who have been on the headquarters staff in London, to whom I am indebted for assistance in carrying on this work.

The first Deputy Minister of Overseas Military Forces of Canada to be appointed was Colonel Walter Gow, of Toronto, who is well known, not only in legal, but in business circles in Canada and in many other parts of the world. Canada may consider herself extremely fortunate in having had the services placed at her disposal of a man of Colonel Gow's attainments.

Through overwork on different occasions, he became incapacitated for duty, and in these periods Colonel G. S. Harrington was acting deputy minister. Colonel Harrington is a barrister of Nova Scotia and the son of a barrister. He familiarized himself with the work in all its details to such an extent that when Colonel Gow retired he was well qualified to take up the work of deputy minister, and I appointed him to that position.

Lieut.-Colonel T. Gibson, D.S.O., who was formerly a partner of my hon. colleague, the President of the Privy Council, and later was connected with the Soo industries, had also a very wide experience in business affairs and possessed good legal attainments as well. He was about to return to Canada, having finished his duties in France, but when he was passing through London I asked him to stay and assist in carrying on the work at our headquarters. He consented, and I appointed him to the position of assistant deputy minister. His services have also been of very great value.

Major L. P. Sherwood is the secretary of our Overseas Military Council. He is the son of Sir Percy Sherwood, of this city, and, of course, well known here.

Colonel W. R. Ward, the accountant general, is a member of the permanent forces of Canada, and has always been considered a very efficient officer.

Lieut.-General Sir Richard Turner, V.C., D.S.O., is a man of the very highest character and integrity. He won the Victoria Cross and the Distinguished Service Order as a young man in South Africa, and those who served with him there are never tired of telling of his bravery. He also showed great gallantry at the front in this war, where he commanded the 2nd Canadian Division, and when the overseas ministry was formed he was brought to London, and is now Chief of the General Staff there. He is beloved by the soldiers, and has always been recognized at the front as a very gallant officer.

Major W. Nickle, M.C., is General Turner's aide de camp. Major Nickle won the Military Cross at the front. He is the son of the hon. member for Kingston.

Lt.-Colonel C. M. Edwards, D.S.O., is a native of Ottawa and is well and favourably known in this city. He is on the General Staff.

Lt.-Colonel H. G. Mayes., M.B.E., was our Director of Physical Training, and his qualifications were considered of such a high order that the British Government asked us to loan him to them, and we acceded to the request.

Brigadier-General D. M. Hogarth, C.M.G., D.S.O., is the Quartermaster-General. If members of the House will take the trouble to examine the report of the Quartermaster-General's Branch they will see what splendid results have been attained through his efforts and those of his officers through the transactions we have had with the Belgian Government and with the Imperial Government in regard to the disposal of horses and stores, and very large sums of money have been saved for Canada because of his keen business insight.

Colonel K. C. Folger, D.S.O., is the Deputy Quartermaster-General. Any one who knows this part of the country would say he came from Kingston—and he does. He was a member of the Permanent Staff before he went overseas, and is a very efficient officer.

Lt.-Colonel E. C. Duffin, O.B.E., is also in the Quartermaster-General's Branch. He has splendid business qualifications and has accomplished excellent results in connection with the shipment of troops to Canada.

Lt.-Colonel S. M. Bosworth assisted the Quartermaster-General in connection with the embarkation of troops and the allotment of shipping space. He is in charge of ocean and rail transport under the Quartermaster-General. He is a son of the president of the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services.

Colonel T. A. Simson, C.M.G., D.S.O., is a member of the Permanent Force, and after distinguished service at the front was brought back to take the position of Director of Supplies and Transport.

Lt.-Colonel C. M. Ruttan, D.S.O., belongs to Winnipeg, as his name would indicate, and is a most capable officer in the Supply Branch.

Major-General P. E. Thacker, C.M.G., D.S.O., is the Adjutant-General, and any comments I might make as to his qualifications can be easily understood when one realizes the smoothness with which demobilization has proceeded. It was his duty with the help of the officers under him to work out the scheme of demobilization overseas.

Colonel F. S. Morrison, D.S.O., also of the Permanent Force, is Deputy Adjutant General, and two assistants are Lt.-Colonel E. W. Pope, son of Sir Joseph Pope, of Ottawa, and Lt.-Colonel G. H. Cassels, son of Mr. Justice Cassels, of the Exchequer Court.

Colonel A. L. Hamilton, C.M.G., Director of Records Overseas, is responsible for the system of documentation and records. Having been manager of one of our banks in Canada, he conceived the idea of a clearing house for documents in each of different areas. Through the working out of that system we have brought order out of what at one time might have resulted in chaos had the procedure on demobilization not been systematized and put in better shape.

Major Hume Blake, grandson of the late Hon. Edward Blake, is a Deputy Assistant Adjutant General.

Major-General G. L. Foster, C.B., is the Director-General of Medical Services. He won distinction at the front where he was in charge of the medical service of the Canadian Corps and was brought back for this position at Headquarters. The Deputy Director-General of Medical Services is Brigadier-General H. S. Birkett, C.M.G., Dean of the Medical Faculty of McGill University, Montreal; who is well-known throughout Canada.

The Paymaster-General is Brigadier-General J. G. Ross, C.M.G., a member of a firm of well-known chartered accountants in Montreal.

The General Auditor is Honorary Colonel L. A. Dowie. He is a very excellent chartered accountant who has given his services to the country during the period of the war.

The Judge Advocate General is Colonel R. M. Dennistoun, C.B.E., now judge of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba. He is in London straightening out many matters in connection with the final demobilization of the troops to Canada.

Major-General A. McDougall, C.B., Brigadier-General B. R. Hepburn, C.M.G., and Colonel G. V. White, C.B.E., have been responsible for carrying out the timber operations, to which I referred this afternoon, in France and in England.

Lt.-Colonel G. S. Robertson, a barrister of Nova Scotia, is in charge of the Estates Branch, and has had to do with something like 300,000 wills of soldiers.

I have run over these names hurriedly because I wanted the House to know the personnel of the Headquarters Staff in London. I want to make this observation: if I wanted men in any business with which I was connected, I should consider myself very fortunate indeed if I could select, on the average, men as intelligent, as efficient, and of as high a class as these. These men are chiefly civilian soldiers; their practices in law and in medicine and their businesses for the most part—I speak whereof I know—have entirely gone from them. Some of them are in middle-life and will find it very difficult to take up the threads again when they return. They have asked me repeatedly since the armistice was signed to be allowed to go home. My answer invariably has been: "Do you propose to leave me alone here on this demobilization problem? You are not working for an individual, for a corporation, even for a Government." I appealed to them on the ground that they were working for a country which they loved; for the best country in the world; and the answer has always been: We will stick to this job, no matter what the consequences may be, until the last soldier is back in Canada. The sacrifices made by these men in carrying out this work for their country will, I am sure, be recognized by the people of Canada; they will be thanked for it in some manner at the proper time in the future.

I have simply referred hurriedly to the Headquarters Staff in London. I do not by any means ignore or overlook the splendid officers who have served in France and in the various areas in England. The services rendered by these magnificent men

who have served Canada so nobly both in the Canadian Corps and in connection with the other formations outside the Corps have been invaluable. They will not have to stay overseas as long as the Headquarters Staff will, but I repeat that they have rendered splendid service. However, their numbers are so great that I cannot very well take up the time of the House on this occasion in referring to all of them.

We endeavoured, as far as we could, for the sake of economy, to keep the staff down as low as was consistent with efficiency. In the Chief of the General Staff's Branch, the Adjutant-General's Branch, and the Quartermaster-General's Branch, and the Assistant Military Secretary's Branch, the number of officers and other ranks decreased as we systematized the work and improved it, as we always try to do, in the light of past experience. On December 1, 1916, the number of officers in these branches was 134, and of other ranks, 566. On November 11, 1918, the staff had been reduced to 61 officers and 319 other ranks, although the work was somewhat heavier.

I do not think I need say anything more on that point. The matter is one which is very close to my heart. I want to say to this House and to the people of Canada that the men who have served overseas both in France and at Headquarters in England are as faithful and as honest a lot of men as could be found, and I believe they have served their country from the very highest motives of patriotism.

I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, who believe that Canada still has a big war problem on her hands, and that in the solution of that problem patience and confidence will be required. On the one side there are the men who have returned and who naturally find it difficult to accustom themselves to peace conditions, to get back into the ordinary occupations of civil life, after having been employed for long periods in something so entirely different. Then, there is the natural anxiety on the part of the men about a livelihood for themselves and their families and the difficulties which they will have to overcome in this regard. As I have said, I have not a word of criticism to make regarding these men. I have been amongst them in their camps; I have been with them on ships on several occasions, and I believe that notwithstanding the hardships they have endured and the things they have gone through while killing the Huns, they are just the same Canadians as they were, and their hearts are in the right place. The whole situation requires to be handled with patience and forbearance. It is our duty, the duty of all the men and women of Canada, to assist in solving the problem which is on our hands with respect to re-establishing our soldiers and finding, as far as we can, suitable employment for every one of them.

On the other side there is the problem of absorption. These men cannot be treated in the same way that men were treated in peace time, when conditions were normal and there was work for all. They took up the great cause for Canada and for those who were unable to go. The Government is doing everything that is possible to help employment, but the Government cannot do everything. It requires the co-operation of every citizen, who must realize that a distinct obligation rests upon his or her shoulders, and employers particularly must deal with the situation in a most sympathetic and practical way. This requires patience, and we must keep the word "patience" constantly in mind; patience is the watchword now for all. In making these observations I have in mind the returned soldier problem, and not another situation which has developed and which is outside of the soldier problem altogether.

Canada has surpassed herself in what she has been able to accomplish thus far, so let us not fail at the end in solving still more difficult problems. If the best results are to be secured and if we are not to be handicapped in our effort at this time, there must be confidence between all classes, confidence also in a commercial sense to enable us to keep the wheels of commerce and industry moving in order that there may be, under such conditions, a maximum of opportunity for employment. A lack of confidence would at this time be irreparable. We want employment for the soldier, indeed for everybody, and one of the worst things that could happen to this country would be the development of a lack of that mutual confidence upon which commerce and industry depend.

We must realize that the war has made a new world. It certainly has made a new Canada, a very different Canada from what it was before the war. It is necessary not only for the soldier to fit himself into new conditions, but for the whole Canadian people to fit themselves into new conditions and to understand what the new conditions mean. Of all the soldiers who crossed the seas from different parts of the world to take part in this war, none of them has a better country in every sense of the word

to return to than Canada's soldiers. This is not a mere commonplace statement, for our soldiers have learned what the habits of the people are in other places than Canada, and the more we have seen of conditions as they exist in other places, the more impressed from every point of view have we become of the magnificence of the country which is our heritage. I will not detain the House any longer at this time. I feel very gratified at the attentive and courteous manner with which hon. members on both sides of the House have listened to my somewhat lengthy remarks.

In closing, let me say that I understood to a great extent the responsibilities which I was assuming when after some misgivings I accepted the task of administering the overseas forces of Canada. The task was a difficult one; it taxed all my energies, but I would venture to say this, that I was always desirous of, and always aimed at, administering the overseas forces in such a manner as would meet with the approval of the Canadian people, once they were in a position to understand all the circumstances.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I will not detain the House at very great length after the exhaustive statement which has been made this afternoon and evening by the hon. gentleman (Sir Edward Kemp). I am sure that all the members of the House will join with me when I offer my sincere congratulations to the hon. gentleman for the calm and moderate manner in which he has presented to the House the facts in regard to his two years' administration overseas. I am glad to see him back in his seat restored to health, and ready, I am sure, at all times, to give the House further explanation when such be required from him after his very interesting report has been fully digested by hon. members.

I fully agree with what was stated by my hon. friend as regards the bravery of our soldiers in the field, as regards the officers who, from day to day, since the first contingent crossed the seas, led our soldiers on to victory. Every Canadian is proud of the record of our men overseas, and if at times there were criticisms, they were aimed, not at the men fighting in Flanders, but rather at officials far away behind the lines, and the object of those criticisms was to give the country a better military administration so that the soldiers generally might benefit by it.

My hon. friend, in closing his remarks, had to admit that the returned men were somewhat upset as they came back to Canada. We all agree that after the strain of this long and terrible war, men's minds are naturally upset. But, Sir, the Government must not abdicate even if they are facing a crisis. Amongst the belligerents no Government in the old world has abdicated, and assuredly the United States Government has not abdicated its authority because the war is ended and because an economic crisis is passing over the world.

9 p.m.

Returned soldiers, and the working men of this country generally, are not satisfied with the Government, because it has not been able to grapple with the situation. The soldier especially is upset and angry at the Government because on his return to Canada, after having been promised—both before and during the war—a better world in which to live, he finds that a few picked men have been rolling in gold for the four years of the war, while at the same time for the workers the cost of living has become simply unbearable. That is the chief cause of the unrest throughout this country. It is all very well to send a roving commission from Vancouver to Halifax to learn for this Government what is the cause of the unrest. Why, the cause is as clear as the sun is in Heaven. It is first, the high cost of living to the poor, and second, the immense and scandalous fortunes made by the profiteers during the war. That is the cause of the trouble, that is the cause of the clash in Winnipeg, in Regina, in Edmonton, in Vancouver, and possibly to-morrow in Toronto. The Government might just as well send a wire to the commissioners of whom mention was made this afternoon by the right hon. gentleman, to stop stirring up trouble, because so far, they are only ventilating the grievances of the poor people. Let the Government themselves tackle the difficulties which are in the way.

Sir, we are passing through an economic crisis, the worst we have ever seen, and yet the Government, although we have now been in session three months, has not yet given evidence of a desire to afford relief to the suffering community. I say it is a scandal that the Budget has not yet been made public, that the changes in the fiscal policy have not yet been announced. We have been here since the 20th of February and we are still marking time, while the storm has been gathering from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Is the Government going to wait until there are Soviets in every industrial centre? Let the Government assert its authority, but first of all

let it table before this House its fiscal policy for meeting the economic wants of the people. That is what I have to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Overseas Military Forces. He uttered a truism a moment ago when he said that this world is not the same old world. The Government will learn that to its cost. The people are tired of listening to rhetoric; they want action and facts. They want a policy which will relieve them from their growing sufferings. The people will never understand why Canadian butter is selling cheaper in Liverpool and London than it is selling in the city of Ottawa. And, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people, during the last four years, have shown that they were able to face any situation with courage and fortitude. The Canadian people have accepted without murmur through those dark days the drastic laws and Orders in Council of the Government; they have accepted an increase of 7½ per cent in the tariff imposed under the flimsy pretext of a war measure. But the Canadian people cannot understand why the levy on the incomes of the rich people was only paltry when it should have been substantial. The taxation is unequal. It bears too heavily on the poor, too lightly on the millionaires, and that is why, Sir, there is passing through this country a wave of unrest which threatens the future of Canada.

Coming back to the administration of the overseas military forces, while I agree with most of what the minister has said regarding the conduct of our soldiers and the patriotism and intelligence of our officers, I am bound to say that in his statement he has overlooked many things; and he cannot plead ignorance. In his absence some of the leading officers of the Canadian army have spoken through the press and in the legislatures of Canada, and the sentiments expressed by those officers have been voiced on the floor of this House by some hon. gentlemen. Surely the hon. gentleman has taken notice of those statements. Yet, in his long but interesting statement this afternoon and evening he made no reference whatever to the very serious charges which were made by those gallant officers against the administration overseas. I hasten to say to my hon. friend that those gallant officers were not members of the Liberal party, but both—one a member of the Ontario Legislature, and the other of the Quebec Legislature—leading lights in the Tory party of Toronto and Montreal respectively. I know the minister is too pious to read modern novels, but surely he reads Hansard during his absence from this House, and he must have read in the debate on the Address a speech by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). A speech of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) is always as good as a novel. At the opening of this session that hon. gentleman—the ex-colleague and friend of the minister—delivered a long speech, in which he made a most vigorous charge, indeed, a series of charges against the administration of my hon. friend overseas. He even went so far as to attack, shall I say savagely—but at least to attack without gloves the commander of the Canadian troops? I leave the whole responsibility for that savage attack on the shoulders of my hon. friend from Victoria; but I do think that in fairness and in justice to the Canadian commander my hon. friend the Minister of Overseas Military Forces (Sir Edward Kemp) should have taken up the quarrel of General Currie and defended him against the attacks of a gentleman who was his colleague for many years in the Government and his predecessor in the Department of Militia and Defence. The hon. minister is more in a position to know about those charges than your humble servant, Mr. Speaker.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: May I interrupt the hon. member to say that I expressed my unbounded confidence in General Currie and my appreciation of him during the time I was on my feet.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Which means, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend has no confidence at all in the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), and that—

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Not at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —far from appreciating, he is depreciating the hon. member.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I only spoke of General Currie. The hon. member can place what interpretation he chooses upon my words.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As we say in law, the inclusion of one means the exclusion of the other.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Well, I am not a lawyer.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I might repeat the adage in Latin. However, it is a well known principle of Roman law that the inclusion of one means the exclusion of the other. I am sorry that the member for Victoria is not in his seat. He ought to be here to hear what my hon. friend has to say about this appreciation of General Currie and

depreciation of himself. Coming to the charges made by General Smart, Colonel Pratt and Colonel Price, I must express regret at the fact that my hon. friend has ignored them. I do not assert these charges myself. I do no take the responsibility for them; I have not been overseas. But I happen to know one of those officers. I know Brigadier-General Smart is a highly respected citizen of Westmount. He is a public man and needs no certificate of character from me. He his well known in Montreal and throughout the province of Quebec. He served his King and country on the field most gallantly since the beginning of the war, and yet Mr. Speaker, when he came back—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have not attempted to draw the line at all closely, but I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that it is a well-known rule that an hon. member cannot refer to a previous debate in the same session.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, I am answering the statement made by my hon. friend about his administration of the Department of Militia overseas, and I am giving as an argument against that administration what has been stated by well-known officers of the Canadian militia. I think, Mr. Speaker, I am in order. I am not rehashing an old debate, but am simply refuting a statement—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not prevented the hon. member from referring to the fact that there has been a debate, but that is as far as he can go. He is about to cover the same ground again, which he cannot do. The debate is upon record.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the hon. minister chooses to ignore the very serious charges which have been made against his department, let it be known that no light will be shed by the Government on this important question. However, Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling as usual.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member can make these charges himself on his responsibility as a member of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend will not charge me with cowardice, I suppose. I would make a charge if I had personal knowledge of the thing to which I refer. I said when I brought the matter up before the House that I had no personal knowledge of the facts, but I take the word of those gallant officers. Two of them are well known to my hon. friend. Does he refuse to take the word of Colonel Price and of Colonel Pratt? I do not know them personally, but they wear the King's uniform, and I respect their word. They were not playing politics; they were simply passing judgment on the administration of what is generally known as Argyll House.

Is my hon. friend, then, not surprised to find on the return of the responsible minister, after these charges having been made publicly in the legislatures, in the press, and on the floor of Parliament, that he should completely ignore them? I am sure that the robust faith of my hon. friend in the minister and in the Government generally is very seriously shaken by that very ominous silence of the minister. Suppose these charges had been laid at the door of my hon. friend. Do you think for one moment that he would have remained silent? Oh, no. He is too restless for that; he would at once have risen in his place and would have courted an investigation. He would at least have denied the charges. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the minister has absolutely ignored the charges. He has not courted an investigation. Indeed, it is as though General Smart, Colonel Price and Colonel Pratt did not exist at all. Now, Sir, since I cannot go into these charges again—accepting your ruling in the matter—I must say that I was surprised to find that in the elaborate statement made by my hon. friend, he did not even mention the name of Colonel Bruce. The hon. minister paid a glowing tribute, to which I subscribe, to our Canadian doctors and nurses. But, Sir, Colonel Bruce has laid a terrible indictment, not against the medical administration, but against the fussiness of Argyll House in the medical organization in England.

It is well known to-day that there is in the possession of the minister somewhere, hidden on the shelves of his department, or in the Government's possession, a report from Doctor Bruce in answer to the Babtie report. Yet my hon. friend will not refer to it, or will not make it public, because forsooth if the report were published it would be very damaging to the reputation of Argyll House.

There is another report, if I am well informed, which is even more damaging than the Bruce report. I am told, on good authority, that Lieutenant-Colonel Jenkins, of Toronto, appointed to investigate the financial administration of the Medical Service, found a leakage of at least $10,000,000, and so reported. But he has been eliminated, the report has disappeared, and

it is as if there was no Jenkins, no report, and above all no leakage. Well, Sir, this is a public question; it has been aired in the press all over Canada. When the hon. gentleman returned some days ago—and we were all pleased to see him back because, after all, he is not a bad fellow—he was asked if he had that report, and after much hesitation—and it looked as if his conscience was balancing between his extreme partyism and his usual honesty of purpose—he emitted a few words. I read his remarks next day in Hansard, and I could not find out whether Colonel Jenkins existed or not; at all events the answer was typically vacillating and uncertain. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman should once for all make a frank confession. Nobody will accuse him of having pocketed the $10,000,000; but the people of this country are interested in knowing whether or not that report exists; and when its existence is no more in doubt, public opinion will force the Government to grant us an investigation. My hon. friend found some unrest upon his arrival in Canada. He finds that the soldiers are upset after four years of war. It is such facts as those I have mentioned which tend to upset the minds of the soldiers. The soldier fought for a dollar a day during a period of four years.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: One dollar ten.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He left the administration of the country in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. The soldier was asked to vote for the Government that would send him reinforcements, and upon his return he finds that there are very serious leakages in connection with the administration of public funds. That is, Sir, one of the many causes of the existing unrest. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been rolling in millions since the beginning of the war. Now the time has come to render an account of their stewardship, and we, the representatives of the people, are here to see that the will of the returned men is given effect to.

Another question which is of interest to the country is that of the riots which occurred overseas. It is too bad that, under the rules of the House, I cannot refer to what three Canadian officers stated in public letters and speeches, because the officers in question all declared that these riots were not confined to Rhyl, but that they took place in almost every camp where Canadians were congregated. We are also informed that riots even took place in the Canadian camps in France after the signing of the armistice. Have we obtained any satisfactory explanation from the hon. gentleman as regard the trials which have taken place in England as a result of those riots?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Does the hon. gentleman refer to Canadian camps in France?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, camps in England.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I think my hon. friend referred to riots that had taken place in France.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: In Canadian camps?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, and I made the statement previously in the House. I am informed that in the Third Division the men refused to obey the command that had been given them. When they were told that they would be sent to help in maintaining order in industrial centres in England they refused to obey the command, and that was the cause of a riot in the Third Division in France. That is the information we on this side have received, and yet nothing has been said in regard to it by my hon. friend. Now some of our men have been killed during the riots that have taken place in England, and others have been sent to jail and are still in dungeons. My hon. friend has been silent on this point. The public wants to be reassured about those facts. Many causes have been assigned for the riot at Rhyl, but there were riots in other camps as well, yet my hon. friend did not refer to them. He paid a glowing tribute to the officers surrounding him at Argyll House, but what has he to say about the men in the camps? My hon. friend stated, and I agree with him, that it was rather a difficult to transport so many hundred thousands of soldiers immediately the armistice was signed. I agree with him, but dissatisfaction at not being returned to Canada sooner was not the only cause of riots. There was a motion on the Order Paper in the name of my hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) purporting to mention the causes of all the riots. I cannot refer to that motion because it has been the subject of a previous debate. I am very sorry that my lips are sealed, but I would draw my hon. friend's attention to Hansard. There he will find the motion recorded and he can peruse it during his leisure hours because he has nothing to do now on this side of the Atlantic; his friend

sitting behind him (Major-General Mewburn) is doing the whole work in the Department of Militia. Let my hon. friend read the charges made by the ex-Minister of Militia and he will find they call for action. He owes it to our soldiers, he owes it to all our men, to see that justice is done them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have from my hon. friend a fuller explanation of the Siberian Expedition. The Government acted without thought in this matter. To show its lack of judgment, in a moment of frenzied enthusiasm it decides to send many thousand young Canadians to Siberia. The people are not consulted, the matter is rushed through by Order in Council. Then suddenly we learn after the expedition has reached Siberia that we must bring our boys back. How much has that expedition cost Canada, and who is responsible for that Siberian folly?

Major-General MEWBURN: The Kaiser.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You mean the present Government. No one but the Kaiser or the present Government would have told those young men that they would be sent to Siberia whether or not they were willing to go; and many were sent away against their will. The Kaiser! Yes, the Canadian Kaiser did it.

My hon. friend spoke about our Aviation Corps. There are tales about those young Canadians which are simply heartrending. It is almost past belief that after the armistice hundreds of those heroic young Canadian aviators were passing the hat around in the streets of London because they had not the means to return to Canada. To obtain the privilege of reaching Liverpool to embark for Canada they had to pay with their own blood money some Shylocks who extorted commissions from them when they applied for tickets. Is that a charge emanating from me, Mr. Speaker? No; it emanates from the friends of the Government, from returned officers who made the statement publicly. And yet my hon. friend has made no reference to it.

I would like to put a question to my hon. friend, which I hope he will answer in good faith, as usual. Has he read the charges made by Brigadier-General Smart, by Colonel Price and by Colonel Pratt, and does he intend to answer those charges?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I understand that those charges have been already answered.

Major-General MEWBURN: In full.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: So far as I am concerned I never read those charges.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But you intend to read them now?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No, I do not. I have something better to do.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Very well. I will report that to Brigadier-General Smart, to Colonel Price and to Colonel Pratt, and we may hear further from them.

My hon. friend has not given to the House a full explanation in regard to the Jenkins' Report. I would like from him a more apparently sincere explanation than the one he gave when he first appeared in the House on his return from England. Does that Report exist? Did he not receive it? And if he received it, why does he not make it public? It should be public property. Colonel Jenkins acted for Canada and was paid by Canada, and I do not see why, even if his Report is against the administration of my hon. friend overseas, it should not be made public. Let us have responsible Government, Mr. Speaker. It is the first time in the history of this Parliament that public reports, signed by officials, reports such as those made by Dr. Bruce and Colonel Jenkins—if the latter report exists—have not been brought down to the House. Have we abdicated our rights and functions as a Parliament? Are we going to be told that because a report is adverse to the Government it shall not be made public? I hope my hon. friend will seriously consider the matter and speak the truth and the whole truth about these two reports.

SUPPLY.

FISHERIES ESTIMATES—STATEMENT BY HON. MR. BALLANTYNE.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Fisheries—Salaries and Disbursements of Fishery officers and Guardians, Fisheries Patrol Service, and Oyster Culture, $600,000.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Chairman, without wishing to detain the members of the Committee, I think it might be interesting to hon. members if I made a very brief reference to the fisheries of Canada and to the reorganization that it is proposed to put into effect. In order that I may be accurate, if hon. members will allow me I will read this brief memorandum that I have here and then they will better understand the Estimates which will be placed before them for consideration.

Reorganization of the Outside Service has not yet been effected, but a method of doing

so has been worked out and approved by the Civil Service Commission. As soon as reclassification of salaries has been completed, steps will be taken to put the reorganization into effect. It is anticipated that the reorganized service will be in complete working order by the end of this calendar year. In broad lines, the reorganization will be as follows:

For the purposes of Fisheries administration, Canada will be divided into three sections, the fisheries of each of which are common in their character, viz:—The Atlantic Provinces; The Prairie Provinces; British Columbia.

Ontario and Quebec, so far as their inland waters are concerned, administer their own fisheries.

To assure the greatest possible co-ordination of the administrative service and the closest and most direct supervision, and at the same time to provide that those engaging in the industry may be in the closest possible contact with the Department, each of these sections will be placed under the charge of a Chief Inspector of Fisheries, through whose office all the work of that division will be carried on. District Inspectors will be continued as at present. Local overseers will be employed, but instead of having a large number of them with small districts and insignificant salaries, so that they must engage in other work to make a living, each overseer will have as large a district as he can efficiently handle, and he will be required to devote his whole time and attention to his work. He will be paid a reasonable salary. The amount has not yet been fixed by the Commission.

Special guardians will have to be employed in some instances at certain times of the year, particularly to protect fish on the spawning grounds in the rivers. But no greater number of such guardians will be employed than is absolutely necessary, and then only for such limited period as their services are really needed. In any instances where services are required for more than thirty days, advertisements will be published calling for applications for the position.

The lobster catch for 1918 fell very much below that for 1917. In fact it was little more than half the annual average of the catch of the four preceding years. This sharp decline should not, however, be too readily attributed to a scarcity of lobsters. The falling off was common on all parts of the coast, and a strong contributing cause will be found in the protracted spells of stormy weather and the abnormal ice conditions that prevailed last spring.

The total value of our fisheries for 1917 amounted to $52,312,044. This sum is more than $13,000,000 greater than the value of the fisheries for the previous year.

This brief statement will give hon. members some idea of what we are going to do. As we proceed with the Estimates I shall be very glad to give any further information that may be required.

Mr. CAHILL: Are new inspectors to be appointed to these new positions that are to be created? What will be their salaries. What commission does my hon. friend refer to when he says that the "commission" has not decided on the salary?

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have a Chief Inspector of Fisheries in British Columbia, Colonel Cunningham, whose headquarters are at Vancouver. It will be necessary to appoint also a Chief Inspector for the Maritime Provinces. All such appointments will, of course, be made by the Civil Service Commission. The salary of Colonel Cunningham, whose responsibilities out there are very heavy and who has been with the department for many years, is $4,000 a year.

Mr. FIELDING: A large deputation waited on the minister recently and suggested some changes in the organization of the department. May I ask whether any progress has been made? Is that matter still under consideration?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member (Mr. Fielding) was present when the delegation from the Canadian Fisheries Association waited upon me. Some of the suggestions that this association made have already been acted upon. In my Supplementary Estimates I intend to ask for an amount for fishing tugs to patrol Lake Erie and to replace the steamer Vigilant, which formerly did that work. That was one of the suggestions that the association made. The most important suggestion that they made was that the fisheries of Canada should be in charge of a deputy minister who would give his whole time to that work, and that the present able deputy, Mr. Desbarats, should not act as deputy minister both for the Fisheries Branch and the Naval Service Branch. I agree with that recommendation, and I hope that before the next session of Parliament we shall have a deputy minister who will devote all his time to the fisheries. We intend also to employ a man who will give most of his time to the commercial side of the question, to the marketing of fish, and so on. The man I am looking for will be a bright young business man who will be able to study the markets of Canada as well as markets abroad, to look into the transportation question, and to advise the deputy minister and myself. While the volume of the fisheries of Canada is very large, a great deal more can be done, and now that the war is over an even more vigorous policy will be pursued than has been followed in past years.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the $100,000 increase chiefly for increased salaries and additional salaries to new appointees?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The appropriation is to provide for the necessary extensions of

the service and for the reorganization to which I have referred; also, for salaries and for the appointment of further fishery officers. When my fishery Estimates were before the Committee last year I said that the number of guardians would be very much reduced. I am glad to inform the Committee that this has been done. In 1917 there were 806 guardians throughout Canada; during the past year that number has been reduced to 392, and we have employed them only for the length of time that we wanted them—for one month or two months, as the case might be. Their remuneration has been increased, and we ask that the service rendered be much better—in fact, that it be such as the appointments call for. Therefore, while the number of guardians has been reduced the remuneration to them has been increased, but the cost on the whole has been lessened. The total cost for guardians in 1917 was $94,-290.59, and this year, with an increased remuneration to guardians, it is only $80,-818.78.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that a new inspector is to be appointed for the Maritime Provinces. Is this appointment for the three Maritime Provinces, or is it only for one? What would the specific duties of this new official be?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Only one Superintendent of Fisheries will be appointed for all the Maritime Provinces, and it will be his duty to co-ordinate the work, to have full charge of the overseers and also of the guardians, and in a general way to be responsible to the department at Ottawa for all of the Maritime fisheries. I think such an appointment will prove to be a good one. It has worked so in British Columbia, and since I have had the honour of being Minister of Fisheries, I have done my utmost to run the department free from politics and to put it on a good business basis. I do not claim to have done wonders, but my sincere desire is to get the best men we can, and to place the fisheries of Canada on an even better footing than at present and to expand them.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister has stated that he is looking for salesmen in the interests of the fisheries of the country. Has he in mind that the increased expenditure will in any way reduce the high cost of living, or if it will decrease the price of fish to the Canadian consumer?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have in mind just exactly what the hon. member has, namely, that we shall induce the public to eat more fish, and I hope the cost of fish will also go down. The problem is, however, a very large one.

Mr. CAHILL: What are the minister's hopes based on?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: On this, that we are going to have a publicity department and to do far more advertising than has been done in the past. We intend getting out very attractive booklets about the various kinds of fish, how they may be cooked, how palatable they are and all that sort of thing, just the same as a live business concern would do. We also hope to have more steam trawlers put in use than there are in use at present, and as the volume of the output of the fisheries of Canada is increased, the cost ought to decline. But I will make no promises in that regard, because the problem is too big a one for a minister to state definitely that he can reduce the cost. We will do everything we can to reduce it, and we can only hope we shall be successful.

Mr. CAHILL: I should like to know whether the Government or the minister in charge has in mind the high cost of living in this country. Every minister who has brought up his Estimates so far has had an increase in them. The minister now tells us that he has cut off some 400 inspectors and other employees of one kind or another, and yet in face of that he is asking us for an increased expenditure of $100,000. Every minister seems to be heading in the same direction of increased expenditure and of making positions for his friends. New positions in unlimited numbers are being created from day to day, but so far no minister has told us that he is endeavouring to decrease the cost of living, or that he is thinking at all about the people. It is all very well for us to vote away the people's money, $600,000 in salaries including an increase of $100,000 over last year, which will in all probability increase the cost of living to the Canadian consumer, and the minister tells us frankly that he has in mind no plan that will decrease the cost. It would be very much better for the Government to spend that $100,000 in endeavouring to find some way of furnishing fish to the Canadian consumer at lower prices than those of to-day. But if the Government wishes to consider only the commercial interests of the country, without any regard to the consuming

10 p.m.

public, we shall continue along in the same direction in which we are now going and get in deeper all the time. All the Government seems to have in mind is to spend money to do business, but that money has to be paid some day, and the ministers should turn their attention to the high cost of living and endeavour to reduce it to the poor people of this country instead of providing what are apparently political jobs for their friends. I take the minister's word when he says he is not letting politics enter into this thing, but apparently, all the ministers say the same thing and they have all found a way of creating new positions at high salaries.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I should not want the hon. member to think that this expenditure is for fishery officers alone; it is for the fishery patrol service and for oyster culture. It might interest the hon. member to know that the price of fish has very materially dropped since the armistice was signed, but I do not take any credit for that. If this new general sales manager, or publicity man, or whatever you like to call him, is the kind of man I hope we shall get, he will be able to look into transportation charges and all that kind of thing in order that fish may be delivered to fish dealers at the lowest possible cost. It is quite probable that the cost of fish will continue to go down, and we want to take advantage of meat unfortunately being as high as it is and fish low to increase the consumption of fish and to educate the people more in the use of it. As regards the consumer, the hon. member will, I am sure, understand that I as well as every other member on this side of the House have the consumer in mind as much as our friends on the other side. No one knows that better than my genial friend the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who knows that the consumer is always the apple of our eye.

Mr. FIELDING: The curious feature of the problem is that while there has been a very perceptible reduction in the cost of fish in the wholesale trade, that reduction does not seem to reach down to the retail trade. Everybody in the wholesale trade will tell us that the cost of fish is so much lower than it was, that many fish merchants have incurred very heavy losses, but the price to the consumer in the retail shop does not vary very much.

Mr. MORPHY: With reference to the transportation of fish to the retailer from the sea, is there a refrigerator service provided for in the minister's estimates?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: Is there any increase for that so as to enlarge the service? That is one of the things that Canada requires more than anything else.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will come to that in a moment, if the hon. member will wait.

Mr. LOGGIE: For the inland trade of the Dominion of Canada it is very important that refrigeration on express cars be provided. I do not think the fresh fish business can be properly undertaken and the inland market supplied unless we have a better system of transportation by express. In the winter season the goods are shipped in a frozen condition, and after being in a heated car for twenty-four hours they arrive at Montreal and Toronto in an almost unsaleable condition, if they have to be kept any time. The moment the frost comes out of frozen fish, the fish should be immediately consumed; otherwise, it deteriorates in value. I do not think the transportation of frozen fish by express can be undertaken in less than carload lots unless some refrigeration is provided. To encourage the transportation of fish from the sea coast to our inland cities there should be express transportation every day in the week. When it comes to delivering fish by freight in carload lots the fish can be landed in good order in Toronto in the summer season, but in the winter season you cannot bring a box of fish from the seaboard to Toronto and deliver it in good condition. In the summer the fish is packed in ice, and even if the ice melts, it is not very material, but even in the summer season there should be some portion of the car which could be cooled by salt and ice, and then the fish would arrive in much better condition than it does at the present time.

Mr. CAHILL: Are these salaries fixed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Under the re-classification they will be.

Mr. CAHILL: But they are not now? What salaries do you expect to pay to these inspectors?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know what the re-classification will provide. I have in mind myself what would be a fair salary, but the fixing of the salary is outside my jurisdiction. We shall have to wait and see in what class the officers are put.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have been informed by some of the inspectors that when a guardian is to be appointed tenders for

the position are invited, through notice being put up in the different districts. These tenders are sent to Ottawa, where the selection is made. I submit that it would be difficult for the minister or any of his officers, unless they had some private information, to select a guardian for the district of Cape North, for instance, in the county of Victoria, if half a dozen or more applications came in from that district from men all of whom were worthy citizens and would discharge the duties of the office equally well. Perhaps the minister will explain how the right person to be appointed is determined when only one man is to be selected out of a dozen applicants.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The commission form their opinion as to the proper man to select, largely, I presume, upon the recommendation of the local overseer or the inspector of fisheries for the district, they are not bound by that recommendation, but it is always passed on to them.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not think that is the way in which it is being done, but if the minister says so, I do not like to contradict him. I think it would be a very good arrangement if the local fishery officer had absolute power to appoint his own men without interference from the department in any way. If he is made responsible for the district of which he is overseer and can select his own men, much more efficient service will be rendered than if the appointments are made for political reasons as they have been in the past. Is it a fact that there is no interference on the part of the department in making these appointments, and that the local fishery officer has been informed that he has absolute power to make the appointment, and that the department will stand behind that appointment when it is made?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite right. The Civil Service Commission was so congested with business during the past year that the guardians were appointed by the local officers. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the way he suggests is the proper way and in so far as I have any influence it shall be used in that direction.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are we then to understand that in future the rule will be that the fishery officer for the district will make these appointments independent of the department and of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, I am sorry to say. If a guardian is wanted for less than thirty days the local officer can make the appointment, but if the appointment is for a longer time the position must be advertised, the local officer makes his recommendation to Ottawa, and it is passed on to the Civil Service Commission, who make the appointment.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How is the Civil Service Commission to decide who is the best man when there are half a dozen applications for the position? I could understand how the local officer could pick the right man, but how the Civil Service Commission can do it is difficult for me to understand, when the applicants live a thousand miles away and the Commission knows nothing about them. Will the minister explain how it is done?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Before the Civil Service Commission took over the making of appointments, I stated on the floor of this House, last year when my Estimates were up, that I intended to leave all local appointments to the chief fishery officer in the various districts. Now, when there are several applicants for the same position, the local officer makes his recommendation to the Fisheries Department here as to the one he thinks most competent for the position, that recommendation is passed on to the Civil Service Commission, and as a rule is acted on by them, although they are not bound to do so.

Mr. McMASTER: When last year the Minister of Marine and Fisheries promised a reduction in the number of fishery inspectors or guardians we on this side of the House gave him a well merited meed of applause. The minister has succeeded in doing what he said he would do. The House and the country should feel grateful to him, and I am sure they both do.

But the minister brings before the Committee to-day an item in his Estimates providing for an increase over last year of $100,000. I have listened very carefully to the discussion which is taking place to-night but have not been able to satisfy myself that the minister has made out a case for this increase. He shows us that in one substantial portion of this item he has effected a diminution in the personnel of the section of his department and an increase in salaries, which I think is perfectly right. I think that the public will be best served by having fewer and better paid officials. That is good business and common sense, and is, I am sure, what we want on both sides of the House. The

minister was kind enough to refer to me and my desire to protect the consumer. He said that he as well as myself had an eye to the consumer all the time. It is true he has an eye to the consumer, perhaps in the hope that the consumer's prosperity will enable him to get a little increase in price for what he has to sell to him. On this side of the House I protect the consumer in the hope of seeing that he gets his goods at a little lower price. But we are both thinking of the consumer, and both hope to see him happy and prosperous. Seriously speaking, however, I would like to have the minister establish his case for this increase of $100,000; because it is a truism—it is trite and tiresome but I must emphasize the fact—that we have to cut our financial coat according to our financial cloth in this country, and there has been no attempt on the part of the Government to cut down the Estimates, as far as I have been able yet to perceive. It seems to me that the ordinary expenses of this country are going to be more than they were last year, and I think we are in a very serious position.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I want to assure the hon. member that I have no wares to sell. I formerly was in business, and when I get through with political life I shall devote all my time to my farming interests. Possibly, therefore, I have more interest in the consumer than the hon. member for Brome. But I want to say, with regard to the item, that the hon. member is quite right in asking for a little more information than I have given. The fishery service has been, I would not say deplorably weak, but it has been weak, and we are going to increase salaries of all those engaged in the fisheries of Canada. We shall engage fewer people and pay them better salaries. Then the patrol service has to be increased also, but I have an eye to the expenditure and hope to get a Bill through the House that will allow me to increase the revenue of Canada to the extent of $262,000. So that I trust there will be no deficit in administering the fisheries when the present fiscal year is closed. I am doing my best to reduce the cost as far as possible, and to increase the revenue and the efficiency at the same time. While the amount may seem large, I would like hon. members to realize the fact that the service was allowed to run down a little during the years of the war and we are now strengthening it. For this purpose we have to have more money for increases in salaries for fishery officers and also for patrol service. I can go into details of the patrol service if it is necessary. The money is also required in connection with oyster culture. With regard to the patrol service, in order that hon. members may have some idea of the extent of this work I may say that we have 38 boats that are owned by the department and 18 that are hired. On the Atlantic coast there are 15 owned by the department and 9 hired; on the Pacific, 22 owned by the department and 9 hired; on Lake Winnipeg, 1 owned by the department. These boats are engaged in preventing illegal fishing and are distinct from fisheries protection cruisers. I do not know that I can give more information than this, but if the money is voted we shall see that it is honestly disbursed.

Mr. KNOX: Is it the intention to improve or further develop the fishing industry in the lakes in the Prairie Provinces? In the northern parts of these provinces we have some very large lakes and almost an unlimited supply of fish. And in view of the fact that these lakes are situated so near some of the cities which at present are showing signs of unrest, due no doubt to the high cost of living, it might be well to devote some attention to the possibilities of further developing this industry.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am glad that the hon. member has drawn attention to this matter, for we are certainly going to do everything we can in regard to our Great Lakes.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Will the money that is to be spent on oyster culture be devoted to patrol work, or in what way is it to be expended?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There are three reasons why we want the money. We intend to increase the salaries of all officials, and we want it for the patrol service and also for oyster culture.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: In what way is the money to be spent in connection with oyster culture?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: On the recommendation of Mr. Ernest Kemp, who is a specialist on oysters, it is intended to keep the public beds in proper condition. For this purpose he has to have a boat. It will also afford information and advice to those going into private oyster culture; and, further, the Biological Board will assist very materially in a scientific way.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Can the minister say what proportion of the item will be used for that purpose?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Between $6,000 and $8,000.

Mr. TURGEON: The fisheries officer in the county of Gloucester died two or three months ago. The Civil Service Commission called for applications, and I know that a number of applications have been sent in. Has the appointment been made yet, and if so, who has been appointed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The appointment has not yet been made but the matter is now before the commission.

Mr. CAHILL: It would be interesting to know how much of this money is to be spent on salaries, patrol service, oyster culture, and so on. The Committee would like to have an idea of what the different phases of this work cost, and what is the cost of the increase of the salaries to officials.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Salaries and disbursements for fishery officers in 1916-17 amounted to $305,000.

Mr. CAHILL: How much is it now?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot say exactly now what the increase will be because we have to go carefully over the list of officers and see what increases in salaries they ought to receive. We have not yet done so. We are asking for the appropriation first and will carefully go over the list of officers afterwards.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will each officer get a share of the general increase?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Civil Service Commission will settle the wages. I hope there will be a general increase, because the fishery officers are very much underpaid at the present time. I hope that when the Civil Service Commission finally settle the matter they will give to these good and efficient officers, and on merit, the increase in salary they are entitled to.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are a great many officers in different parts of the country—I think they are called commissioners—who have a whole county, or more, to look after. They receive a small salary and their travelling disbursements are paid. Would the minister take the four counties of Cape Breton and tell us the salaries of the different officers there and how their travelling expenses compare with their salaries? Perhaps I should not trouble the minister to give the comparison for the whole island of Cape Breton, but let him take one county and give us some idea as to how these accounts stand as between salary and travelling expenses.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the hon. gentleman has reference to overseers, and in Inverness county there are eight. In Eastern Harbour the overseer gets a yearly salary of $120, and is allowed ten cents a mile for travelling expenses. In Kingsville, Mr. McLellan gets $50; in Pleasant Bay, Mr. McIntosh gets $75; and in Port Hood, Mr. John A. McDougall gets $150. These are overseers, not guardians.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister has given the salaries. I also wanted the amount paid these officers for travelling expenses, to see how the two amounts compare.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The many hundreds of overseers are allowed ten cents a mile for travelling expenses. I will endeavour to furnish the amount of travelling expenses, but I am sorry I have not the information before me at present.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not very particular about it, because I had occasion to make a private inquiry into the subject a couple of years ago, and I find that while the salaries are very small the accumulation of travelling expenses is getting very high. Some years ago I suggested to the minister that it would be far better for the country, and in the interest of honesty and integrity on the part of the officials, that they should be paid a fixed salary and do away with the pernicious system of inviting them to pad their accounts so as to get moneys to which they are not entitled.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I quite agree with the hon. member that the system is not a good one, and is liable to be abused in just the manner he states. However, we intend to do away with the system, and to give these fishery overseers a fixed amount for travelling expenses each year, a sum that would be fair and reasonable according to the district which they are covering—possibly about $200 per annum. The present system is open to criticism as the hon. gentleman has very well stated, and a dishonest fishery overseer could pad his travelling expenses. I will not say it has been done, but the possibility of doing so exists, and the system will be changed.

Mr. ROSS: I should like to get details if I can in regard to this item, which seems to be divided into three heads: Salaries and disbursements of fishery officers and guardians; fisheries patrol service; and oyster culture. I would like the minister to tell the Committee how much was spent under each head last year, and how much he estimates is going to be spent under

each head this year; also how many officers he had under the first head last year, and how many he expects to employ under the same head this year.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Under the heading of Salaries and Disbursements of Fishery Overseers, there was expended last year $305,000, and on the fisheries patrol service $190,000. The number of fishery guardians in 1917-1918 was 806, and this year the number is 392. The overseers in 1917-18 numbered 134, and we hope to greatly reduce them next year. The number of inspectors in 1917 was 24 and in 1918, 21. As to how we are going to divide the expenditure under the increase that we have asked for, that is a matter which will have to be determined in detail later on.

Mr. ROSS: What about oyster culture?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The expenditure for this purpose last year was $6,000.

Mr. ROSS: How much will it be this year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As far as we can tell it will not be much more during the coming year than it was last year.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister is apparently not doing very much to encourage oyster culture, and I regret exceedingly that he has made up his mind to stop the propagation of lobsters on the coast. I note that a few days ago a meeting of those interested in the fisheries of Canada took place in this city. Among the recommendations made at that meeting was one that some money should be spent in the propagation of lobsters and in the development of oyster culture. The minister was present and delivered a speech. In a general way he complimented the meeting for the interest those present were taking in the fisheries, and approved of their proposals, but he did not enter into details as to what the Government's policy would be. The minister will remember that when he took office a few years ago we had some twenty-seven establishments on the coast of the Maritime Provinces engaged in the propagation of lobsters, and many people thought they were doing a very good work. At a meeting of the Fisheries Committee of the House the year before last the action of the department in regard to lobsters was criticised very severely, and most of the members on the Committee from the Maritime Provinces were of the opinion that a mistake had been made in closing the lobster hatcheries without very much consideration. I am aware that in so doing the minister took the advice of a certain expert in Kingston, who professes to know a great deal about the propagation of lobsters. I have no doubt that theoretically the expert referred to is well informed, but like all these learned men, he does not know everything, and he may have been wrong in his conclusions as to lobster propagation. I am aware that there has been a dispute about it for some years. But the amount spent in the propagation of lobsters, if I remember correctly, was somewhere in the vicinity of $30,000 a year. It was not a very large amount, and it was the belief of many people on the coast that the money was well spent.

The minister will recollect that the Fisheries Committee did not approve of the course taken in regard to closing the lobster hatcheries the year before last on the advice of a certain professor from Kingston without consulting the members of the House, and the trade, and the people specially interested. At that meeting the minister said that he would call a general meeting at Halifax of those interested in the fisheries. The meeting was duly held, but the minister was not present. There was no united opinion at that meeting that the minister had taken the proper course, so far as I remember, in deciding to close the lobster hatcheries. The closing of those hatcheries was delayed by the minister until that meeting in order that he might secure some advice as to what ought to be done. I expected to see the minister himself present to get the views of the people of the Maritime Provinces, and I was sorry that he was not able to attend. I do not think that the advice given generally at that meeting would convince him that he had taken the right step in regard to the lobster hatcheries.

Since that date, without submitting the question to the Fisheries Committee or to the members of this House, I understand, the minister and his officers have decided to close the lobster hatcheries altogether, and offer them for sale—in fact a good many of them have been sold, but whether all or not, I do not know. I think it was rather an extraordinary step for the department to take without the consent of the representatives of the Maritime Provinces, many of whom, from my own personal knowledge, were not in accord with the move then made. If our advice is any good, we and the people we represent would like before a decided step like that is taken, to have at least an opportunity of discussing it and giving our views thereon. There is a

great deal of dissatisfaction along the coast of the province from which I come in regard to the course the minister has taken.

I am quite well aware that there are two views in regard to hatcheries. No doubt if we could prevent the destruction of the seed lobsters we would not need these hatcheries. But the same is true in regard to the propagation of salmon and of trout and other fish. We are maintaining hatcheries in the other branches, why should we abandon them in the case of lobsters? The natural way of propagating salmon is, of course, the best way if it can be done, and, as I said before, the same is true of all the other varieties of fish. But it is difficult for me to understand why the minister has made a distinction in regard to the propagation of lobsters. Therefore I would like to have an explanation from him, although I expect it will be of very little service now that he has taken such decided steps to abandon the hatcheries.

I would also like to know what the minister has done in the way of preventing the destruction of the seed lobsters. The hatcheries were useful in that way. When the seed lobster was taken, the seed was preserved and placed in the hatcheries, and millions of these young lobsters were put in the water every year, which action, I have no doubt, helped to maintain the industry. But now we are back to the old system, and as far as I can learn on the coast there is no improvement in regard to the care taken of the mother lobster. If the minister does not intend to do something in that direction, I think he has made a decided mistake in abandoning the hatcheries.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think we would make better headway if we took the items in the order they appear, and when we reach the item of fish breeding establishments I shall be glad to answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There is no item relating to lobsters at all.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hatcheries will come under vote I have referred to.

Mr. ROSS: I do not wish to be too persistent in regard to this item. But the minister told us that last year certain sums were allocated to salaries and to fisheries patrol service. Last year he asked $500,000, and this year he expects to spend $600,000 on oyster culture. That is increasing the vote by $100,000. I would like to know which of the items get the increase. The minister ought to be able to give us some idea of what these increases are going to be in each branch of the service.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As far as the oyster beds are concerned, as they are controlled by the provincial governments, that will explain why the Federal authorities do not intend to spend any more than $600,000. I have as clearly as possible indicated that the $100,000 is for the salaries of the fishery officers and the patrol service; but to get down to the actual details of how much is for the patrol service and how much for the fishery officers is something I could not do until we had actually gone into the whole matter in detail. The first thing I must do is to try and get the members of the committee to give me $100,000 and then we will distribute it under these three headings. I could not tell to a dollar how much is going to be allocated to the patrol service and how much to the officers.

Mr. ROSS: Tell us to $10,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I would expect the Fisheries Department to make a calculation of the amount of money needed. It is extraordinary that they should make up their minds to ask for $100,000 and yet not know what they are going to do with the money. That is not the business way of voting money. In a business concern, for instance, a bank, if salaries of the officers were to be increased, and $100,000 was required for that purpose, the directors would have a statement and would know just why the amount was required and what was going to be done with it. But it appears that in the fisheries office a lump sum of $100,000 is asked for, and afterwards the officials are going to consider what they will do with it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite right. I have been in business myself and know exactly how a body of shareholders would question a proposed increase of $100,000. They would want to know first of all what the directors were going to do with it. If I told them it was for fisheries patrol and for fishery officers they would naturally inquire further how much we expected to spend on increased patrols and how much on increased salaries. In round figures, as the hon. member has asked, it would be $60,000 for patrols and $40,000 for salaries. That is not absolutely accurate, but it is what we estimate it will be.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the cause of the great increase of $60,000 in patrols?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Because the service has been allowed to run down, due to the

war, we have not had a sufficient protective service. Now that the war is over we are increasing the number of patrol vessels and officers to give the protection that we think the fisheries ought to have. We were not able to do that during war time.

Mr. McKENZIE: The coast lines of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia comprise a great many miles, and I do not see how one man can travel that distance during the short season of fishing and carry on this work with any degree of efficiency. If he had the whole year it would be different; but the fishing in the Maritime Provinces begins about the middle of May and ends some time in August, and one man could not inspect all the different fishery points during that period. I assume that the inspector will be supposed to examine the packs of lobsters, to see how the work is carried on in the lobster factories, to ascertain how the guardians are doing their work, and so on. It is absolutely impossible for one man to do that work. If it is necessary at all to have such an official there should be more than one; but I am not in favour of the idea, because if the right men are locally selected to do the work of fishery officers there will be no need of any one to oversee the work. The money that the minister expects to spend on this official would produce better results if given to local officers—not to guardians, but to inspectors and other officials throughout the several provinces. If he increased their salaries and imposed greater burdens upon them he would get more efficiency from his officers and better results generally.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I quite understand that it would be impossible for this officer to visit in a short time all the various fishery points in the Maritime Provinces, but he will do so gradually. We shall try to get a man who is familiar with conditions there and who will co-ordinate the work. According to the experience of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries in British Columbia, the move is a wise one. If one officer is not enough it may be necessary at the next session of Parliament to ask for another; but I am hopeful that one officer will be able to handle all the work. The inspectors in the Maritime Provinces now report to Ottawa; the intention is to have them report to the Chief Inspecting Officer for the Maritime Provinces and thus co-ordinate the work.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I want to mention a request that has been sent to me at various times by farmers living along the St. Mary river in Nova Scotia. Some years ago these farmers had the right to set nets once or twice a week half way across the river for the purpose of catching salmon for their own use. They appreciated this privilege, which had been enjoyed by their forefathers for generations. But the department decided that no more net fishing for salmon should be allowed in that river. Now, the farmer has not time to use a fly to catch salmon, as the sportsmen do. I sympathize with the minister's idea that the fishing in that river should be preserved; but the question is whether we are succeeding in doing it by our present method. The result of the present rigid method is that many of the people in that vicinity are turned into law-breakers. They take the ground that the salmon belongs to them, not to the sportsmen, because the river passes through their farms; that the right to catch these fish as I have described is an ancient right which they had for a long time and which should not have been taken away from them. They satisfy their consciences in this way, and they break the law by going out at night to catch the salmon. I do not believe it would injure the fishing in the river if once or twice a week, they were allowed to set their nets in certain places half way across the river and the law was rigidly enforced against any one who would sweep the river at night or violate the regulations. That is the proposal they have made to me, and their request would seem to be reasonable. I understand that that has been done in some rivers in New Brunswick. If it is true that farmers along certain rivers in New Brunswick are allowed to set nets under certain regulations, and if that practise is not injuring the fishing in those localities, I would like the minister to consider the advisability of extending a similar privilege to the farmers along the banks of the St. Mary river.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is right so far as the St. John river is concerned; it is a much larger river than the St. Mary river. The regulations in respect to the latter are that there shall not be any net fishing above the ebb and flow of tidal waters. If the use of nets was ever permitted on that river, it must have been quite a number of years ago. I shall refresh my memory and find out how long ago that privilege existed.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The St. John river is a very long one, and in places it is not much larger than the St. Mary river. If this regulation applies to the whole of the

St. John river, or to the upper waters of the St. John, it would be on all fours with the St. Mary river. I am aware that fishermen below tidal waters in the St. Mary river are allowed to set their nets. The peculiar thing about the matter is that the river below tidal waters is not very much wider and in some places no wider than it is above tidal water. But when we get to tidal waters, prohibition exists, and people living above are not allowed to set nets. If the St. John river is open all the way up, I would think there would be no distinction made between it and the St. Mary river. What effect has this had in the St. John river? Is it satisfactory or has it been injurious to the fishing? The contention of the people who make these representations to me is that it would be of advantage to the fishing; that there would not be so much violation of the law; that they would not be sweeping the river at night, because they are now prevented from catching any fish at all excepting by fly or by hook, as they are not allowed to use nets. It might be a good thing for the fishing in the river to permit this to be done. I should like to get the experience in New Brunswick.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The regulation covers only a portion of the St. John river from Fredericton to Andover, and that portion of the river, as the hon. member is no doubt aware, is quite large, while the St. Mary river is small. In any event, I will look into the matter and see what can be done.

Mr. COPP: I was not in the House a moment ago when my hon. friend was referring to oyster culture. I understood that only $6,000 is allowed for oyster culture. Does that extend throughout Canada or only in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In the Maritime Provinces principally.

Mr. COPP: If the cultivation and protection of oysters is of any importance, the amount the minister is devoting to the work is very small. I hold in my hand a report made to the minister by some official of the department, and I notice that on page 17 it states:

> The position of the oyster industry in the Maritime Provinces is an extremely unsatisfactory one. There are in these provinces approximately 10,550 acres of producing natural beds, viz., 5,000 acres in New Brunswick, 4,300 in Prince Edward Island, and 1,250 in Nova Scotia, but there are tens of thousands of acres around the coasts of these provinces that by proper artificial culture and cultivation could be converted into highly producing oyster areas.

If that report means anything, it means that the minister is not taking the proper course in appropriating only $6,000 for oyster culture in the Maritime Provinces, because, as he knows, the beds have been depleted very materially in the past few years. It is almost impossible to get oysters at all, and they have practically tripled or quadrupled in price. If there are around the coast of these provinces tens of thousands of acres that could be converted into highly producing oyster areas, the minister, instead of increasing the vote in other respects, might very well give more to the cultivation of oysters.

11 p.m.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The reason I am not advocating spending more is because the provincial authorities control the oyster beds. The federal authorities are endeavouring to induce the provincial authorities to turn the oyster beds over to us, and if that is done, we shall be very glad to spend more money, but inasmuch as the provincial authorities control the oyster beds, the Federal Government cannot do very much.

Mr. COPP: If it is right and proper for the Government to spend $6,000 on beds belonging to the provincial authorities, it might well be argued that it should spend more, but if the Government has no control of the oyster beds in the Maritime Provinces, why spend anything?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There are a few public beds that are not leased to anybody and that the federal authorities have control of, but, generally speaking, oyster beds are under the control of the provincial governments, and in the general interest and for the few public beds of which the Federal Government has control, we ask the small amount of $6,000. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman's views, and if we had full control the amount would be much larger.

Mr. COPP: I do not know if the minister is aware of the fact that a private corporation in New Brunswick entered into the oyster culture business a few years ago, and I understand they got assistance from the Government. Has there been any report regarding the success of this venture?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not received any report about the matter.

Mr. COPP: Will the minister find out if there is any report in his office? The matter is important.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The company has not received any financial assistance from the Federal Government.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: A few moments ago the minister, in answer to my question, made reference to a report of Captain Kemp. Is there in that report anything referring to a disease that is attacking oyster areas in the Maritime Provinces and especially in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes; Mr. Kemp did refer to an epidemic that broke out. I understand it has been overcome now, but it breaks out periodically and the oysters become diseased.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Is it under the jurisdiction of the minister's department to attend to the combatting of the disease that attacks oyster areas, and will any of this money be spent along that line?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The matter of diseases of oysters has been thoroughly gone into by scientific men, and, so far, no means have been devised to overcome the disease.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it open to any private person who has oyster beds in front of his property, or in the near neighbourhood, to cultivate oysters without license?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It would be necessary for such person to get a license from the Provincial Government.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Would it not be wise, when we consider increasing the other two items under this heading, to increase also the item for oyster culture so as to give some assistance towards developing the beds or enabling the fishermen to develop their areas in a manner that would overcome the disease or to conduct scientific investigation so as to find out what the disease really is? Would not that come under the Biological Board ?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That has been done by the Biological Board, as the hon. member states. I will discuss the matter with the board. I cannot discuss it from a scientific standpoint, but I will certainly offer the board a greater expenditure than $6,000 if they ask for it.

Building fishways and clearing rivers, $30,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This expenditure is mainly for clearing the rivers of British Columbia. The salmon go up the small streams as well as the large to spawn, and on account of the mountainous nature of the country these streams are liable to be jammed with logs.

Mr. COPP: I had some correspondence with the department with regard to a fishway in the Petitcodiac river. Has any progress been made with that work?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Plans and specifications have been prepared and the work will be carried out.

To provide for the inspection of pickled fish, $15,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there not some legislation pending in connection with this inspection? If it is the intention of the minister to press that legislation through Parliament this session I should like some further explanation about it, although I may not be quite in order in bringing up the matter on this item. The compulsory inspection of the fisheries is rather a disagreeable task to impose upon the fishermen in different parts of the country. This legislation I speak of was before the House in the absence of the minister, and there was considerable opposition to it as far as it advanced, and I should like the minister to consider well before pressing it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We consulted all the interests, and the majority of them were in favour of making the inspection of pickled fish compulsory. The matter has also been discussed with the various associations that have called upon me, and as far as I know, this legislation is being introduced to meet their wishes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I pointed out to the Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries when this legislation was up earlier in the session that the greatest possible difficulties and legal entanglements might result from this inspection. A man may put up 500 barrels of herring down in northern Victoria county, where there are large fishing interests. He believes it to be No. 1 herring and sells it for No. 1 to some concern in Halifax. There is no provision as to where the fish shall be inspected. The man in Halifax who buys this No. 1 herring without saying a word that he is going to have it inspected may get an inspector to say that it is only No. 2 or No. 3 herring. Then the fat is in the fire, and there will be all kinds of trouble. The fish is sold and beyond the reach of the man who had it in his possession. If there is to be an inspection, it should take place at the place where the fish is packed; otherwise there will be all manner of trouble be-

tween the seller and the buyer, and the fishermen as a rule are not sufficiently well off to stand the expense of a lawsuit. There are many other reasons why compulsory inspection should not be pressed upon the people just now. There may be some large sellers of fish who are in favour of compulsory inspection, but it is not the man who buys from the fisherman all along the coast and sells again that I am thinking of, but the small man who put up small quantities of fish and who is now getting along first-rate and has been, and those before him, for the last seventy-five or a hundred years. I am not in favour of imposing fresh duties and further obligations and compulsions by law upon such a man. He has enough to contend with already. He has to fight his way into the Atlantic and battle with the elements in order to catch the fish, and after he has caught it I am not in favour of putting any more embarrassing obligations upon him unless there is real necessity for it. So far we have been putting up very excellent fish in the province of Nova Scotia; I have heard no great complaints. It is to the interest of every fishermen to put up good fish, for he is competing with his neighbours who are putting up good fish. That is the result of local competition, which has been doing very well. Unless the minister finds that the ordinary fisherman is satisfied to have these new obligations imposed upon him, I would not be in favour of imposing them. If he is willing to submit to this inspection, that is his business, but so far I have had no evidence of that kind.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This amount is for the voluntary inspection of fish which has been carried on for many years. It is an annual vote. When the Bill my hon. friend speaks of is before the House full opportunity for discussion will be afforded.

Mr. PEDLOW: Does the department provide for the inspection of oysters? What protection have the public against the sale of diseased oysters?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They have not any. I was unfortunate enough to contract typhoid fever from eating oysters, I believe. Unfortunately there is no protection that can be offered to those who are fond of oysters.

Mr. PEDLOW: Should not the department provide some means of protecting the public from the distribution of diseased oysters, which may lead to various diseases among the consumers?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is a problem I will put up to the Biological Board. I would like to see it done if it is possible.

Salaries, construction and maintenance of fish breeding establishments, $365,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister deal with the question of the propagation of lobsters?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I carefully considered the subject before those fourteen lobster hatcheries were closed by the Government, and consulted a number of men interested in the business, both business men and scientific men; and from the information I gathered I did not see that they were of any practical use. The fishermen take the lobsters and after brushing off the berries the eggs are taken to the hatchery. We found that the propagation in the hatchery was only about 30 per cent, but when the propagation occurred from the female berried lobster in the natural way it was 100 per cent. The small fry are exposed in the sea, whether they come from the lobster hatchery or whether the eggs are exuded in the natural way. While the lobster hatcheries were costing the Government considerable money we found that instead of being of service to the industry they were the reverse. For that reason I recommended that the hatcheries should be closed. But I was very careful in the matter. As the hon. member said, I waited for a year, and sought advice from every available source that could be of assistance. We have sold three of the lobster hatcheries, one at Shippegan for $610, another at House Harbour for $760, and another at Canso. For the Biological Board for scientific investigation purposes we are retaining the hatcheries at Arichat, Antigonish, Bayview, Charlottetown and Port Daniel. The remaining hatcheries are offered for sale: Inverness Harbour, Little Bras d'Or, Isaac's Harbour, Georgetown, Shemogue and Buctouche. I am not an authority on lobsters and all I could do was to consult those interested in the business in the Maritime Provinces. I was largely guided by the report of Professor Knight, and if it is a fact that there was a propagation of only 30 per cent in the lobster hatcheries as compared with 100 per cent in the natural way, it was conclusive evidence that the hatcheries were not performing any useful service to the country and that the lobster interests would be best served without them.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What proof has the minister that there was 100 per cent propagation in the natural way?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am only quoting Professor Knight's opinion.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Professor Prince was opposed to the step taken by the minister and he is our authority on this matter. I do not know who Professor Knight is, but I am quite sure that no man will say that there was 100 per cent natural propagation because that is impossible of demonstration, and if any professor makes that statement he is "talking through his hat." As regards the 30 per cent propagation, I think that if we succeeded in securing that percentage we were doing very well. The number of eggs on a lobster is something enormous. It runs up into the millions; at all events hundreds of thousands. I cannot remember the number, but I know it is large. According to the reports of the department there were hundreds of millions of young lobsters put into the water every year from these hatcheries, and the propagation of 30 per cent was very good. They were lively looking little lobsters when they were put out, but whether they would live afterwards was a matter of doubt and that was the question that the department never seemed to have the enterprise to investigate. These lobster fry were siphoned out on the water some three miles from the coast and after that they were allowed to shift for themselves. They were very small and I have seen them about the size of a mosquito. The theory of the scientists was that they floated on the surface for some time until they developed, when they sank and crawled on the bottom. As far as I know the department has never made an investigation to discover whether or not they survived and it was a controversy among the fishermen as to whether these young lobsters survived when they were put into the ocean. That was the question which should have been ascertained by the department and it is surely capable of being ascertained. What I complain of chiefly is the fact that the minister undertook this matter without consulting those members interested in the fisheries. In a question of this kind, which is not a political but a business question, and on which there cannot be any difference between the Government and the Opposition as regards the proper administration, is it not curious that although we have a Fisheries Committee sitting, the minister should—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member will surely remember that I appeared before the Fisheries Committee last year and went very fully into this matter. As to whether or not it was a good thing to do that is purely a scientific question. Professor Knight and the Biological Board, which is composed of some of the most eminent university men in Canada, including Professor Prince, strongly recommended the step, and I can only act on the advice of such eminent scientific authorities as I have quoted. But I remember having appeared before the Committee myself and having spent half an hour or more discussing this very subject.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That is true. I had not the pleasure of being present when the minister was before the Committee. But there were several meeting of the Committee, and if a vote had been taken the action of my hon. friend would, I think, have been almost unanimously condemned. The Chairman of the Committee asked us not to pass a resolution condemning the action of the department without hearing the minister. The minister appeared before the Committee subsequently and made a statement, but whether he convinced the Committee or not no one knows; he did not give the Committee an opportunity of meeting again and coming to a decision. I understood that the minister stated that he would call a meeting of the fishermen and fish packers, and people interested in the fisheries in the Maritime Provinces and submit the question to them. He did call a meeting last year at Halifax, but he has not told us what the decision was. I was at the meeting, but I do not remember of any decision having been arrived at in regard to this question, and I think that if it had been put to a vote of the meeting there would have been a considerable difference of opinion. But we have a number of men in the House representing the Maritime Provinces and I would like to know what we are here for. Is our advice not to be listened to? Are we not to be consulted on a question like this, but is some professor up in Kingston to decide whether lobster hatcheries in the Maritime Provinces are to be closed or kept open? My complaint is that the minister, without consulting members of Parliament who are interested in the fisheries, decided to close the lobster hatcheries and to sell them. He says he has sold one in my own constituency that was doing splendid work. I do not care what he received for it if he made a bad bargain by selling it. Their advice was ignored, and if the Committee had been consulted in my opinion they would have decided against the action of the department.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. gentleman scarcely does me justice. He criticises me

for not being present at the meeting in Halifax, when at that very time I was attending the Imperial Conference in London, England.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am not complaining about that.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: With regard to these matters not being put before members of Parliament, I fully agree with the hon. gentleman. This whole matter was referred to the Fisheries Committee, but, unfortunately, ministers are so driven by the pressure of public business that they cannot attend these committee meetings as often as they would like. For instance, a meeting of the Fisheries Committee was called for this morning at eleven o'clock. How many appointments had I at that hour? There was a very important meeting of the Cabinet taking place at eleven o'clock and I was asked to be there. A very large delegation of labour men representing the shipyards in the East wished to meet me at eleven o'clock. Then there was the meeting of the Fisheries Committee at the same time. Well, I chose to meet the labour men, and, therefore, was unable, much to my regret, to be present at the Fisheries Committee meeting. I would like to attend all the meetings, but if any men have cause for striking it is the ministers of the Crown. Talk about working eight hours a day; we are driven from early morning until the present advanced hour of the night; and it is quite probable that two or three gentlemen will still want to see us after we reach our hotel. I have always referred these matters to the Fisheries Committee, and this subject was thoroughly discussed there. My good friend from Shelburne and Queen's found some fault with me a year ago for not attending a committee meeting. I really could not do so because there were so many other matters pressing for my attention. However, I am always glad to be present whenever I can do so, and that has always been my wish.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Did the minister get the consent, or the approval, of the Fisheries Committee for the course he has taken in this matter?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, as far as I understood it. I did not hear any gentleman there opposing the suggested action, and I certainly understood that I had the unanimous approval of the Committee, after going into the matter very fully. As to the Halifax Convention, I was not there, but the department was represented by the superintendent of fisheries, Mr. Found. He says this matter was not discussed at all; the discussion there was about the regulations with regard to the fishing of lobsters. If my memory serves me right, and I have a fairly good memory in regard to past events, the Fisheries Committee gave me their unanimous approval.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I question very much if any resolution was passed on the subject by the Fisheries Committee.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) was present and I regret very much he is not here to-night.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The attitude of the Fisheries Committee was quite different before the minister did them the honour of conferring with them, and if they had been allowed to pass a resolution on the subject it would certainly have been in opposition to what the minister has done. My point is that after the meeting in Halifax the Fisheries Committee should have been called together and the members from the Maritime Provinces consulted before the minister took the step he did. However, the minister ignored those members altogether and acted on his previous advice. I have no doubt the members of the committee were too polite to say very much to the minister when he was making his statement before them. However, I do not think he obtained any resolution of approval from them. The matter was left in abeyance at the time in the anticipation that a meeting of the fishing interests in the Maritime Provinces would be called to decide it. As no proper decision was arrived at when that meeting took place, it was up to the minister to call the Fisheries Committee together again and give them a chance to have something to say on this important question.

Mr. TURGEON: I concur in what my hon. friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) has said with respect to the disappearance of the lobster hatcheries. The lobster hatchery at Shippigan, in my county, has been sold. Now I took great interest in my early years in Parliament, together with Professor Prince, in the operation of lobster hatcheries. I believe to-day that Professor Prince was right in his views as to the value of these hatcheries, and that it was a bad policy to do away with them. I had expected that at the close of the last session of Parliament, according to the understanding of the Fisheries Committee, some offi-

cial would visit my county in reference to this matter. However, no one came to the county of Gloucester, but nevertheless the lobster hatchery there has been sold, and I presume for a song.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The amount paid for it was $610.

Mr. TURGEON: That is about twenty-five per cent of what it is worth to anybody who wants such an establishment along the shore. May I ask who was the purchaser?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: W. S. Loggie, Limited.

Mr. TURGEON: The firm got a good bargain that time. Now what are we going to do in regard to the propagation of lobster?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not an authority on lobster propagation. It is purely a scientific question, not a business one, and the biological board is composed of the brightest scientific men we could get throughout Canada, including Professor Prince. That board recommended to the Minister of Fisheries that it was in the interest of the lobster industry to close the hatcheries. I did not take scientific advice merely, but sought information elsewhere, and the matter was thoroughly threshed out before the Fisheries Committee. I did not know that the Committee paid me such deference that they would not express their opinions freely if I happened to be present at their meetings. I appreciate the honour, but I hope that in future when I attend their meetings they will have no hesitancy whatever in expressing their minds frankly. If all the members of that Committee remained silent on this question a year ago when I was present at their meeting, I cannot be blamed for taking that as consenting to what was proposed. As far as I can tell the move is a wise one and in the interests of the lobster industry, but it is purely a scientific question, and I would not attempt to offer any opinion on it myself.

Mr. TURGEON: May I be permitted to proffer advice which I believe to be sound. The lobster hatcheries along our shores have disappeared, and there are now only two measures left for the maintenance of that fishery—maintenance of the close season and limitation of the size of lobsters taken. The close season may have served somewhat in the past, but really the maintenance of the size of the lobsters is the only salvation for the industry in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: And the protection of the berried lobster as well.

Mr. TURGEON: Last year, or two years ago, the Minister of Fisheries abolished the regulation as to the size of the lobster that could be caught and any lobsters at all were allowed to be brought in. It is pretty difficult to enforce such a regulation, and the only way is to make the packer himself responsible for the size of every lobster he buys—whether he buys from independent fishermen or whether he takes the catch of fishermen who work for him by the day. The packer ought to be made responsible for every lobster that goes into his boiler. It is better to spend a few dollars in that way, and have the guardians look carefully into the character of the lobster pack at each factory, than to adopt regulations which would not be enforced. I do not wish to indulge in any lengthy observations at this late hour of the evening, but I repeat that the only salvation for the lobster industry in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is to maintain the size of the lobsters. For the last twenty-five years they have not been allowed to grow in those waters. In the case of the Bay of Fundy districts the lobsters must be nine and a half or ten inches in size to find a market in the United States, and owing to that requirement their size has been maintained, notwithstanding the immense amount of lobster fishing that is done there.

We were told that our fishermen and packers would not be allowed to take small lobsters so that in a few years big lobsters would be again plentiful. I have always contended that under the conditions prevailing during the last ten years we should have stopped taking lobsters from the gulf of St. Lawrence for two or three years at least, and should have divided the district into two portions so that the fishing would not be too much interrupted. I submit those considerations to the minister, and I believe he will find that they are sound and ought to be put into practice.

Mr. COPP: I do not think my hon. friend from Gloucester has been quite fair to the packers, because he must realize that in the Maritime Provinces at least, if not all over Canada, the lobster packers have been only putting three-quarters of a pound of lobster in a pound can, and in that way have been conserving the lobster.

I do not know which of these items contains the expenses of conducting fishery investigations, but I have in my hand a very valuable report on the lobster fisheries,

and I want to draw the attention of the Committee to it. I find one clause in it in regard to the canning of lobsters in the province of New Brunswick. It is stated that there are 660 shippers in various parts of the province, and that their output amounted to 195,993 cases of 48 pounds each. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there is only 36 pounds in a case of lobsters, and I contend that this report is absolutely wrong and misleading to the public when it states the measure of the amount of lobsters taken in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. McKENZIE: Item 230, development of deep sea fisheries, was allowed to stand. Some hon. gentlemen who are not in the House to-night wish to discuss various fishery matters, and therefore I would not wish the minister to be in any particular hurry about bringing this up for some days. I have in mind that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) will be away for ten days or so.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is no hon. member that I would like to oblige so much as the hon. member for Lunenburg, but owing to the amount of business that remains to be transacted—and we all hope the House will prorogue by the end of June —I could not promise to leave this item to stand over for ten days. I would like to finish it to-morrow.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CANADIAN WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 45, to incorporate the Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association.—Mr. Sheard.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand that section 11 of the Bill was struck out by the Senate?

Mr. SHEARD: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: And that the other changes made are immaterial?

Mr. SHEARD: Yes. One provides for the change of office being published in the Canada Gazette, and another for the insertion of the word 'Canada' in one or two places.

Amendments concurred in.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Wednesday, May 28, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Trade of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1918; Annual Report of the Department of Labour; Report of the War Trade Board—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

POST OFFICE STATISTICS.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many post offices are established in Montreal City? (a) Head office. (b) Postal stations. (c) Sub-post offices. (d) On any other basis?
2. What pay is allowed the last named office, and why are they not classed as sub-post offices and paid accordingly?
3. How many post offices are there established at Toronto? (a) Head office. (b) Postal stations. (c) Sub-post offices. (d) Any other basis?
4. At Montreal, why is an allowance of $80 granted for rent at the St. Jean Baptiste de Montreal office?
5. Is this a sub-post office? If not, why?
6. Is the district in which this post office is situated served by letter carrier?
7. Are any of the sub-postmasters at Winnipeg, Vancouver, Hamilton, Toronto, allowed any compensation for heat, rent, light, etc.?
8. Are all sub-post offices supposed to be conducted on same basis as to rates of pay, etc., or is there one set of regulations for one part of Canada and another set of regulations observed in their branch for another part of Canada?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. (a) Head office 1; (b) Postal stations 13; (c) Sub-post offices 91; (d) On other basis 4.

2. Offices on other basis:

Verdun post office is run by one clerk from the Montreal post office and an appointed Postmaster with salary at the rate of $1,400. By order of the Acting Postmaster General, April 1, 1918.

Hochelaga:

Salary, $600; Box rent commission, $48. By order of the Postmaster General, April 1, 1877. The post office is a Government building.

St. Henri de Montreal:

Salary $2,500, out of which the Postmaster pays two clerks $500 each. The post office is a Government building. By order of the Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, in February, 1912.

Westmount:

Salary $4,000, out of which the Postmaster pays three clerks $2,040. The post office is a Government building. By order of the Postmaster General, June 1, 1918.

3. (a) Head office 1; (b) Postal stations 9; (c) Sub-offices 110; (d) On other basis, Nil.

4. The post office at St. Jean Baptiste de Montreal was made a sub-post office on May 18, 1918, and the rent allowance of $80 a year was discontinued from that date.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Yes.

7. No.

8. All sub-post offices are supposed to be conducted on the basis as to rates of pay, etc.

REGIMENTAL FUNDS BOARD.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

*1. Is there a Regimental Funds Board under the control of the Government?

2. If so, what are the functions of this Board?

3. Who are the members of said Board?

4. When was it created?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes; one in Canada and one in England.

2. Regimental Funds Board in Canada—(a) To deal with all questions relating to regimental funds referred from the Overseas military forces for adjustment in Canada; (b) All questions concerning canteen or other regimental funds arising in Canada; (c) The final adjustment of all regimental funds on the final demobilization of units, the approval of trustees and trust agreements; (d) The supervision, and audit, if necessary, of all regimental funds in hands of trustees. 3. Lt.-Colonel J. H. Kaye, Lt.-Colonel G. F. McFarland, Captain F. W. Campbell. 4. January 16, 1919. Regimental Funds Board in England—2. To supervise and report upon all funds and regimental property of units in United Kingdom, and arrange for transfer of assets or absorbed and depleted units to local trustees of the unit and their dependents, or where no trustees were appointed, to the Paymaster General, Overseas Military Forces of Canada, in trust for transfer to such authority in Canada as might be specified by the Department of Militia and Defence.

3. On the date of formation of the board as follows: President, Colonel R. M. Dennistoun, Judge Advocate General. Members: Lt.-Colonel R. I. Towers, 70th Battalion; Lt.-Colonel D. R. Street, 77th Battalion; Captain R. R. Pattinson, Department of General Auditor, (Secretary). No information as to any change from the above is available at present.

4. January 31, 1917.

TAXATION OF COLD STORAGE WAREHOUSE COMPANIES.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

*1. What sum has the Government collected from cold storage warehouse companies since the Order in Council limiting the profits of the said companies to 11 per cent has been passed?

2. What amounts have been collected from each one of said companies, and what are the dates when said amounts were collected?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1 and 2. Persons, firms and incorporated companies engaged in the slaughtering of live stock or the manufacture of products therefrom liable to taxation under the Order in Council of 9th March, 1918, are assessable for all profits in excess of 15 per cent upon capital and one-half profits in excess of 7 per cent up to 15 per cent upon such capital. Regulations under the said Order in Council were in effect from 1st January, 1918. The Commissioner of Taxation has been engaged in investigating the business and accounts of all persons, firms and incorporated companies who might be liable to assessment under the Order in Council. These investigations are not completed, but so far as they have proceeded they do not disclose profits in excess of the amount exempted by the Order in Council. Many firms and companies engaged in the business concerned, sustained heavy losses during 1918 calendar year, which year was most unfavourable to the packing industry.

ENLISTMENTS IN CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

*1. How many men belonging to the United States enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force: (a) of English origin; (b) of French origin?

2. Were the said enlistments registered separately, or numerically credited to the different provinces? If so, how many, and to which provinces?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. 33,335. No distinction was made between French and English. Recruits were obtained simply as British subjects.

2. Recruits were sent to nearest military district from the place of recruitment.

	Accepted.	Rejected.
Ontario—		
M. D. 1..	2,163 +	228
" 2..	12,342 +	804
" 3..	791	

	Accepted.	Rejected.
Quebec—		
M. D. 4..	5,049 +	314
M. D. 6..	212 +	11
Nova Scotia—		
M.D. 6..	212 +	11
New Brunswick—		
M. D. 7..	1,362 +	46
Manitoba—		
M.D. 10..	2,672 +	393
British Columbia—		
M.D. 11..	3,538 +	228
Alberta—		
M.D. 13..	382 +	6
	29,275	+2,038= 31,313

The 2,022 unaccounted for by districts include recruits who transferred on arrival to Imperial units (Inland Water Transport, Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, etc.), and those who joined other units than the ones to which they were sent.

HULL INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

*1. Who was the Commissioner appointed to hold an investigation concerning the Hull industrial dispute, during the current month of May?

2. When was the said Commissioner appointed, and what salary is he being paid therefor by the Government?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. There have been two industrial disputes in Hull during the current month of May, as follows:

(a) Hull Electric Railway and its employees, being street and electric railway workers, and the board being constituted as follows: Chairman, Mr. D'Arcy Scott, K.C., Mr. George D. Kelley, and Mr. F. Bancroft.

(b) The Hull corporation and its employees being firemen. In this case the Minister of Labour claims jurisdiction under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, only with the concurrence of the employer concerned, and the employer having granted concurrence, a board was established, Messrs. Archambault, Mayor of Hull, and Pat Green, Ottawa, being appointed as for corporation and employees respectively. Messrs. Archambault and Green being unable to secure a chairman by agreement, the minister, acting under section 8, paragraph 4, appointed the Honourable Mr. Justice F. S. Maclennan, of Montreal, of the Superior Court of Quebec, to the chairmanship. The board was called to meet on Thursday, May 22. Before the board met Mayor Archambault resigned on the ground that the chairman was not French-speaking and belonged to the district of Montreal, rather than the district of Hull. The Registrar requested the City Council to nominate a substitute for Mayor Archambault and the City Council recommended the reappointment of Mayor Archambault. Mayor Archambault was accordingly reappointed. Judge Maclennan notified the Registrar also that court engagements would preclude his continuing to act as chairman. Messrs. Archambault and Green have been instructed, under section 8, paragraph 3, to confer, looking to a recommendation for a third member, who will be chairman. No report has been received.

2. No salary is paid any members of Boards of Conciliation and Investigation, but each member receives the fees payable under the Industrial Disputes Act, section 51, as amended, namely, twenty dollars per day for each day when conducting the inquiry.

HON. MR. JUSTICE MACLENNAN.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has His Honour Judge McLennan, acting as Chairman of the Board of Industrial Disputes in connection with the dispute between the Canadian Express Company and its employees, been paid his fees and expenses therefor, by the Government?

2. If so, on what date and for what amount?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 The Honourable Mr. Justice F. S. Maclennan acting as chairman of the Board of Appeal which dealt with a dispute between the Canadian Express Company and its employees has been paid his fees and expenses therefor.

2. April 14, $50.61.

INSPECTORS AND ASSESSORS IN INCOME TAX OFFICE, MONTREAL.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many deputy inspectors have been appointed, under the Income War Tax Act, in Montreal?

2. What are their names and salaries?

3. Under whose recommendation were they appointed?

4. Have any returned soldiers been appointed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1 and 2. None. The following inspectors and assessors are employed in the Dominion Income Tax Office at Montreal:

Name.	Salary per month.
P. F. McCaffery, inspector	$300 00
A. Labbe, inspector	250 00
Geo. C. Leroux, chief assessor	250 00
A. H. Rowland, asst. chief assessor	233 33
J. B. Kreps, assessor	200 00
J. L. Frigon, assessor	200 00

Name.	Salary per month.
A. G. Foot, assessor	$150 00
J. A. Archambault, assessor	150 00
R. L. Warden, assessor	150 00
E. Robitaille, assessor	150 00
Jas. Barclay, assessor	166 66
H. E. Smith, assessor	166 66
Leo. Duquet, assessor	133 33
T. H. Carbray, assessor	133 33
James Dunlop, assessor	133 33
H. Pearson, assessor	125 00
J. O'Keefe, assessor	100 00

3. Inspectors were appointed on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Taxation. Assessors were appointed on the recommendation of Inspector McCaffery endorsed by the Commissioner of Taxation.

4. Yes.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many applications for divorce Bills have been received since Confederation?
2. How many divorce Bills have been passed during the same period?
3. How many applications for divorce Bills have been received during the present Session?
4. How many divorce Bills have been passed during the present Session?
5. Have fees been remitted in connection with same?
6. If so, in how many cases?

COAL FOR CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

Mr. J. H. MACKIE moved:

For a return showing the tenders received for coal for the Canadian Northern Railway and Canadian National Railways, between 1st January, 1918, and 1st April, 1919, also a statement showing the tenders accepted during the same period, along with a statement of all tenders for coal (a) received, and (b) accepted, by the Grand Trunk Pacific since that road passed into the hands of a receiver.

Hon. J. D. REID: I mentioned to the hon. member (Mr. J. C. Mackie) that I could not agree to this motion going through in its present form It includes a return relating to a private company.

Mr. J. H. MACKIE: May I ask the permission of the House to amend that notice of motion so as to drop out the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway? The motion will then be for a return as to all tenders affecting the Canadian National Railways and excepting the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the amendment is to eliminate the Grand Trunk Pacific? The hon. member can put his amendment in proper form by to-morrow.

Motion allowed to stand.

[Sir Thomas White.]

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of all correspondence since 1911 between this Government and the Government of Nova Scotia, relating to the licensing of bonded warehouses for the storage of intoxicating liquor.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, resolutions and other documents in the possession of the Government relating to the establishment of abattoir and cold storage facilities at Halifax, N.S.

INQUIRY ABOUT THE FRANCHISE BILL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon and Chateauguay): Mr. Speaker, may I direct the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) to the speech from the Throne delivered during his absence in which considerable prominence was given to the question of a new Franchise Bill. We were then promised a Bill to amend the Franchise Act. We have now been in session for three months but the Franchise Bill has not yet been brought down. Might I ask the Prime Minister when we may expect the Franchise Bill and when the five constituencies which are now without representation in this House will have an opportunity of electing members?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In regard to the latter question I believe that the answer has already been given by my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White). In so far as the first question is concerned I cannot give my hon. friend (Mr. Robb) a definite answer to-day. Some papers connected with the Franchise Bill were placed before me last evening, or this morning, but I really have been quite unable even to look at them. I imagine they will require something more than a mere cursory examination. If my hon. friend will let the matter stand for to-day, I shall endeavour to give him his answer at as early a date as may be reasonably possible.

DESTRUCTION OF FOOD—COLD STORAGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I am informed that the following quantities of food were confiscated and destroyed in Montreal during the last four months:

Beef	7,908	pounds.
Veal	10,539	"
Mutton	12,750	"
Pork	7,125	"
Fowl	607	"
Fish	48,216	"
Various meats	5,049	"
Vegetables	2,484	"
Other foods	2,766	"
Ice	203	tons.

In view of that statement is it not the intention of the Government to nationalize the cold storage establishments in the country so as to decrease the very high cost of living?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend will realize that he ought to put a question of that character on the Order Paper.

CONTRACT BETWEEN CANADA AND GREECE FOR SUPPLY OF WHEAT.

Mr. ROBB: The Montreal Gazette of this morning contains a special cable despatch from its London correspondent which reads as follows:

> London, May 25.—A contract has been signed between the Canadian and Grecian Government for the supply of 25,000,000 tons of wheat to Greece to be transported in Greek tonnage by the London shipping firm of M. Embiricos. Ten vessels of five thousand tons are en route, and during the summer months will mostly call at Montreal.

I would like to inquire from the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) or the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), how much of this statement is correct. It is quite apparent that it is not entirely correct inasmuch as it represents more wheat than we would have to export for three or four years. I think it is important that a statement should be made as to how much of this information is correct and whether it is the policy of the Government to give precedence to the sale of wheat rather than the products of wheat.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Negotiations have been proceeding for the disposal of some wheat to the Greek Government but we have no official intimation up to the present time that any contract has been signed. Pending any definite information on that subject, I am unable to give a reply of the character which my hon. friend (Mr. Robb) would desire. I may say, however, that the efforts of the Government have been directed towards the exportation of wheat products in the form which he mentioned. It is not always possible, in negotiations that are being carried on, to accomplish that to the fullest extent desired. I am not quite sure whether any portion of this is to go in the form of flour or whether the whole of it is to go in the form of wheat.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I might add to what the Prime Minister has said that the amount involved is about a million bushels a month which will run to an aggregate of 12,000,000 bushels and cover a period of twelve months.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask how the prices are fixed in these deals?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The price will be the price in Canada at Port Arthur or Fort William, plus carrying charges to the seaboard and upon the ship. The Greek Government have been desirous of furnishing its people with the best possible flour. and they therefore desired to obtain a quantity of Canadian wheat. The matter was most carefully considered by the Government with those interested in the sale of our wheat, especially wheat of this year's crop, and it was thought desirable in the national interest that the wishes of the Greek Government should be met, with the result that some twelve or fifteen million bushels of wheat will be sold. About three million bushels of that will be of this year's exportable surplus; the balance will be of the coming year's crop. I may say that the Government considered it desirable that no effort should be spared to furnish as far as possible a market for the entire exportable surplus of this year's wheat crop, including, of course, " wheat " flour, which is a product of wheat.

Mr. ROBB: If I may trespass again, does this apply to the raw material, or will the Greek Government take flour?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This applies to wheat, because the Greek Government wants wheat. The policy of the Government, as I explained to my hon. friend when the deputation waited upon us not very long ago, has been, to the utmost extent possible, to promote the sale of Canadian wheat in the form of flour. But obviously it cannot all be exported in that form, and the Dominion Government would not feel justified in missing the advantage of a sale such as this, with its ultimate beneficial consequences, by reason of the fact that the Greek Government desires to make this purchase in the form of wheat.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it financed by the Canadian Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No; by the Greek Government from outside funds.

LABOUR UNREST IN CANADA.

THE SITUATION IN THE WEST.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Is the Government in a position to make a statement in regard to the strikes in Western Canada?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Labour): There is nothing further to convey to the House respecting the Winnipeg strike situation. What little news has been received by the Government since yesterday has been of a reassuring nature. The only change which has taken place—which, perhaps, I might mention—is that the railway mail clerks of the Winnipeg Division are out on strike. There is nothing particular to report concerning conditions at Edmonton. A general strike was ordered and is now effective; but it would appear that no very large number of men have responded to the order. At Calgary strike conditions prevail, there being about six or eight different classes of trades out. The postal clerks at Calgary are out in sympathy with the strike, but at Edmonton they are still in the service. At Vancouver a general strike vote has been or is being taken, but we have received no official information as to the result.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: What about the threatened strike at Toronto?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): A delegation from the city representing both employers and employees, together with the Mayor and the President of the Board of Trade, are to arrive here to-morrow morning for a conference.

HIGH COST OF LIVING AND MINIMUM WAGE.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. A. K. Maclean) what is the weekly budget for the average Canadian family as found by the latest report of the Department of Labour; and what is the minimum weekly wage to correspond with that weekly minimum budget?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): I could not answer my hon. friend's question. I may be able to do so at the close of the session to-day possibly, or Friday.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. SPEAKER: That question should properly go upon the Order Paper. From its nature the hon. member could not expect to have it answered off-hand.

GENERAL CONFERENCE SUGGESTED TO SETTLE LABOUR DISPUTES.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Leader of the Opposition): Might I take the liberty of suggesting to the Prime Minister that the Government would be well advised to take into consideration the calling of a general conference of all the parties concerned in connection with the various strikes that are now proceeding throughout the country? Such a conference here in Ottawa might have the effect of allaying the general unrest now prevailing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall, of course, give very attentive consideration to the suggestion which my hon. friend has made. If possible it would be most desirable to have the Minister of Labour (Hon. Gideon Robertson) here if any such conference should be called. He is at present doing his best to bring about an adjustment of the strike at Winnipeg. I shall give the suggestion full consideration and communicate with him.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): In connection with the same matter, in answer to my friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) who yesterday asked what was the attitude of the Government in regard to "collective bargaining," the right hon. the Prime Minister said that there were many definitions of this term, and if given a certain interpretation the result would be rather unfortunate. May I ask the Government whether there is some system of collective bargaining with which the Government is in sympathy; and if so, what is that system?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As I explained yesterday—possibly my hon. friend was not present—we are awaiting the report of the Industrial Commission, which no doubt will take this question into consideration. I should not desire to anticipate that report by making any such announcement as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. CAHILL: Would it not be possible for the Government to get that commission to report at an earlier date than was mentioned yesterday, viz. the 15th of June? In view of the dangerous condition of the country as the result of the many strikes

in operation and threatened, I believe an early report by that commission is of the utmost importance.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know whether it is possible for the commission to report at an earlier date or not. I believe they have been very actively engaged. Indeed, they might reach the conclusion that they are, after all, getting on as fast as the House is.

Mr. CAHILL: As fast as the Government is?

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

RE-CLASSIFICATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Macelan (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution. Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Civil Service Act, 1918, and therein to provide:—

1. That the Civil Service Commission shall consist of not more than five members appointed by the Governor in Council: Provided, however, that after the expiration of three years from the first day of April, one thousan nine hundred and nineteen, no person shall be appointed a Commissioner until the number of members of the Commission is reduced to less than three, and after such reduction the number of members of the Commission shall not exceed three.

2. That the Chairman of the Commission shall be paid a salary of seven thousand dollars, and each of the other Commissioners six thousand dollars; such salaries to be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

3. That the provisions of the said Act relating to temporary employment, dismissals, resignations, hours of attendance, annual reports, regulations, examinations, classification, appointments, promotions, transfers and compensation be amended, and that provision be made for re-classifying the Civil Service and for any additional expense which may result from such re-classification.

Mr. MANION: Last year when the Civil Service Commission was being appointed, the hon. member for Muskoka and myself took up with the Prime Minister the question of appointing a returned soldier as a member of the commission. I believe the Prime Minister gave us to understand that the suggestion would be favourably considered this year. I should like to ask the hon. minister if it is the intention of the Government to give effect to our suggestion?

Mr. LEMIEUX: On the same line as the question put by my hon. friend, I suggested last year when the minister introduced his Bill that a woman should be appointed to the commission; first of all in view of the large number of women who are in the Civil Service; and, second, in view of the fact that we have now given the suffrage to women. Under these circumstances they ought to be represented on that commission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should not like to give a definite answer to the questions put by the member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) and the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). We are taking the authority to increase the number of the Commissioners by two, and it naturally follows that there is no reason why one returned man should not be placed on the commission. However, I do not like to anticipate the action of the Government by saying any more than that. I assure my hon. friend (Mr. Manion) that every consideration will be given to the suggestion which he puts forward and which was urged very strongly and repeatedly during the last session of Parliament. Perhaps later, during the course of the passage of the Bill, I shall be in a position to make a more definite announcement.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about my question?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot answer my hon. friend's question; I do not like to anticipate the action of the Government in the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As to the principle, does not my hon. friend see eye to eye with me?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I assent to the principle that women are entitled to the suffrage and to fill any position that they are capable of filling. I cannot say, however, whether I am in favour of the appointment of a woman to the Civil Service Commission and at the moment I do not propose to bind the Government or myself in that matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not even for the time being?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This is a time when the Government ought to practise economy. I do not see any reason why there should be an increase in the number of Commissioners. The minister accepts the principle that it is better to have three Commissioners than five, because he provides that after a couple of years no new appointment shall be made until the number of Commissioners has been reduced to three. Why should we incur the expense involved in the appointment of two new

Commissioners when three are sufficient to do the work?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The principle of enlarging the commission may be right or may be wrong; it will be for Parliament to settle that question. At the present time the commission is an exceedingly busy organization and the view is held by many that they cannot possibly do justice to the great volume of work that is before them from day to day. During the reconstruction period it may fairly be held that the commission should be enlarged by the addition of further members. The Bill will provide that the number will automatically revert to three. I will read the section which will appear in the Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not know whether the minister has already explained the reasons for the introduction of this resolution and of the Bill which is to be founded upon it. If he has not, would he be good enough to do so, and to state also whether it has anything to do with the reclassification that has been in progress for some months, so that we may understand what we are talking about?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I propose, with the permission of the House, to advance this Order to-day to the extent of having the resolution adopted. I shall not move the first reading of the Bill to-day, because what are known as the classification schedules are not yet fully printed. I hope that some time during the next week they will be available and that when I move the first reading of the Bill I shall be able to place on the Table, and possibly in the hands of hon. members, the printed classification schedules. I do not wish, therefore, to make any extended explanation of the Bill this afternoon, if I can avoid doing so. However, I desire to say just a few words.

Mr. MURPHY: So that the reclassification will be under discussion at the same time as the new Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. Hon. gentlemen will remember that under the Civil Service Act of last year the commissioners were directed to reclassify the service. Since last August, experts employed by the commission have been engaged in that work. As I have already stated in the House during this session, the task was a stupendous one; otherwise the reclassification would have been submitted to the House long before this. I assure hon. gentlemen that it involved a great deal of work, but satisfactory progress has been made and the work is about completed; in fact, the actual classification has been completed—the delay is in the printing. The classification involves the arrangement of the whole Civil Service, outside and inside, into classes. For instance, there is a clerical service, which will be common to a great many of the departments; the clerical force is found in almost every department. To-day the clerical staff of the Department of Public Works, for instance, may be paid on an entirely different rating from that which applies to the clerical services in other departments. The scheme of reclassification will put all the clerical staff into one service; the members of that service will be paid according to their duties and responsibilities and there will be no variation in the salaries throughout Canada. The postal service is a service by itself, because everybody engaged in the postal work belongs to the postal service. There may, however, be a clerical staff in the post office which will become part of the clerical service.

I should like to give to the Committee a definition of some of the new terms which will be imported into the Bill ratifying the classification. The word "position," which will be used frequently, is understood to mean "one specific office or employment occupied normally by one person." For example, a man may have the position of delivering letters, or taking dictation, or driving an automobile; his position is defined.

The word "class" will be used also in the reclassification and in the amending Bill. "Class" is understood to include all those positions, employments, or offices the duties and responsibilities of whose incumbents and the qualifications required and demanded of applicants therefor are sufficiently alike to be given the same denomination or title. In the Department of Railways and Canals, the Department of Public Works and the Department of Marine and Fisheries we have persons engaged in marine work; regardless of the department they are employed in, they will come within the class of marine workers.

Mr. MURPHY: Engineers the same way?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is an engineering division. "Service" is understood to mean an aggregation of classes having similar functions. For instance, all the clerical staff, wherever found, inside or outside, regardless of department, belong to the clerical service. The classification will disclose the following services.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before my hon. friend proceeds, may I inquire what is the name and location of the firm that made the re-classification, what are the names of the classifiers, and are there any Canadians among them?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The work of re-classification was carried on by the Civil Service Commission who employed certain people to do it. The principal assistants were furnished by the firm of Arthur Young and Company who are engaged solely in the work of classifying and organizing civil services.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of Chicago?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Their main office is in Chicago, but they have offices in other large cities, including, I think, an office in Toronto. They furnished the Civil Service Commission with a certain number of experts and some Canadians were engaged in the work.

Mr. DEVLIN: What firm in Chicago would know about the working out of the Civil Service system of Canada?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see why a firm in Chicago would not be able to do the work just as well as a firm in Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN: Then why not give the preference to a firm in Canada?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think there is in Canada any person or firm that has ever given any attention to this class of work.

Mr. DEVLIN: Are these people not accountants solely?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, they are not accountants. Their attention is devoted entirely to work of this character, and they are now being and have been employed by many States and cities of the United States of America.

Mr. DEVLIN: As a matter of fact, is it not true that the heads of the department did the work of re-classification?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, they had nothing to do with it other than to give information when asked for it.

Mr. EDWARDS: Was not Mr. P. D. Ross available for this work?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: His services were not sought by the commission.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who is Mr. P. D. Ross?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the remuneration.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot inform the hon. member as to the exact remuneration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How much per day?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot give the information. The firm of Arthur Young and Company engaged by the Civil Service Commission, was a very able body of men who knew their work well, and it matters little to me what country they are citizens of so long as they are capable of doing this particular work. I think it will be found, when the whole matter is submitted to the House and thoroughly understood, that they were very capable men.

Mr. EDWARDS: What is the rate of pay of this American firm; how many are included in their staff, and how much is the staff paid ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend that information to-day. I would hardly be expected to carry that around with me, because there is no particular reason why I should know it. This Parliament authorized the Civil Service Commission to carry on this work, and the commission secured the services of this firm without consulting the Government at all. I shall, however, later on inform the House as to the probable cost of this work.

Mr. HOCKEN: Have certain departmental officials found it necessary to revise the classifications made by this firm?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That question might be answered "yes and no." When the report is fully completed, the Civil Service Commission and the experts who are assisting them, do not expect the report to be without error. There are 60,000 positions in Canada which are being classified, and the classification schedules will occupy between six and seven hundred pages. There will be some 1,600 or 1,700 classes of positions classified in the service, and it would be almost too much to expect that such work would be absolutely free from error; in fact, the commissioners would be well satisfied it they did not find greater error than from five to ten per cent. From time to time the commission have consulted different members of the Civil service, sometimes a deputy minister, sometimes another departmental official. This was necessary, and I have no doubt that, from time to time, they secured from such persons valuable information which would induce them to revise a preconceived idea as to classification of any particular service.

Mr. HOCKEN: All of this leads one to wonder whether a commission of experts composed of our own officials would not have done the work better than this imported commission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not of that view, and I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend. We shall be in a better position to judge of that when the schedules are printed and in the hands of hon. members. My opinion is that when the report is studied it will be the judgment of hon. members that the work has been well done and that it will ultimately prove to be in the public interest.

Mr. DEVLIN: Without wishing to be too persistent about the gentlemen who came from Chicago to revise the whole Civil Service system, I should like to know who recommended them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Civil Service Commission obtained the services of these men. They went out looking for men capable of doing this work; they could not obtain such services in Canada, and they took the best means they could of obtaining the names of some concerns outside which might do the work.

Mr. DEVLIN: Then I understand the Civil Service Commission themselves, without the recommendation of anybody, engaged these accountants or others in the city of Chicago?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is true.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Thus trading and trucking with the Yankees.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would be unsatisfactory to the Committee and also to myself if I were to endeavour this afternoon to give an explanation of the classification without the schedules before me. I hope, therefore, the Committee will be good enough to permit progress to be made with the resolution, and when I move the first reading of the Bill I purpose giving as full an explanation as possible.

I should like, however, to give an illustration of what classification means. For instance, I have in my hand what will be a page of the classification schedule. This contains three schedules, and to give the Committee an idea of what a schedule actually means, I will read it. The schedules are headed "Junior Forward Sorter," "Box Collectors," and "Postal Labourer." These are three positions in the postal service. It is the position which is classified, and not the individual. The responsibilities and duties of the position are first set forth,

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is nothing new there.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When I move the first reading of the Bill I think I shall be able to point out cases in the Canadian public service where men are receiving at least one hundred per cent more than they should for the class of work they are doing. In other cases civil servants are underpaid for the class of work they are doing. I have read this schedule merely to give hon. gentlemen an idea of what a classification schedule means. The duties of a Junior Forward Sorter are set forth as follows:

> Examples: Facing and sorting letters for the cancelling machine and hand stamper; revising and tying sorted letters; opening, closing, and labelling mail bags; checking amounts of postage on mail matter; sorting letters for forwarding in one or more easy frames; sorting newspapers for forwarding.

From this the incumbent of the office can see what are the duties of his position. Heretofore, the duties pertaining to positions in the public service have not been defined except in a very casual way, and have varied according to the departments.

The schedule also states the qualifications for the position, which in this case are as follows:

> At least public school education; good physical condition and a good memory; quickness of hand and eye.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Public school qualifications?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: For this particular position of Junior Forward Sorter, the intention hereafter, and this will be provided for in the Bill, is that candidates for positions in the Civil Service shall be examined merely in respect of the duties of the office which they are seeking, instead of undergoing a general examination on matters which really do not relate to the duties of the office.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is well enough in its way, but will there have to be another examination in the case of promotion to a position requiring higher educational attainments?

Mr. A. K. McKENZIE: There would be another examination in respect of the work to be done in the new position to which the man seeks to be promoted. The schedule also sets forth the principal lines of promotion, so that a person on entering the service in any position may know

what lines of promotion are open to him. Of course, it does not follow that the official will necessarily be promoted, because promotion will depend upon his record and efficiency. It was the judgment of the Civil Service Commission, however, that the lines of promotion should be stated in the schedule so that the incumbent of any office might know what other positions in the public service he might aspire to.

Mr. DEVLIN: Did I understand the minister to say when speaking on the Post Office Department that some officials of that department were receiving one hundred per cent more than they should be receiving?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, I did not say that.

Mr. DEVLIN: I think so.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am certain I did not say that. I said that if I deemed it necessary or wise to do so, I could indicate some positions in the public service of Canada where the incumbent was receiving one hundred per cent more for the work he performed than the work was worth. The principal lines of promotion for junior forward sorter are as follows:

To perform, under supervision, simple tasks in connection with the forwarding of mail in a large post office and other related work as assigned.

To: Forward Sorter, Directory Clerk, General Registration Clerk, Money Order Clerk, Registration Clerk, Registration and Money Order Clerk.

I think it is an excellent plan to have inserted in the schedules the principal lines of promotion open to anybody in the Civil Service. The schedule finally states the compensation, under monthly and annual heads. The commission have examined fairly well all the civil positions in the public service of this country, and have classified the duties and responsibilities and qualifications of each class of positions. I do not think it is necessary for me to give any more examples.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does the report of this new commission differ materially from the report of Sir George Murray?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My recollection is that the report of Sir George Murray was a general report on the conditions in the Civil Service of Canada. This new report has to do entirely with the re-classification of the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Murray report was discarded, if I mistake not.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did I understand the minister to say that the classification has been completed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am curious to know what the minister is going to do when the report of the Special Committee inquiring into the manning of the Civil Service is presented. As this new classification is going to be confirmed by an Act of Parliament, does it not seem to the minister, labour in vain for this Special Committee to be toiling every day reconstructing what has already been reconstructed? I would like to know what the minister thinks this Special Committee is doing, and what the result will be when their report is presented.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I really cannot tell my hon. friend what I think the Committee is doing, because I am not a member of it, and I should not like to make a guess. The Committee were directed to inquire into the question of whether or not the service was overloaded, and not to make a classification of the service. The reference to the Special Committee was of a more general character. I do not think there will be any conflict whatever between the two reports.

Mr. CAHILL: What have been the salaries of the commissioners up to this time?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Chairman $6,000, and the Commissioners $5,000.

Mr. CAHILL: In view of the fact that there is now a Special Committee of this House investigating whether the service is overmanned, and the further fact that the service has now practically been reclassified, having regard also to conditions generally throughout the country and the dissatisfaction with a lot of appointments made, on what ground do the commission justify the appointment of two other commissioners to undertake work that has already been done? The Special Committee may report in favour of reducing the number of civil servants. Upon what ground does the minister base his opinion that there is going to be a large increase in the Civil Service of this country in the next two years?

It seems to me that this is entirely uncalled for. Instead of increasing the salaries of these commissioners, if they are not satisfied and are not able to get along with a salary of five or six thousand dollars

a year, the Government might be able to get other very estimable gentlemen who would accept the position at the present remuneration. There are doubtless many returned men in Canada that are perfectly competent to fill these positions, and would be glad to accept a stipend of $5,000 a year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The salaries of deputy ministers were recently fixed at $6,000, and it was felt that the members of the Civil Service Commission occupy a position in the service analogous to that of a deputy minister. Let me point out that the duties of the Civil Service Commission will not terminate because the re-classification has been completed. The members of that commission could not have carried out that re-classification because their time is fully occupied with other duties, and on the first reading of the Bill to amend the Civil Service Act I propose indicating to the House in some manner the many duties which they have to perform. During the last twelve months a tremendous amount of work has been placed upon the commission, and the putting under their administration of practically the whole Outside Service has imposed an enormous additional burden on them. Furthermore, after the re-classification is adopted by Parliament the service must be fitted into it, which will be no slight task; also the Civil Service Act of last session directed a reorganization of the departments, involving additional duties. Again the placing of returned men in public positions in this country means additional work for the commission, because a preference is being extended to those men. With the permission of the House I will read a clause which will appear in the Bill covering this extension of the personnel of the commission.

There shall be a commission to be called the Civil Service Commission, consisting of not more than five members appointed by the Governor in Council: provided, however, that after the expiration of three years from the first day of April one thousand nine hundred and nineteen no person shall be appointed a commissioner until the number of members of the commission is reduced to less than three, and after such reduction the number of members of the commission shall not exceed three.

After the lapse of a few years the Civil Service Commission will be better organized than it is to-day; its staff will have more experience, and the public will have become accustomed to the new order of things.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend stated a moment ago that as a result of the re-classification referred to, many civil servants would get an increase in their salaries, whilst others might, perhaps, in future face a decrease. Might I call the minister's attention to what has taken place lately in a large corporation? The Canadian Pacific Railway has of late re-classified the salaries of its officials from coast to coast. Under that re-classification not only has the company considered the salaries of the officials who are in active service, but it has also, according to my information, given a pro rata increase to those who have been superannuated, on the ground that the cost of living and the prevailing conditions apply to the latter class, just as much as those who are serving actively. I understand that there are very few—at least only a relatively small number—public servants who are now on the retired list, and enjoying superannuation. I would therefore ask if it is the intention of the Government in the re-classification which will be presented to the House by my hon. friend to include the former officials who have been superannuated? The additional expenditure which would be involved thereby would not be large in view of the smallness of their number, and there is some justice in the claim for consideration in their case, because with a reduced salary, resulting from their superannuation they also feel the stress of the times we are passing through.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I might say that no person now in the public service holding a permanent position will suffer any diminution in salary during his or her lifetime, even if the position which he or she fills is re-classified.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is, re-classified at a lower salary?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, at a lower salary. The same provision was contained in the Civil Service Acts of 1908 and 1918. The schedules will show a very substantial increase in salaries, though speaking generally the compensation is not based upon the actual conditions to-day—the salaries have been fixed just as if the cost of living was normal and the war had not occurred. During last year a bonus was paid to a very large section of the Civil Service, and that is being continued; in fact, the Committee will be asked to vote a certain amount this afternoon to enable the bonus to be paid for April, May and June of this year. After the amended Civil Service Act becomes law, and the salary schedule which accompanies it is adopted, it is proposed to present to Parliament a scheme for the payment of a bonus to civil servants which will meet

the prevailing conditions, but that will probably not take place until very late in the session. My hon. friend has suggested that a bonus should be given to those employees who have passed out of the Service and been pensioned. My hon. friend was good enough to mention this matter to me yesterday, and two other persons in Canada wrote me making the same suggestion, but I have not had an opportunity of placing the matter before my colleagues. The first thing to be done will be to ascertain what additional cost will be involved if the suggestion is carried out. I readily admit there is much force in the suggestion because the purchasing power of the pension which is paid to these former officials has fallen very much, and I shall be very glad to give consideration to it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I might give my hon. friend a concrete case. Take, for instance, the inspectors of customs who ten or fifteen years ago received a certain salary, and whose pensions, when they were superannuated, was based on that salary. Their successors in the Service have, since their promotion, had the benefit of one or two increases, and will now get a further increase, so that when they in turn are superannuated they will receive a pension proportionate to their salary. On the other hand, the men whom they succeeded are receiving a smaller pension based on the salary paid years ago. It seems to me that it is only a matter of justice to grant recognition in the way suggested to these former public servants.

Mr. EDWARDS: I think that in dealing with the salaries of civil servants we have commenced at the wrong end, I suppose, on the principle embodied in the old saying, "To him who hath shall be given." Those who stood most in need of salary increases were the men at the bottom of the list, getting from $1,200 to $1,400 a year. On these salaries they have been forced to exist—you cannot call it live—owing to the increased cost of everything they have had to buy and they have found their salaries, with the bonus addition, hardly sufficient to keep their families and themselves in any kind of decency. These, in my judgment, are the members of the Civil Service who should receive the first consideration but those who have received the first consideration have been the deputy ministers and the chief clerks whose salaries were comparatively large. I say "comparatively large" when placed alongside the salaries of others in the service who are getting $900, $1,000 or $1,200 a year.

I fail to see how the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) can possibly arrive at the conclusion he expressed a moment ago that the members of the Civil Service Commission were quite sufficient to do the work. He was at that time criticising the increase in the number to five members. We have any amount of evidence that the Civil Service Commission were not capable of doing the work which fell to their lot. What did they do? They handed their work over to sub-committees. Applications were received for a position and a sub-committee was appointed to make a choice from amongst the applicants. That did not occur only once; it occurred many times, showing very clearly that the Civil Service Commission composed of three members could not cope with the amount of work that fell to them. If the Government are open to censure at all for increasing the Civil Service Commission that censure should come to them because they did not increase it sooner. I would very much rather have, not three, not five, but a dozen members of the Civil Service Commission who were in some sense responsible to this Parliament than have a commission of three finding themselves unable to do the work devolving upon them and making selections of men who have been milking the Government ever since they were big enough to appreciate the possibility of obtaining assistance from the Government.

A very notable example of that is the editor of the Ottawa Evening Journal, Mr. P. D. Ross, who from 1896 to 1911 succeeded in obtaining for advertising between $9,000 and $10,000 out of the Government of the country, who, in the last six years, has obtained from this Government alone over $24,000 in advertising and who, in addition, has obtained something over $62,000 for the rent of a part of the premises which he built and which he occupies as a newspaper office. Here is a gentleman who has been called upon by the Civil Service Commission, I believe, on more than one occasion, to decide whether this person or that person was the proper one to appoint to a Civil Service position.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the editor of the Ottawa Journal?

Mr. EDWARDS: I understand so; Mr. P. D. Ross.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is he subsidized?

Mr. EDWARDS: I think the figures show how very disinterested this public-spirited citizen is, how he is not looking for anything

for himself. We find this gentleman with his hand out from 1896 to 1911, receiving $10,000 for advertising, and we find him with his hand out to every department of the Government for the last six years and receiving payments in the way of advertising. Was it because of his very minute knowledge of every one of these departments that he has been chosen to act on a sub-committee to make appointments which should be made by the Civil Service Commission? Is that the kind of a disinterested man that we should have making these appointments? I am told, and I believe on good authority, that it was an understood thing that when this gentleman put up the building that he at present occupies and holds, and from which he issues his paper, the Government would rent or lease a part of it for Government offices. In that way he was investing his money in such a way as to have a sure thing, that in the course of a few years he would get back, in the form of rental, the money he had expended in putting up the building. This is the type of man who has been selected to do the work, in the way of making appointments, which should be done by a Civil Service Commission responsible to this House. This is the gentleman who takes advantage of the fact that he owns a newspaper, to criticise very severely any member of this House who ventures to express an opinion different from his own in regard to the members of the House having a say in the appointments which are made in their constituencies.

I repeat, in the face of the facts which have been placed before this House again and again, that the Civil Service Commission have been entirely unable to cope with the amount of work which has been thrown on their hands. In view of the fact that they have appointed sub-committees to deal with hundreds of applications for positions in the Civil Service, and in view of the fact that we have had men who are not responsible to Parliament, or to anybody else, making selections of persons for appointment to the Civil Service, it is high time that we had an increase in the personnel of the Civil Service Commission, so that we will have some person who is responsible to Parliament for the appointments which are made.

I do not blame the Civil Service Commission for it but that situation has developed through the assinine policy of this House in placing upon the Civil Service Commission work which could be better performed in the public interest by the men who are responsible to the people, the representatives of the people sitting in this House. It is an absolutely ridiculous and illogical situation that faces this House and the country to-day that we as members of the House are to be held responsible to the people for appointments which are made not by members of the Civil Service Commission but by sub-committees appointed by the Civil Service Commission and responsible to no person in the country not even to the commission itself.

That is an absolutely ridiculous state of affairs against which I want to protest, just as I also want to protest against the way in which salary increases have been made in the Civil Service. Are we to suppose—perhaps we can get some consolation from looking at it from this point of view—that the only officers affected in the city of Ottawa by the high cost of living are the deputy ministers of the various departments, the chairman and members of the Civil Service Commission, and the chief clerks? Is it to be presumed that the high cost of living does not affect those men getting from $1,200 to $1,400 and that therefore it is not necessary to deal with them?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend has referred to the lavish way in which the Government has poured money into the pockets of Mr. Ross and I have no doubt he has told the truth. I think that is likely all true, but he has not referred to the other side of the story. Mr. Ross has earned every dollar that he ever received from the Government. There has not been a shady transaction in which the Government has been concerned since 1911 that Mr. Ross has not defended and if the hon. gentleman had told the whole story there would not have been so much of a reflection to be cast upon Mr. Ross.

My hon. friend criticised my proposal that the commission should be reduced from five to three or that it should remain as it is at present. I think that is a proper proposition. It depends altogether on what work the Civil Service Commission are endeavouring to do. Are they conducting clerical work? Or are they making inquiries throughout the country as to who a man is, what stripe of politics he is, and whether he ought to be appointed over somebody else? Are they engaged in work of that kind? If, on the other hand, they are engaged like judges, in delivering decisions, as they should be engaged., they could do the work all right, and the clerical work these gen-

tlemen are doing could be performed by a clerical staff. I cannot see why five commissioners would be any better than three in doing work of that kind, because we want the combined judgment of the commission in arriving at decisions according to some definite principles. These men have got a great deal of work to do no doubt; but I fear they are doing work that somebody else might be carrying on at a very much lower cost. Therefore, I still want to register my protest against increasing the personnel of the commission. I think a commission of three would be more efficient, and with a sufficient staff such a commission, I submit, would be able to do the work better than five commissioners, with less confusion and with much greater satisfaction to the country .

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not want to be taken as endorsing what the hon. member for Guysborough has said in regard to the editor of the Journal having earned money for backing up shady transactions, although Mr. Chairman, I am quite willing to defer to the superior judgment of the hon. member in matters of that kind. I do not know any member of this House better qualified to judge of what is and what is not a shady transaction than the hon. member for Guysborough. I sat with the hon. gentleman in this House for a number of years when the party he supports was in power, and although Liberal newspapers from one end of the country to the other were receiving gifts of money, I do not remember to have ever heard him suggest that any of that money was being earned by the Liberal press in supporting shady transactions; and yet unquestionably from my standpoint many of those newspapers during the fifteen years the Liberal party was in power were backing up transactions which I might, without going very far astray, characterize as shady. I do not think it comes with a good grace now from the hon. member for Guysborough to talk about backing up shady transactions, and making that as a political stroke, because the hon. member has been ready in season and out of season when his party was in power to back up anything and everything that came along, no matter what might be the colour or the shade of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Chairman, I would be sorry indeed that in this discussion any one should introduce party politics. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) in his denunciation of the practice of some gentlemen belonging to the press receiving subsidies directly or indirectly from any Government. The other day I used very severe language regarding a certain portion of the press, and I was taken to task by that press, and yet I find to-day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) justifies completely the statement I made to the House on that occasion.

Here is a concrete case. Mr. P. D. Ross is a wealthy gentleman with a large and profitable property in Ottawa, who is supposed to enlighten the public with independent information and to guide it with his unbiased judgment. We however find from the blue-books that he is not satisfied with being appointed on special commissions and with receiving fat contracts from the Government, but he also rents his buildings to the Government.

Now, let us take the case of the Free Press—or the Journal Press, because it has changed its name. If the leopard can change his spots—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I must ask him to address his remarks to the resolution before the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will, Mr. Chairman. The Free Press was a Liberal newspaper before 1896. I know that in 1911, when the Reform party, met its Waterloo, that paper supported the naval policy and the reciprocity pact and yet immediately after the Hon. Mr. Rogers became the master of the Borden Administration that paper, having, I suppose, adopted the principle of Dr. Osler, became choloroformed, and one morning, the Liberals found that it had not the same old vigorous style as usual.

At that time the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) denounced in the House the shady transaction which had taken place by which that paper was parading as a Liberal paper although it was the property of well known Tory financiers. Not only was it masquerading as a Liberal newspaper, but it was reading the Riot Act to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and to some other members of the old Liberal party. That concrete case explains, Mr. Chairman, many of the events that have taken place since 1911. The purchasing of the press en masse by the powers that be is one of the deplorable conditions to-day in Canada, and if the people have no direction from an independent press, it is because the press has surrendered its independence into the hands of those powers. There is no respect to-day for the press in Canada. There are indeed respectable newspapers, but those other papers which have been chloroformed

have, so to speak, contaminated the whole press family in the eyes of the public. I am not inventing this. My hon. friend knows it just as well as I do.

The statement was positively made in the House of Commons in 1912 that the Ottawa Free Press, although parading as a Liberal paper, was really the property of certain Tory financiers. It is not surprising, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the Free Press should have defended all the shady transactions since, because the price has been mentioned by my hon. friend. Not satisfied with receiving job printing contracts from this Government, not satisfied with accepting positions on important commissions, the proprietor of that paper receives large amounts every year for rentals. How can you expect the public to respect the press of Canada in view of such a condition of affairs.

We are passing through a revolution, Mr. Chairman, and one of the most regrettable features of that revolution is that there is no leadership from the press of Canada to-day on the great questions that are confronting the Dominion. And the revolution which is gaining ground every day——

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —is chiefly caused by that purchase——

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —of the press of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am through, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My hon. friend has said that the press of this country has no respect for the people of Canada. I just want to say that is a melancholy reflection to me that the press say exactly the same thing about members of Parliament, including the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend is in a melancholy mood this afternoon.

Mr. BEST: Will civil servants who have been voted increases of from $500 to $1,000 during the present session obtain these increases if the re-classification gives them a lower rating than they had before these additional sums were voted? If so, why were they voted these increases?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think they will.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: It seems to me that the time has come when this House has

to do one of two things, either take back into our own hands the responsibility of making all appointments, or make this commission proficient in every way. It is evident to members of Parliament who have had anything to do with appointments during the last year and a half that things have not been working too smoothly. I have been told by deputy ministers that the Civil Service Commission is practically using their staffs for the purpose of ferreting out information that could be got for the asking from any member of Parliament. If you are going to exclude the advice of members of this House in these matters the principle embodied in this Bill is correct: we must enlarge this commission to such an extent that the work can be carried on fairly and well. These commissioners should not act upon, I was going to say, half information; they should not act without being well informed as to the merits and demerits of all appointments. The minister stated that one of the reasons for increasing the number of commissioners was the fact that soldiers had been appointed to different offices throughout the country. I refer him to page 1026 of Hansard, where an answer to a question is quoted which states that out of 1,672 permanent appointments and 14,570 temporary appointments made last year, a total of 16,242, only 1,834 were given to returned men. I might go on and say what everybody knows: the appointments they did get were those at the very bottom of the list. A year ago the Prime Minister, in answer to a question, gave what was practically a promise to the House that if this Commission was enlarged a returned man would be given an appointment on it. Considering the great unrest that prevails in Canada to-day, and having regard to the great service that the returned men are rendering to the country at this present hour, there is no doubt in my mind that the appointment of a returned soldier to the Civil Service Commission would do a great deal to quiet things down and would cause returned men throughout the country to feel that their interests will be properly looked after.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: While the minister does not like to make a definite promise, without consulting his colleagues, that a returned man will be appointed—

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I am not asking that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: —I might recall what I said earlier this afternoon, namely, that there was no reason that I knew of

why a returned man should not be appointed to the Commission. I am not in a position to give the Committee this afternoon the number of returned men who have been appointed to public offices, but I think I can say that practically no appointments are at present being made to the Civil Service which are not given to returned men. True, promotions are being made in the Service, in accordance with a provision of the Civil Service Act, which, in my judgment, should be observed. I am glad to say that in my interviews with returned men I found that they did not ask the abandonment of the principle of promotion of men who had been long years in the service and the giving of these appointments to returned soldiers. I think it would be unfortunate if that principle was departed from. When I move the first reading of the Bill I shall endeavour to give to the House some figures which will indicate the number of returned men who have been placed in the public service.

Mr. DEVLIN: Any remarks which I make this afternoon I shall not direct against the minister ad hoc respecting the subject now under discussion; I shall rather direct them, generally speaking, to the Government which is responsible for the legislation we are now called upon to consider. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has perhaps borne greater burdens than the ordinary man could bear; he has occupied several positions with respect to different departments. This is accounted for partly by the fact that the Postmaster-General (Hon. Mr. Blondin) is not in this House. Then, a number of ministers went away and the hon. gentleman took their places while they were travelling. It seems incongruous to have called for the return of these ministers and not to have them here to give a word of explanation when such an important matter as this is before the Committee. I direct my remarks particularly to the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell). There has been, not only throughout the country but within the Civil Service, a great deal of unrest that might have been obviated had a proper course been adopted at the proper time. I speak now as a member representing a rural constituency, and with a very strong feeling that right and justice should prevail in the Civil Service as well as in all other classes of the community. Some years ago, when the bonus was spoken about, I offered a suggestion on the floor of the House that in view of the increased cost of living——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the hon. member purposes discussing the matter of bonus to the Civil Service, I might say that immediately after the committee disposes of this matter, I purpose taking up the vote in connection with the bonus so that my hon. friend will then be enabled to discuss this particular subject.

Mr. DEVLIN: I would be delighted to do so, but the suggestions I mean to offer to the minister are such as he might yet in time embody in his Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Go on.

Mr. DEVLIN: I was saying that when the question of the bonus came up, I suggested to the House that owing to the increased cost of living there should be an all round increase in the wages of the civil servants of this country sufficient to meet that increased cost, and that coupled with that, a bonus should be given to put civil servants in a position to meet some of the back debts which they might have contracted owing to the insufficiency of their salaries and the constantly increasing cost of the articles they are obliged to purchase. The Government in its wisdom at the time gave a bonus to a certain class in the Service, namely, to those earning under $1,800, and nothing at all was received by the poor devil who might have been thirty or thirty-five years in the Service, as I know some of them had been, and who happened to have a salary of $2,000 with a large family to support and under greater obligations in many instances than the man earning $1,800. Had my suggestion been adopted at the time, the minister would have got rid of one of the great reasons of unrest in the Civil Service to-day. The second reason for the present unrest in the Civil Service as well as the unrest throughout the country is the fact that the Government has taken no earnest steps to meet the profiteer. Whenever it was a case of capital, well, capital had its way with the Government; but when it was a question of the ordinary consumer needing redress, then the Government was inactive or indolent or refused entirely to do anything. We have had one Minister of Labour who did his best according to his own light as minister of that department. He followed on exactly the same course as that on which the new Minister of Labour is following, but he was not considered to have had enough initiative or to have succeeded, and he was, therefore, set aside. We have now the same difficulties over again in an aggravated form

and the ministry—and I am not blaming my hon. friend, but I am blaming the ministry generally—have been indolent, inactive, and have not taken the proper steps to meet the increased cost of living and to keep down the undue profits that have been made in this country for some years past. It was mentioned to-day that there was a report by Sir George Murray, but the Government does not even know to-day what Sir George Murray's report was. There were reports from other commissioners, but the Government does not know what those reports were. There is a report now from some experts from the city of Chicago, and I want, as a Canadian, here and now to enter my protest against the action of the Civil Service Commission or the Government in going over to the United States to get a few accountants, or experts if you will, to do work in Canada that Canadians are quite competent to do. I do not think it is any arrogance upon my part to say that I have confidence that we have in Canada as good brains as those that are to be found in the country to the south of us. It is true there is a great deal of good and a great deal of money in the United States. It is true that from time to time it becomes necessary to go to the United States to borrow money. It is true that at times it becomes necessary to truck and trade with the Americans. All that is a business arrangement; but when we are told upon the floor of this House that in order to get brains enough to remodel the Civil Service, we have to go to the United States for them, I, as a Canadian, protest and wish to make that protest as formal and as strong as I know how. The money has been paid for these men, and how much has been paid? When the Supplementary Estimates were under consideration, we were told that $46,650 were expended, and that is a pretty good pay for these American experts. Have they gone away yet? There are some cruel enough to say that after they have finished the re-classification of the deputy ministers, chief accountants and other high officials of the different departments, they are going to enter upon the gigantic work of re-classifying the Cabinet. I give that rumour for what it is worth; it may be true or it may not be true. If they are capable of classifying this Cabinet, it is no business nor concern of mine, but I wish them God speed, and I think they will have a difficult task before them. It is unfortunately the case in this country, and it may be so in many other countries, that when it is a question of paying a man a very high salary, that man's case immediately assumes such proportions that it must be considered at once; but when we, the poor men of Canada, who represent the poorer classes, the wage earners, the consumers of Canada, come before the Government, we cannot get from it that information, much less that action that we ask for.

What is the purport of this resolution which the minister pleads with us to pass, telling us not to consider for a moment the lack of information afforded, and that the information will be given at some later date? I accept the minister's word that the information will be given at some later date, but we are told that from time to time. We longed for the return of the ministers in order that unrest might be allayed in Canada, and what were we told yesterday: Wait one month for the report of the commission and then the Government will tell you what it will be able to do. While I do not want to charge the Government with not doing things they cannot do, and while I am with them in the upholding of law and order in this country, there is another way of settling the present unrest, and it is not necessary to wait another month. Action may be taken at once. Get after your profiteers; lower the cost of living, so that the wage-earner can keep his family and himself, and then you will settle all the unrest in this country. This is not a matter that has cropped up since the war ceased, nor did it begin during the war; we have been complaining of it ever since 1912. The Government knows that the cost of living has been increasing ever since that year. The Government was prepared for it, and they got together certain combinations to work out means. The Government threw aside the old Conservative party, and formed a new party, called the Unionist party. True and staunch Conservatives had to take back seats in order that the new blood which had been allied with other parties in the past could take the reins in their hands and meet the situation. What has been the outcome of it all? A dismal failure, disunion in the Cabinet, assassination among the ranks; and that has contributed to the unrest in the Civil Service.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. gentleman is not confining his remarks to the resolution before the Committee.

Mr. DEVLIN: If I am not to say anything further about what I consider to be

the cause of unrest in the Civil Service of this country I shall resume my seat.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In my constituency, in 1914, a man by the name of Charles Gauvreau, and another by the name of Alfred Trudel, volunteered to go overseas, but were rejected as medically unfit. They were subsequently appointed fire rangers, which position they held up to this year, when they were discharged by the Civil Service Commission on the ground that the position must go to a returned soldier. Now, a returned soldier may mean a man who has only visited Argyll House, or a man like my brother, who has been in France about fifty miles behind the firing line. If Trudel and Gauvreau had been discharged for cause I would have no grievance, but I say that the principle is wrong for the Civil Service to give preference to a returned soldier who may not have gone any farther than England over men who were perfectly willing to sacrifice their lives for the Empire and who actually volunteered. If this point is not covered by the Bill I would ask the minister to give it his consideration.

There is another feature. I understand that under the present Act a civil servant holding a permanent position cannot be removed except for cause. Now a fire ranger is appointed every spring, and unless there is reason for dismissing him he should be re-appointed every spring. The position is of a permanent nature, although a fire ranger cannot be appointed for twelve months in the year. I would ask the minister to see that provision is made in the Bill that men who were willing to serve their country but were rejected as medically unfit shall not be removed from the service except for cause.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not acquainted with the facts in the case of these two men other than my hon. friend has stated them, but I shall make inquiries of the commission and later shall make a statement in the House or personally to the hon. member. I quite appreciate his viewpoint that these two men should be regarded as permanent appointees, and not merely casual employees. I do not like to express an opinion one way or the other, however, until I have learned something from the commission as to the reasons for dismissing these men.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (translation): I understand that the object of this resolution is to enable the members of Parliament to make suggestions. Well, I feel in duty bound to offer a few suggestions. First of all, I object to and protest against the idea of increasing the number of commissioners from three to five. I know the present commissioners personally, I believe them to be mindful of their duty, and I do not think the Civil Service or the country has suffered from the fact that the commissioners are but three in number.

It occurred to me that the hon. Prime Minister was perhaps encumbered with the present number of his ministers. Journeys to Europe being now at an end, we have two Ministers of Militia, and the position of commissioner might be deemed suitable for one of them or perhaps for the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), as a reward due to the services he has rendered the Union Government, as all the ministers have now returned and there no longer exists a vacancy.

However, I strenuously object to and protest against this additional expense of $12,000. While not being opposed to the increase of $1,000 a year, which the commissioners are being granted, I think the question of increases to employees in the lower grades should have been dealt with in the same resolution. I understand that the Bill will come up at a later date and we shall know, then be enlightened as to the salaries of those employees. In the meantime we can only guess, though we know that the Government has always been in the habit of favouring the high paid officials and of overlooking the subordinates altogether. The hon. minister who has charge of this Bill will allow me to tell him—

An hon. MEMBER (translation): He does not understand.

Mr. FONTAINE (translation): If he does not understand, let him ask for a translation of my remarks. He will allow me to tell him, once for all, that, this time, he must not overlook the lower grades.

In the city of Hull, we have a large number of public servants and, a startling, nay incredible fact, there are among them some who are earning but $50 a month. I wonder how one can think of adding $1,000 or $2,000 to the salaries of the commissioners and deputy ministers without providing also an increase for those employees who do not even get enough to buy bread for their families.

Mr. Chairman, I would not like to wander from the question, but it seems to me that I may be permitted to digress and say that one of the reasons for all the unrest

prevailing to-day among the workers is the failure on the part of the Government to look after the destitute and small wage earners. Had I the honour of being a member of the Government—

Mr. CANNON (translation): You should rather say, the misfortune.

Mr. FONTAINE (translation): My hon. friend from Dorchester thinks "misfortune" would be the better word. I shall follow his advice and say again: had I the misfortune of being a member of the Government, I would consider it my first duty to find a way of lowering the cost of living, of protecting the poor and destitute people, instead of being only concerned about those who got large salaries.

I do not intend saying any more at this moment, as we shall have the opportunity of reverting to this matter when the Bill is laid before us; but it seems to me those are things which the hon. ministers should at once look into. They should show greater concern, because if the Government did nothing to mend the present state of affairs, the strike which is now going on in the West and threatens to spread eastward, may extend to the public servants here.

While I have no desire to advocate strikes, I may say it is quite natural for those who get inadequate salaries to be dissatisfied and to try in every way to better themselves.

Conditions are very serious to-day and I must protest against the inaction of the Government who do nothing at all for the consumers and who, since they are in power, speaking not only of the present Administration but also of the former, since 1911, have exclusively concerned themselves about the millionaires and the manufacturers, without doing anything for the people.

Why should they be so solicitous of commissioners who are earning $5,000 or $6,000 a year? Why should they be so concerned about deputy ministers who are getting $5,000 or $6,000 in salaries, when they do not care at all for the men who only receive $50 or $75 a month?

Mr. Chairman, when we have to pay such high prices as we are now paying for food, when we have to give 75 cents a pound for butter and $10 for a pair of shoes, and when the Government give but $50 a month to some of those employees, it is the Government, I say, who are responsible for all those evils and I cannot blame the men who go on strike under such circumstances.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for his references to myself; I appreciate them very much. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the salary schedules which relate to the lower positions in the Civil Service will show a marked increase over the existing rates, and the bonus which must be given this year will, of course, add to that. I would like to impress upon the hon. gentleman, and upon every member of the House, that all people in the Civil Service cannot receive the same compensation because their responsibilities and duties differ. I know of no other principle upon which any body can be employed and paid than according to the nature of the responsibilities that are assumed and the duties that are discharged. Unfortunately it may happen at times that those in the lower positions in the public service are unable to get a salary which perhaps may be deemed suitable, having regard to adverse or unfavourable conditions which affect the cost of living. That is to be regretted, but it is applicable to all other classes of work as well as Government activities. However, I hope when the hon. gentleman sees that classification schedule he will be pleased with the compensation to be given to those in the lower ranks of the public service.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are one or two things which I deem it my duty to bring to the notice of the minister in connection with this Resolution and the Civil Service. In the first place, I think work is imposed on the Civil Service Commission that they should not be called upon to perform. The resolution seeks to appoint a body of men, not exceeding five in number, of whom four will receive $6,000 and one $7,000 a year. Such a body of men is almost equal in number to the membership of any of our Supreme Courts. Now we all know what important duties are discharged by a judge of the Supreme Court, and what important work the Supreme Court in any province, as a body, is supposed to perform. It would be very absurd if we were to appoint judges, with salaries ranging from $7,000 to $8,000, to do work that could well be performed by a justice of the peace. No Government could justify such a proceeding as that, yet it is exactly what is happening here. The appointment of a tide waiter in the county of Guysborough, the appointment of a fishery guardian in the county of Pictou, the appointment of a postmaster in the county of Victoria, which I have the honour to represent, thousands and thousands of such appointments are being

made all over the country, and we have a commission sitting in Ottawa to whom we are to pay $31,000 a year in salaries alone, not to mention incidental expenses, to deal with matters of that nature. I think such a proceeding is highly improper. I am entirely in favour of appointing big men to handle big questions; but I certainly do not approve of having a commission, whose members are paid large salaries, to deal with small matters that can be dealt with by the most ordinary individual in the country. I submit to the minister that he should cut down the volume of work which is imposed upon this commission. Let him remove the manifold appointments of a petty nature that the commission now have to deal with, and let the appointments be made in some other way. It transpired last night, during our questioning of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the hundreds and thousands of fishery guardians that must be appointed in this country within the next few months, are first recommended by the fishery overseer, and then the nominations are sent to Ottawa to be confirmed by the Civil Service Commission. Is that not a work of supererogation? Is not that taking up the time and energy of the Civil Service Commission to no good purpose? In such cases the commission must of necessity accept the recommendation of the overseer, and must trust him to nominate the right man. If he has done so, why not put the appointee in office at once, and thus cut down the enormous amount of petty work which now goes to the commission, and the dealing with which does not require any executive ability at all. I submit that if this is done much unnecessary work on the part of the commission can be dispensed with. It is not fair to ask the Civil Service Commissioners to sit down in solemn form and to pass judgment as to who shall be tide waiter at Big Bras d'Or, or who shall be fishery guardian in British Columbia. All these appointments could be dealt within another way, and in a manner more expeditious and less expensive to the country. I certainly protest against increasing the number of Civil Service Commissioners from three to five in order to deal with matters of this kind. If the real questions that should engage the attention of big, capable, brainy, well paid men were cut down to the class of work that should be done, you will find that three men could do it just as well as five, and with less trouble.

There is another thing about these examinations. I suppose the Government think they are conferring a favour upon any candidate for a position in the Civil Service whom they let in with an easy examination. I do not view it in that way. I do not think that a worse service could be done any young man in this country than to set an examination by which he could get into a lower class at an age between 18 and 25. He gets in after a certain examination. He is there until the next stage of promotion arrives, five or six years afterwards, when the age for learning has passed, when the time for going to school has gone and he finds himself up against a stone wall. He never can pass any more examinations and he has to stay where he is or go back into the world to seek some other work. I submit to the minister that he should always have in view the admission of good men to the service who would be capable of development and promotion from one stage to another and that he would in the different classes pass such an educational examination in the very first instance as to qualify a person educationally for promotion in that class until he reaches the top.

I am not in favour of asking candidates for the Civil Service to pass a high examination in Greek, Latin, geometry, trigonometry, and all those difficult subjects. I am in favour of a good English, or French education. I want a man to be a good writer, a good speller, to have a good knowledge of the English or French language, and such general knowledge as would bring him to a standard perhaps equal to our grade 12 in our curriculum, or qualify him to pass a first class teacher's examination. You have a man of good common sense and fair practical education. Put him at the bottom if you like but qualify him once for all so that if he is ambitious and capable he may look forward to getting to the top. It is no friendship or favour to any person to give him an easy examination whereby he can get into the first grade. He spends some years there, he cannot go to school again, he cannot pass any further examination and he is blocked for the rest of his life. I wish the minister to keep that in view when dealing with the educational test. As I read the examination papers and the curriculum prescribed for Civil Service examinations, it appears to me that it is not a fair test. In some things it goes too high, and you require an examination on subjects that keep many good people out of the service. People get in by reason of their ability to pass these

tests who are not as good as those who would get in if the test were along the line that I have suggested.

My whole remarks come down to this: That too much small business is imposed on the commission. Hundreds of thousands of cases which come before the commission might be dealt with by a most ordinary officer at an ordinary salary, and my other point is that I think the educational test should receive more consideration and that it should be conducted in such a way that it would secure for the service the right kind of man and the right kind of woman.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and concurred in.

SUPPLY.

VOTE TO PROVIDE A BONUS FOR CERTAIN CIVIL SERVANTS.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

To provide for the continuance of the payment to those employees of the Civil Service to whom a War Bonus (including provisional allowance under item 419 voted at the last Session of Parliament) was authorized to be paid under the provisions of the Order in Council dated the tenth day of December, 1918, and the Orders in Council incorporated therewith, or in amendment thereof, and who are still in the Service, of amounts equal to one-fourth of the amounts so authorized to be paid to them during the fiscal year 1918-19, by way of a War Bonus for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1919-20, $2,500,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will you kindly explain that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Hon. gentlemen no doubt are acquainted with the fact that last year a war bonus was granted to the Outside Service and also to members of the Inside Service. The bonus was first granted to the employees in the postal service, I think in September last, but it was not made applicable to those who were receiving a salary in excess of $1,800. Later, the bonus was extended to large numbers of the Inside Civil Service, but again it was not made applicable to those who were in receipt of a salary of over $1,800. It was deemed advisable and necessary to continue this bonus during the present year as conditions affecting the cost of living had not changed any since last year. It was not desirable to vote this sum of money by Order in Council—hon. members opposite, I am sure, will approve of that—but it was thought better we should come to Parliament and ask for a special sum to carry on this bonus as it was paid last year for the months of April, May, and June.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will it stop then?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, that is not the idea of the Government. As hon. members are aware there were many qualifications and limitations last year as to payment of the amount and its receipt by members of the Service. It was thought that there were some inequalities and, perhaps injustices, in the method used in this regard. The Government accordingly submitted the whole matter to the Civil Service Commission, and we are hoping for a report from it shortly. In the meantime we wish the bonus to be paid as it was last year. Towards the end of June we hope to make a new submission to Parliament and ask for a larger vote. This now merely carries the bonus on for three months.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: In the constituency which I have the honour to represent there is an experimental farm. I am informed by the labourers on that farm that the men higher up, the superintendent and the foremen, have received a bonus, but that the ordinary working men have not. If that is the policy the Government is going to pursue this year, I wish to register my protest against it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are many persons in the employ of the Government who receive a daily wage, which in most places is at the market rate. For instance, in the city of Ottawa there are many classes of employees, tradesmen of one kind and another, who receive the market rate of wages. The bonus did not apply to that class, because it was thought they were receiving what was the current market rate for their labour. I assume that upon the same principle, possibly, these persons to whom my hon. friend refers did not receive the bonus. It may be that they are not receiving a fair wage. If so, that should be investigated. I shall be very glad to discuss the matter with the Minister of Agriculture and later advise my hon. friend privately or in the House, just exactly what is the position.

Mr. ROWELL: May I supplement what my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce has said? The matter is dealt with by Order in Council of the 10th day of December, 1918, in this form:

All persons known as mechanical or labouring men employed at a yearly or monthly salary or wage shall be entitled to receive the bonus. All those employed at a daily wage at current rates of pay shall not be entitled to receive the bonus. All those employed at a daily wage at less than current rates shall be entitled to

receive such bonus within the limits defined by the said Order in Council of November 7, 1918, and this report as the minister in charge of the department in which such person is employed may recommend and the Governor in Council approve.

My hon. friend will see that the object was that where any men were employed by the day at less than the current rate of wages—

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Who is to define what is the current rate?

Mr. ROWELL: I presume the officers of the department. The minister would be the final authority. He is the man who has to recommend what sum, if any, should be added to the man's pay to bring it up to the current rate of wages.

Mr. MORPHY: Are those men on the permanent list or not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are not regarded as permanent employees of the department, although many of them continue in the public service for a long time. This is the principle involved: It was assumed that the classes referred to in the portion of the Order in Council just read by the President of the Council had received increased pay by reason of war conditions, and in that way had received their bonus. Now it might happen in case of the employees of the experimental farm in the eastern part of Quebec that they were overlooked entirely, and perhaps their pay was not increased at all, which of course would be unfair.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like to call the attention of the minister to the same thing that I have always complained about in this House, namely, that there is nobody to look after these men. They are not acquainted with the Orders in Council, they do not know whether they are permanent employees or not, and they are standing back too frightened to ask. When the miniter says they get an increase in wages in accordance with the increase caused by the war, he forgets entirely the increased cost of living of these wage-earners, who have to work daily year in and year out as if they were permanent employees, but are not so treated. I repeat again—and I hope the minister will take it into consideration—just what I said the other night that it is the easiest thing in this House for a man who is getting a salary of $4,500 to have it raised suddenly to $6,000—a jump of $1,500—as happened in the Estimates under discussion at the time; while these poor men all over the Dominion, in Ottawa and outside of it, with families to maintain, notwithstanding the increased cost of living are working along at $600 a year. I do not think that any able-bodied employee of the Government with a wife and family to support should be asked to work for this Government or anybody else at $600 a year. It is about time that the Government realized that it is their duty to look into the lower branches of the Service through some specially appointed person, whose duty it will be to ferret out injustices and to remedy them.

Mr. ROBB: At the outbreak of the war certain civil servants joined the forces and were given their regular pay, in addition to which they received their pay as officers in the army, and, if they were married, their families received separation allowances. In many cases those men never went to France; some got safety-first jobs in England and others got safety-first jobs in Canada. Is it the policy of the Government, in addition, to favour those men with a bonus, while employees, as represented by my hon. friend from Kamouraska, are given no bonus whatever?

Mr. ROWELL: Civil servants who receive both civil and military pay are not entitled to the bonus under the Order in Council or under this vote.

Mr. COWAN: Nor do they receive separation allowances at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Civil servants for whom I have a great deal of sympathy are the Dominion Police. They are a highly respectable body of men and have rendered, during the last few years, most important services to Canada. I understand that last year they did not receive the bonus. I do not think it is fair that they should be overlooked; in my opinion they should be treated just the same as other public servants.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend perhaps will correct me if I am in error, but my impression is that the Dominion Police are not civil servants. They are under the Department of Justice. The fact that they are not civil servants would, I assume, be the reason why they do not come under this Order in Council. It would be quite a legitimate matter for discussion whether they should not receive some additional compensation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Dominion Police are as much entitled to a bonus as office employees, day labourers, and others. They

are subjected to examinations; they are men of character and ability, and it seems to me that they are entitled to the same treatment as that which is accorded to other members of the public service.

Mr. FRIPP: I wish to support the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to the Dominion Police. I cannot see any distinction in this matter between a member of the Dominion Police and a Public Works employee in Ottawa. Labourers in the Public Works Department have received this bonus. There is no real distinction between the permanency of a member of the Dominion Police and the permanency of a labourer in the Public Works Department. Moreover, the Dominion Police are not, I understand, paid as well as the City Police Force in Ottawa, and they have not the same advantages. They have not the superannuation, and many other privileges and advantages that the City Police Force have are not enjoyed by the Dominion Police. Therefore I strongly support the contention of the member for Maisonneuve that the Dominion Police should get the benefit of this bonus.

Mr. KEEFER: I concur in what has been said with regard to the Dominion Police. They should be put in the same position as any other members of the public service who receive the bonus. They render efficient service, and are entitled to every consideration.

Mr. ROWELL: I am under the impression that the question of a bonus or of increased compensation to the Dominion Police is under advisement by the Department of Justice. I cannot speak with certainty in the absence of the acting minister, but he will be here in a day or two, and I will bring the matter to his attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend attend to that? The minister is away, and the acting minister is away, too.

Mr. ROWELL: The acting minister will be here to-morrow, and I will bring the matter to his attention.

Mr. POWER: I wish to direct the attention of the minister to two other classes of civil employees who have not as yet obtained any bonus. I do not know about the employees of the Dominion arsenal at Lindsay, but I do know about those at Quebec. They are employed by the hour, the rate being fifty or fifty-five cents an hour for mechanics. They have carried on during the war; they have done good work, but they appear to have had very little, if any, wage increase during the war, and they have not been brought under the operation of this bonus. Another class which is, perhaps, even more deserving, comprises certain men employed in the Marine Department. Up to August, 1918, the employees of the Marine Department in Quebec had not received an increase of salary for ten or fifteen years. They were working at a great deal below current rates of pay, so much so that the Marine Department, which is not usually very generous in these matters, were finally obliged to grant them a very small increase. I went into the matter thoroughly with the department at the time and found that mechanics, boiler-makers and so on, in the Marine Department at Quebec were earning about two-thirds of what men doing similar work were earning outside. These employees should be brought under the operation of the Order in Council which deals with the bonus. Furthermore, I cannot understand why a day labourer, as such, should not obtain a bonus while a salaried man does. Of course, I see the viewpoint of the minister: That the wages of day labourers have increased—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Especially where they are organized, and in cities.

Mr. POWER: Whether they are organized or not, their wages certainly have not increased in the city of Quebec. Owing to the benevolent attitude of the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries an attempt at organization on the part of the labourers in the Marine Department in Quebec city was so well squelched that not one of the men has been able to return to his position. I am afraid therefore, that the argument about organization does not go very far. As organization is impossible under a Government department in Quebec—although it seems to be quite possible elsewhere—these men should be given an adequate bonus and be treated the same as other employees in the public service have been treated.

Mr. McCOIG: I have seen Estimates go through providing for increases of $500 and $1,000 respectively to deputy ministers and other officials. As a matter of fact, we are passing Estimates daily increasing the salaries of almost all employees the Government has, from deputy ministers down. Let me put in a plea for the man who is the most deserving of all the employees of the Government so far as increased pay is concerned, and that is the man who delivers the rural mail throughout the different parts of the country. For instance,

one rural mail courier whose route is about twenty-five miles long, gets $750 a year. His contract calls for the supplying of a horse and rig and of two horses when the roads are bad, and he has to furnish these horses and maintain them and his rigs, at that handsome wage. When we are giving additional pay to employees of the Government—in some cases where they have not asked for it—we should consider the case of these men. They are held down to their contracts and in many cases they are working for starvation wages. The action of the minister would meet with general approval if he would give some assurance that an additional allowance will be made to the men who have signed contracts to deliver mail in all kinds of weather for the paltry sums which they are receiving.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have been speaking to the President of the Council and to my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) about the matter of giving consideration to a certain class of men who are employed in this building.

I have listened to the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) reading the Order in Council and the regulations under which those increases are made. He speaks of the current rate of wages, but it is hard to determine the current rate of wages. If the pay of any member of this House was to be measured by the current rate of wages out in the street, his pay might be cut down materially, and I suppose the man who is working at a carpenter job or digging a drain or anything like that, would be much better off than any of the members.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A bonus was not withheld from the Parliamentary staff upon the ground set forth in that part of the Order in Council read by my colleague. The Order in Council provided that the bonus should be paid only to those who were employed during the whole year, and I think that pretty nearly every person whom my hon. friend has in mind is merely a sessional employee. It was under another part of the Order in Council that they were denied the bonus.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would be very brief if the minister would give me some hope that those men would be considered. Their salaries have not been increased; indeed nothing has been done for them. If he would increase their pay in some way, I do not care whether he calls it a bonus or not, it would be of great assistance to them. There are men in this class that I speak of who are bookkeepers; some of them have charge of many men and are doing particular work, and yet they have not received any increase. Some of them come here from long distances and while they used to get a free ticket to come here, they have now to pay their way, and the cost of living has no doubt increased their expenses when they have come here.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Have they had any increases in recent years?

Mr. McKENZIE: No increase whatever. I have had a talk with one of them who has been here for nearly twenty years and who is getting exactly the same pay as he was receiving twenty years ago. I do not care whether you call it a bonus or an increase of pay or an indemnity, the only thing I am after is that those men who come here from year to year, who, by reason of their coming here, have been to some extent disqualified for any other kind of work, who like to come here and who must come here to keep things going, should not be singled out and told that when others are receiving advances they must remain in the same old rut. I have spoken about this matter several times before, and I hope that the case of these men will be considered.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I understood the minister to say that the Government were considering giving a higher bonus, and I should like it to be made clear that they are also considering providing a bonus to Civil Servants who are receiving more than $1,800 a year. I can see no reason why the Government should fix this arbitrary maximum of $1,800 and stop there. A short time ago the Government and the House adopted a principle that shows conclusively that the bonus should not stop at $1,800. When they gave an increase to deputy ministers, they recognized the principle that a man who received more than $1,800 a year might be so affected by the increased cost of living as to require extra remuneration. I know of several cases of men who are receiving more than $1,800 a year and who are not able, upon the salaries they are receiving at present, to keep themselves and their families in the condition in which they are entitled to live. The cost of living to them has increased in proportion to the way in which it has increased to men earning less than $1,800 a year, and I hope the Government will consider the advisability of extending the bonus to men receiving more than $1,800.

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Government given any consideration to placing in the class of Civil Servants those country and

village postmasters who have to devote all their time to the duties of office? I do not mean those postmasters where the post office is a side line. In my county I presume there would not be more than two or three of the class to which I refer and they should be classified along with the regular Civil Servants.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They have not been up to date, but the classification will show a division of all postmasters of Canada into ten ranks. In some cases this does not mean an increase in salary, for rural post offices, but it will affect the compensation. I might say in reply to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) that members of the Civil Service receiving an income in excess of $1,800 have placed before the Government what they deem to be their grievance by reason of the withholding of the bonus from them and the matter is now under consideration. Hon. gentlemen will understand that until the re-classification of the Service is settled and the salaries for the current year determined, it is difficult to decide what bonus should be paid, because the re-classification will place some men in a more favourable position than they were in before. Shortly after the re-classification is submitted to Parliament, we should be in a position to announce our policy respecting the whole service.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the case of postal employees in the West. I refer particularly to most of the employees in the Strathcona post office which is a semi-staff office. These men have an initial salary of $600 per annum and with the temporary bonus and some other living allowance which is given to them, their salary is brought up to between $900 and $1,000. The point on which these men have a grievance is that the ordinary mail carrier who does not require the same amount of clerical ability is drawing more money than the postal employees in the office. Under the present strike conditions prevailing throughout Western Canada, these men have remained loyal to the service inasmuch as they have not gone out on strike, and last year when the Winnipeg and Calgary officers went out on strike, these men remained on duty in spite of the fact that they felt they had a distinct grievance and that it was not being looked after by the department. This method of granting an initial salary of $600 a year which must be supplemented by bonuses and living allowances is peculiar, and I hope the minister will assure me that in the re-classification all these anomalies will be wiped out, and that the salary will be fixed, so that a man will know definitely what his salary is, and that if he is getting $600 or $1,100 a year that amount will not be reduced by the stoppage of any bonus, living allowance or any subterfuge of that kind. I gathered, and I hope correctly, from what the minister said, that in the re-classification provision will be made for the adjustment of cases such as I have mentioned.

Mr. ROWELL: The minimum salary of the postal clerks at the present time is $600, and a living allowance of $180 has been paid for many years. There is also a war bonus, which brings the minimum up to $1,080. The maximum is $1,880, which is very much higher than the maximum of the letter carriers. The re-classification will fix the minimum and the maximum salary, and will provide for a bonus due to the high cost of living.

In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. McCoig), provision has been made whereby if a rural mail contractor thinks his contract is at too low a price, he may ask to have it reconsidered and new tenders called for. We passed an Estimate the other evening for $375,000 to meet the increased cost to the country due to new tenders having been called from parties under the old contract.

With respect to the matter to which the leader of the Opposition drew my attention, namely, where contractors are held to their contract if no new tenders are submitted, I am looking into that matter; I think it should be remedied.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Has any provision been made for fixing a minimum rate per mile for the rural mail couriers?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. PAPINEAU: What was the amount of the bonus paid during the last fiscal year?

Mr. ROWELL: It would approximate $800,000 per month.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do temporary employees come under this?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I wish to protest against the habit we are falling into of granting increases without due consideration of where we are likely to land as a result. First of all, I do not like the term "war bonus" in this item; I do not think

there is any justification for it. I believe that where competition prevails you will get much better service, and I think that the feeling of unrest throughout the country to-day is in no small measure attributable to the action of Governments in this country in fixing the hours of work and the wages in the Service. Once people get into the Civil Service they receive so much in, I fear, many instances regardless of the service they render. There is no competition. In the case of the rural mail couriers, however, who tender for contracts, and where competition prevails, the lowest tender is accepted even if the sum is only half what another civil servant is getting who is not rendering anything like as great service. In view of the fact that a commission is now inquiring into the relations between employers and employees in Canada, I think this item should stand until we know the findings of that commission. The Government of this country, not this or the preceding Government, but all governments are responsible for fixing the hours of labour in the service, which I believe are from six to seven hours per day. I believe the fact that men and women in the Service do not have to work more than six or seven hours a day is largely responsible for the unrest that prevails in Canada to-day, and which is in no small measure responsible for the high cost of living. The short day attracts people to the Civil Service. The real creators of wealth in this country, the people who are producing food, are also attracted to the city and the Service by the short day and once they get in the Service they think all they have to do is to hold a gun to the head of the Government to get anything they want. There is no reason why a civil servant should not leave the Service if he or she can better themselves outside, and I think the time has come when we should quit coddling civil servants. We should deal with them as other people are dealt with, as though we expected them to render value for the salaries received. I know the Government is in a very difficult position in dealing with these people, but I think the time has come for plain speaking, and we might just as well face the issue now as at any time in the future.

Progress reported.

At six oclock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 19 (from the Senate), to Consolidate and Amend the Railway Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When this Bill was under consideration by the Committee we had considered and adopted all of the clauses with the exception of clauses 34, 210, 358, and 374. We will now take up clause 34.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Before taking up clause 34, I would like to revert to clause 325. I understand that an amendment has been made to this clause as it originally stood, a fact of which I only learned yesterday, having, unfortunately, been absent from the House owing to indisposition.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry but the hon. gentleman is out of order in discussing the clause referred to, which has been adopted in his absence. The hon. gentleman, however, can by unanimous consent take the opinion of the Committee on a motion that the clause be reconsidered.

Mr. McQUARRIE: If you will permit me I would like to do that a little later on. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) is desirous of speaking to the clause which has been called, but I would like if I might be permitted to move later on to reconsider clause 325.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman can do that at any time if there is no objection.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I object to the clause being reconsidered. A deputation from the city of Hamilton was heard in regard to it, and after a full discussion the Committee unanimously passed the clause in its present form. I for one object to the subject being re-opened.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I have no apology to offer for moving an amendment to this clause. It is true that in the early stages of the session I gave notice of a Bill which was worded similarly to this amendment. It is also true that the amendment went before the special committee appointed to consider this Bill and was defeated by a small majority. Nevertheless, I believe that what I propose is in the public interest, and I hope the Committee will insist upon its being placed upon the statute book at the earliest possible moment, in order that the conditions which have existed in past years may not continue in the years to come.

The amendment I propose is not as far-reaching as the one that was submitted to the special committee, and for this reason I laid it before Sir Henry Drayton, Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and asked him to eliminate from it the words "in regard to ocean borne traffic." I also asked him to re-construct clause 358 of the Bill so as to confer upon the Railway Commission control over the maximum rates to be charged; that is to say, that the commission should not have control over any other rates than the maximum rates. Sir Henry Drayton was good enough to re-draft the amendments in accordance with my wishes and I will submit them to the Committee. Sir Henry Drayton's letter to me on the subject is as follows:—

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.
Office of The Chief Commissioner.

Ottawa, May 23, 1919.

Re Water borne traffic.

Dear Mr. Armstrong,—

You ask me to consider the amendments submitted, which read as follows:—

"Privilege and Concession to be under control of Board.

"(A) 1. With respect to any privilege or concession given by any company or express company, or by any person owning or controlling any such steamboat or vessel as is in the next paragraph mentioned, and where any privilege or concession is given by any such person or by any company or express company to any person or class of business, or in any part of Canada, the Board may order that such privilege or concession be discontinued, or modified, or granted to any other person or class of business, or in any other part of Canada, either the same or in a modified form.

"Steamboats to be subject to regulations of Board of Railway Commissioners.

"Tariffs, etc., to be submitted to Board."

"(A) 2. With respect to the traffic accommodation, classification of freight, traffic agreements, tolls, and tariffs to be furnished, made, entered into, and charged in connection with and by steamboats, and other vessels carrying passengers or freight, or both, from one port or place in Canada to another port or place in Canada, and with respect to any place where such steamboats and vessels shall call for traffic, the time of all and duration of stay and all tariffs, tolls, traffic agreements, and classifications of freight charged, entered into, or adopted in connection with any such steamboat or vessel shall be submitted to the Board."

I understand that you are now of the view that the ocean traffic overseas ought not to be mixed up with the same kind of regulation which would apply from one port to another in Canada.

If the policy of water regulation be adopted at all, I would certainly think that you are right in this conclusion, and that the amendment you propose making to the draft above submitted, "or to a port or place outside of Canada," be stricken out.

You ask my view as to whether or not the sections are sufficient. The question as to whether there should be any regulation of water borne traffic, and whether the Board's powers should be extended in this direction, is one entirely of policy for Parliament and a matter on which I do not presume to advise or take any part; but if Parliament does adopt the principle, I would suggest that in addition to the amendment above set out, Section 358 be recast. The present Section 358, which is headed, "Water Traffic," would indicate that the Board's activities in this connection are limited to the traffic on water of any railway company. As I understand it, your proposal is to regulate all water carriers, whether such carriers be or be not railway companies. To give effect to your intention, I would, as stated, recast this section, and provide as follows:—

"Section 358. The provisions of this Act in respect of tolls, tariffs and joint tariffs shall, so far as deemed applicable by the Board, extend and apply to the traffic carried by any carrier (whether such carrier be or be not a railway company) by sea or by inland water, between any ports or places in Canada; and no freight or passenger rate shall be charged by any such water carrier in excess of the maximum rates from time to time approved by the Board; and no such water carrier shall engage in the business of transportation, whether of freight or of passengers, until such carrier shall have submitted to and the Board shall have approved its standard freight or passenger tariffs."

Yours faithfully,

H. L. Drayton,
Chief Commissioner.

J. E. Armstrong, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

That is the proposition which is now before the Committee. I may be asked my reasons for placing this matter under the control of the Railway Commission. As every hon. gentleman knows, that commission is one of the best organized public bodies that we have in Canada. It has given most excellent service, and in spite of the fact that it was constituted some ten years ago, and that tens of thousands of questions of vital interest to the public have been brought before it from time to time, not one of the decisions it has rendered has been questioned on the floor of Parliament. This speaks well for the Railway Commission, and therefore I cannot think of any more reliable body of men to have control of just such matters as we are considering to-night.

The reason for the creation of the Railway Commission was this: It was found advisable to appoint a body altogether separate and apart from the Department of Railways, that would stand between the public and the railways and deal out even-handed justice to the public in the face of the railway monopoly which then existed to a considerable extent. A somewhat similar situation exists to-day in regard to our water-

borne traffic. There is on our large inland lakes, and in connection with our coastwise trade, a monopoly which controls the traffic on those waters, and the eight millions of people scattered throughout this country are unable to organize and protect themselves from the combines that exist in connection with water transportation. It must be remembered that in my amendment I have eliminated the ocean-borne traffic, its provisions being confined to lake, river and coastwise trade. That object has been achieved by striking out the words " or to a port or place outside of Canada." If the amendment carries, and the Bill as amended goes back to the Senate and becomes law, then all the vessels operating on our inland waters and in connection with our coastwise trade will come under the control of the Railway Commission as regards the maximum rates which they charge.

In connection with ocean traffic, I hope, at an early date, to submit to Parliament a proposal, which should meet with the general approval of all the members, whereby a Board appointed by the Dominion Government, and a Board appointed by the Imperial Government, shall be able to control rates. In this regard I might call your attention to the fact that this Government, in 1912, appointed Sir Henry Drayton a commissioner to go overseas and investigate conditions in regard to the rates charged on ocean-borne traffic. Sir Henry Drayton made a thorough investigation and submitted a report to Parliament. In 1916 he prepared a still more exhaustive report in which he definitely and distinctly stated that it would be in the public interest to have a joint Board established in order that there might be a joint control between the Imperial and Dominion Governments of tolls and tariff agreements.

In 1912-13 the Imperial Government appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the natural resources, trade, and legislation of certain portions of His Majesty's Dominions. That commission travelled throughout the different Dominions beyond the seas, Canada amongst the rest, and, on its return to England, prepared a number of valuable reports. In 1917 it submitted its final report to the Imperial Parliament. I will just read one clause from page 128 to show the urgent need of taking action to control ocean-borne traffic:

> Clause 538. Our investigations have satisfied us that in normal times the combination of shipowners is strong enough to limit the freedom of shippers, whose varied and detached interests make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to combine in any effective opposition, and that therefore, in principle, it is not desirable that the operations of the steamship companies should remain longer without some measure of Government supervision.

In this report you will find many recommendations, and it is with these recommendations that I intend to deal a little later on.

To-night we have before us the question of controlling the traffic on our inland waters and our coastwise trade, which is entirely separate from the matter to which I have been referring. It will be necessary for us to take into consideration the clauses 34 and 358 in connection with these amendments. They both deal with exactly the same subject, both being for the purpose of bringing our boats under the control of the Railway Commission. The Bill gives added powers to the Board of Railway Commissioners and we are most careful to see that in every detail we grant to the board complete control over traffic agreements and any concessions that may be made. We give them absolute control over almost everything connected with a railway system. Telegraphs, telephones, the wireless, and electrical development are all under Government control. But running alongside these great railway systems is another transportation system that has made wonderful progress within the last fifteen or twenty years. Last year there passed through the Sault canals, American and Canadian, freights to the value of $85,000,000. As that traffic passes on down through lake Huron and the river St. Clair and into lake Erie, it increases in volume. Practically all the traffic is carried by boats that are absolutely free to charge whatever tolls and make whatever arrangements they please, and neither this nor any other Canadian Government can say a word. These boats can call or not at our ports, take goods or not as they wish and are a law unto themselves. Let me call your attention to the increase in some of these rates. I will not have time to take many of them, but here, for instance, is a list of lake rates on wheat from Fort William and Port Arthur to Montreal for the undermentioned seasons of navigation:

Year.	Rate per bushel. Highest.	Lowest.	Average.
1911	6.50	4.25	
1912	....	....	5.77
1913	6.34	4.8	
1914	5.52	4.2	
1915	5.20	3.59	
1916	9.11	6.71	
1917	11	3.	
1918	11	6.	

This is a statement prepared by Mr. Coats, Dominion statistician. I also had a statement prepared by Mr. Payne of the Department of Railways and Canals who says that rates went as high as 12½ cents per bushel.

Mr. J. D. REID: For what year?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Last year.

Mr. J. D. REID: He must have been crazy.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: From what ports?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: From Port Arthur to Montreal.

Mr. J. D. REID: Is that by rail?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: By boat.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I have a letter that contradicts that flatly.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The hon. gentleman can read the letter.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I will read it later.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: All right; it will be for the hon. gentleman to show that the statement I have given is not correct. In 1909 the steamboats on our inland waters were able to carry that same kind of grain from Port Arthur to Montreal for two cents a bushel, and it has been stated that they carried it for less than that. In face of the fact that these increases have been going on from year to year there seems to be no limit to them, and there is no reason in the world why they should not charge 15 or 20 cents a bushel. They could possibly reach that limit and I have no doubt that they would be only too glad to have that rate.

I shall show a little later on the enormous profits that some of these companies are making. It would appear they are taking full advantage of the opportunity confronting them. I repeat again, that these organizations are under no control whatsoever, and all that I am asking in this amendment is that the Railway Commission shall have the power to declare what the maximum rates shall be.

In the United States they have complete control over their boats engaged in inland water and coastwise trade. Not only have they that control, but I have under my hand a complete set of the ocean rates from the United States ports. Let me call your attention to their legislation. Under a statute of the most drastic character they absolutely control their boats engaged on inland waters and coastwise trade. For instance under this statute on April 18, 1919, the Shipping Board at Washington issued the following statement:

> Rates for shipment on the Great Lakes this season for ore, grain and coal were formally approved by the Shipping Board to-day as follows:—Ore 80 cents a ton; coal, 42½ cents a ton; grain from Lake Superior to Lake Erie and from Lake Michigan to Lake Erie, April and May loading, 3½ cents and 3 cents per bushel respectively; September, October and November grain loading, 3½ cents and 3 cents respectively; and December grain loading, including winter storage of vessels, 5 cents and 5 cents respectively; grain rates to Georgian Bay and Goderich were fixed at one-half cent per bushel; to Port Huron one-half cent per bushel and to Collingwood one-half cent per bushel under the Lake Erie rate. The rate to Detroit was made the same as to Lake Erie ports.

In Canada we have no such condition of agairs. Our shipowners can continue charging their ten cents or twelve cents a bushel or more if they please, and we are powerless to control them. Just a few words in regard to this Shipping Act which was passed by Congress in 1916. It is chapter 451 of the United States statutes and is intituled "An Act to establish a United States Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing and creating a naval auxiliary and a naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its territories and possessions, and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes. This statute deals with the transfer of government-owned vessels to the board and the operation of American merchant vessels; it defines what is a common carrier; specifies the penalty for violation of the provisions of the Act—the authority of the board to approve or disapprove of rates—common carriers not to lower rates by unfair means—tariffs to be filed and displayed—through rates—restrictions on increasing charges—and so on. I might go on reading page after page of this Act, but I have indicated sufficient to show that it is of the most drastic nature and that it covers absolutely all boats owned, operated and controlled in the United States. A number of amendments have been made to that Act since 1916, every one of them in the direction of giving still greater control over their water-borne traffic. But we have made no effort whatever to control our water-borne traffic. It is said that the Railway Commission is given control over the through rates of boats owned controlled and operated by the railways of Canada. That is

true, but they have only control over the through rate, and if that rate is charged without any unjust or unfair discrimination there is no cause for action on the part of the commission. As far as the railways are concerned, they have not appeared before any of the committees in opposition to this measure, and as far as I can learn they do not oppose it in any way.

But why should we allow the Railway Commission to have control over a certain portion of our water-borne traffic and not place the whole of it under their control? We have 8,500 vessels under Dominion register, employing 45,000 men. In this Act that we are to pass to-night, the railway men who are assisting in the operations of the railroads in Canada are surrounded with all sorts of safeguards. During the hearings before the Select Committee, those men sat day after day, week after week, and month after month, listening to the arguments to see that their rights were protected; while, on the contrary, the 45,000 employees, as far as I can learn, are absolutely at the mercy of the vessel owners. We assist water transportation in every way; we surround these men with special laws for their benefit. Not only do we do that, but within the last month when a member called attention to the fact that the United States had forbidden Canadian vessels to do any coastwise trade on their coast, the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce said that owing to that fact similar restrictions would be placed upon boats owned in the United States coming to do a coastwise trade on our coasts. So that these men are surrounded by every conceivable protection and are in the position of an absolute monopoly.

We protect our marine interests from foreign shippers; we buoy and light our rivers; we dredge them and we deepen our harbours; we build docks, piers, breakwaters, canals, without end, until we have expended over $400,000,000 of the people's money on these great enterprises. And in the face of that we find members on both sides of the House asking the Minister of Public Works to continue the expenditure of enormous sums of money on such works in different parts of the Dominion. What for? In order to aid navigation. But are we to continue this expenditure? The more money we expend the higher go the rates, and we are in the unfortunate position that we have no control over these vessel owners as to what they may charge or the manner in which they conduct their affairs. The people of Canada do not receive any interest on this money. We have abolished the tolls on our canals. We are spending a million and a half a year in order to operate these public works, all aids to navigation, but there is no apparent return to the people; the rates have been constantly increased rather than reduced. In addition to this, we have built elevators at Port Arthur, Fort William, Montreal and St. John. We have spent immense sums to facilitate the loading and unloading of grain. The capacity of the vessels has increased enormously. Not so many years ago we thought that a vessel which would carry 100,000 bushels of grain had reached about the limit of carrying capacity, but vessels are to-day carrying down our lakes 500,000 bushels in each cargo. When the Welland canal is opened these boats will be in a much more favourable position than they are in to-day. It is generally understood that rates on water-borne traffic should be at least one-third the rates by rail, but we find that the rates for water-borne traffic are kept as close as possible to the rail rates, those interested in the operation of these vessels desiring to make every dollar they can out of the people. We have expended enormous sums of money upon the construction of elevators in our western provinces. We have provided a grain commission. We see that the rates charged in these elevators are fair and reasonable and that the rates on the railways which carry the grain from the elevators to Port Arthur and Fort William are the very lowest that can be charged. From the day the grain is turned over to the vessel men at Port Arthur and Fort William and is loaded into their vessels until it reaches its destination —our own markets or the markets of the world—not one word can any one say with regard to the transportation charges made on that grain. That is surely not a reasonable or a fair position for the people of the West to be placed in. As I shall show you, the people of the East are in the same humiliating position. Why control only part of our transportation system? These undertakings have called for vast expenditures of money. No individual or corporate enterprise would undertake them. Canada has undertaken them; what return has she? An unregulated, irresponsible mercantile marine. Unless you place on the statute-book some such legislation as I am urging, you will continue to be subjected to excessive charges.

Either regulate and control this organization, or open the door to competitors. Expenses of carriage by water are small as compared with the expenses of carriage by rail. The shipowners have no roadbeds or tun-

nels or bridges to keep in repair, no terminal stations to maintain, no telegraphs or telephones to operate. Before the Committee these men told us of the severe storms that occur on our lakes and on our coasts, and how they materially interfere with the operation of the vessels. But have they taken into consideration the fact that during the winter season the railroads are able to do only about sixty per cent of the business they are capable of doing during the summer months? The amount of money invested in boats compared with that invested in railways is very small. Take, for instance, the 2,200 miles of splendid waterway that reaches on up into the heart of this continent. The first 1,000 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Montreal may be traversed with perfect safety by vessels drawing thirty feet of water, and vessels drawing fourteen feet of water can proceed 1,200 miles further to Port Arthur and Fort William. When the Welland canal is completed a much better condition will be brought about. The investment in Canadian steamships plying on this route would, at a fair estimate, not exceed $50,000,000, while the cost of a railway covering about the same distance, at $100,000 a mile—which was the cost of the railway most recently built by the Dominion—would exceed $200,000,000. I make this comparison merely to show that while these men are carrying on their business as I have indicated, the expense connected with the operation of their vessels is small compared with the cost of our railways.

Our export trade is enormous. The following are the figures, roughly speaking, of the value of the exports of Canadian products for the year ended March 31, 1919, as compared with 1915:

	1914-15.	1918-19.
The Mine..	$ 51,000,000	$ 77,000,000
The Fisheries. ..	19,000,000	37,000,000
The Forest... ..	42,000,000	70,000,000
Animal products.	74,000,000	197,000,000
Agric'l products.	134,000,000	269,000,000
Manufactures. ..	85,000,000	549,000,000
Miscellaneous. ..	663,000	6,000,000

This makes a total of $419,000,000, in round figures, for 1915, and $1,207,000,000, for the year ending March 31, 1919. Our exports will increase year by year, and as they increase the need of controlling these boats will become more apparent.

I have here a great deal of correspondence with regard to this matter, but I shall only glance over some of it hurriedly to direct attention to what is going on in different parts of this country. On April 20 of this year the following statement was made with regard to the conditions at Sarnia:

> There is considerable dissatisfaction here because the Northern Navigation fleet will again stop and take on the passengers at Point Edward this year, as in the past. Sarnia business men and citizens in general feel that all passengers for these boats should be taken on at the Sarnia wharf and discharged there as well.

Instead of stopping at the city and taking on passengers and products, they simply stop where they please. Here is a telegram from Niagara-on-the-Lake:

> Strongly urge adoption of Bill to bring steamboats under Board of Railway Commissioners. This district very much injured by lack of service at end of season and poor service with high rates, damaged freight, and lost goods; rates raised without notice, and boats taken off without warning.
>
> C. H. Lloyd, President Nigara District Board of Trade.
> L. H. Collard, Reeve of Niagara Township.
> James Macphee, Mayor, Town of Niagara.
> R. G. Dawson, President, Niagara Agricultural Society.
> A. Onslow, Niagara.
> G. W. Bernard, Niagara.

I have here another letter from the President of the Niagara District Board of Trade. Then there is the following telegram from Petrolia:—

> The executive of the Lambton County Farmers' Club, forty in number, 1,000 members, heartily endorse the proposed legislation re bringing boats on our inland waters under control of the Railway Commission. We wish to see the proper legislation embodied in a Bill.
>
> H. A. Gilroy,
> Chairman.

This is a letter from the town of Huntsville, from Arthur Paget, mayor, to me.

> I am strongly of the opinion that all steamboats trading in Canadian waters should be subject to some authoritative body, to whom they should be compelled to submit all rates, tolls, tariffs and traffic agreements, and be subject to the control of such a board as our railway commissioners.

I have here bills of lading and a long letter from Mr. T. E. Godson, of Toronto, mining commissioner, in support of the Bill. This is a letter from the United Fruit Companies of Nova Scotia, Limited:—

> Replying to yours of May 22, we have carefully read over the proposed clause No. 358 for the new Railway Act and we believe that it would be an advantage for the Board of Railway Commissioners to have control of the water shipping in Canadian inland waters.

This is a telegram from Sarnia, Ontario:—

> For years officials Northern Navigation Company have encouraged Lambton producers to expand on production of tender fruits and vege-

tables, promising us rates and service to protect the industry. Now when our county has over half million trees coming in bearing they cut us off from one of our largest nearby markets by refusing service entirely. In addition rates issued effective 1917 show increases in some cases of 50 per cent advance over last year. On behalf of largest vegetable co-operative association in province Ontario we strongly request legislation regulating steamship lines as laid down in clause.

Lambton Growers' Co-operative Association.

This is a telegram from Dorset:—

Reasons for amendments to your Bill re steamship company from local conditions first unwarranted discrimination in freight and passenger rated between consignees individuals and ports; second, threatened boycott of litigants and their ports of call; third, service discontinued to largest port on lake; fourth, rate raised without notice or publication. Your Bill an urgent necessity.

E. Speers, Reeve of Ridout,
and James E. Smith, Reeve of McLean.

This is a resolution from the township of Sherbourne, Angus McKay, reeve:—

Moved by John McNamara, seconded by James Russell:

That this council ask our Federal member, Sir Sam Hughes, and also the Minister of Marine to support the Bill to place inland steamship companies under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Railway Board. Carried.

They give a lot of reasons in support of their position, and there are other letters from that district. This is an important letter from a man who is thoroughly conversant with shipping interests on the lakes, a man who operated a number of boats not many years ago. His name is Mr. J. T. Horne, and he is located at Port Arthur:—

Dear Sir:—

My reason for writing you is that as a Canadian I feel that no one class should be allowed to make abnormal profits during this war.

At the instigation of the Canada Steamships Co., section 358 of the proposed amendment to the Railway Act placing Canadian vessels under the control of the Railway Commission was placed before the Council of the Board of Trade of the city of Fort William, and they decided by a vote of 4 to 2, with the shipping interests, voting for the resolution, to oppose placing Canadian shipping under the control of the Railway Commission.

As a matter of fact, all the information the council of the board had, came through the Canada Steamships Co., and it was meagre. A fair freight rate and one that any vessel owner, even at the present high cost of operating vessels would be glad to be assured of would be 2½c a bushel from Fort William to lower lake ports, when this rate of 2½c is advanced to 5c a bushel at the opening of navigation.

It made the ordinary citizen sit up and ask himself if these gentlemen who controlled the shipping interests on the lakes were not taking a war advantage of the rest of the citizens of Canada and more particularly of the overseas Allies, and when the rate advanced to 7½c a bushel it would seem that there should be some control placed on these vessel owners.

Take a 300,000 bushel vessel and giving her a 7½c freight rate, allowing her only 20 trips, one way loaded, she would gross $455,000, placing her expenses for the season at $115,000, and this is ample. She would, say on a capital investment made during normal times of $340,000 net for one season $340,000.

Surely during these strenuous war times these rates should be controlled by some one.

Yours truly,
J. T. Horne.

Mr. J. D. REID: Between what points is the 7½ cent rate?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: From Port Arthur to Montreal, I understand.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman stated that the vessel would carry 300,000 bushels from Port Arthur to Montreal, and the rate as stated by Mr. Horne was 7½ cents. What I wish to say is this, that there is no vessel that can go from Port Arthur to Montreal carrying 300,000 bushels.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This gentleman was a steamboat owner and the minister must surely know him. If he does not the representatives from Port Arthur and Fort William can vouch for his standing in Port Arthur. He says: "The lower lake ports." He might mean Port Colborne, but the rate is 7½ cents. A few minutes ago I showed that the United States had absolute control over their vessels and that their grain is carried from Port Arthur and Fort William down to Buffalo, a greater distance than to Port Colborne, for 3½ cents. The people of Canada must feel humiliated at being compelled to pay such extortionate rates in the face of prevailing conditions.

I do not want to take up much of the time of the Committee in reading these letters, but they are all urging that these clauses be passed. I have here a communication from Mr. J. T. Small, barrister, of Toronto, strongly urging that these boats be placed under the control of the Railway Commission. This is a letter from a prominent citizen in the town of Sarnia:—

From our experience this year as shippers with the Northern Navigation Company, it is more imperatively necessary than it ever has been before, that this legislation should pass. As matters stand now, shippers have no rights that the steamship lines in particular pay any attention to. Rates have gone up to the limit. Service, while fairly satisfactory is nothing as good as it should be. What does this mean to your home county?

George French.

This is a communication to the Department of the Secretary of State from the Government of British Columbia:

Certified copy of a report of a committee of the Honourable the Executive Council, approved by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor on the 26th day of March, 1919.

The committee of Council submit for the approval of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor a resolution of the Legislative Assembly of the province of British Columbia, of the 24th instant, as follows:—

That, in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the rates of lake and river transportation systems owned and controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia should be under the control of the Railway Commission of Canada.

Be it further resolved, that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, praying that a copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the Honourable the Secretary of State for Canada.

The Committee advise that a copy of this minute be forwarded to the Honourable the Secretary of State of Canada.

J. D. MacLean,
Clerk, Executive Council.

I might go on reading these communications, but I do not care to take up the time of the committee. It is true that Canada's waterways have been the chief factor in building up towns and cities along them. These are the channels through which pass much of our raw materials and manufactured products. We must, therefore, control these great national transportation facilities, and we must not turn over this splendid heritage of the many to be exploited for the benefit of the few. We must consider the interest of the producer at one end and the consumer at the other. Reduced rates will mean cheaper food for our people with commercial development all along our waterways. With boats under control, fair profits to boat owners will be given, and the producer and consumer will be greatly benefited. Vessel men are constantly asking for improvements. Our past expenditures would have been justified had rates been reduced, but the opposite has been the case. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), it is true, voted against this amendment in Committee, but inside of a few hours he was in the House voting away money for the improvements of these great waterways and for the benefit of the vessel men. There has been circulated among the members of the House of Commons and the Senate a pamphlet carefully prepared by one of the solicitors of the Canada Steamship Company.

Mr. BRISTOL: By whom?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Mr. King.

[Mr. J. E. Armstrong.]

Mr. BRISTOL: He is not the solicitor.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: He is solicitor for the Dominion Marine Association. Is not that correct?

Mr. BRISTOL: Yes.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: He represents at least ninety per cent of the vessels on our inland waters, and my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) knows it. This pamphlet was not very complimentary to me. It held up to ridicule my efforts in the past in connection with this measure. It is true that at different times during the last six years I have brought forward this measure. It is also true that the Railway Act which is now under consideration has not yet been passed. But I do not see why I should be condemned for the action I have taken in the matter. I should like to give a brief account of what has taken place.

In the year 1912-13 members on both sides of the House called attention to the enormous increase in freight rates on our inland waters and on our ocean-borne commerce. Considerable time of the House was taken up in debating the question, and a Special Committee was formed which had under consideration the consolidation of the Railway Act. While it was under consideration, the Saskatchewan Government appointed a commission to investigate freight rates on our inland waters and ocean-borne commerce. That investigation took place, and I was able to submit to the Railway Committee in 1914, a statement in regard to the work of that commission. I also laid before the Committee a letter from Mr. R. McKenzie, secretary of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, reading as follows:

I am in receipt of your favour of the 20th inst., urging me to appear before a Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons who have the consolidation of the Railway Act under consideration. I did not receive the telegram from you which you state you sent under the same date as letter.

I would be very pleased of an opportunity to appear on behalf of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association before the Committee on the important question of the consolidation of the Railway Act, more especially clause 358 of the Bill to which you drew my attention. It appears to me that the Railway Commission or any other body have not effective control on export rates unless that same body can also control the rates on vessels that are a part of a through transportation system. It is a simple matter of bookkeeping for the railways to apportion a loss made on the railway, and make up on the water portion of the through system.

I also placed before the Committee the following statement from a manufacturer in the city of Sarnia:

As you are possibly aware, there is a most unjust discrimination against manufacturers situated as we are. At the present time, steamship companies will carry freight from Montreal to the head of the Lakes, we are told, at the same rates as we pay from Sarnia to the head of the Lakes. We know for a fact that there is an existing rate of 10½ cents from Cleveland to Fort William, while we pay 16½ cents from Sarnia. This is one case showing the unjust discrimination made under the present method. Where this affects a manufacturer, such as ourselves, it would avail the manufacturers of the same commodities as we make, down in Montreal or Hamilton, to enter into a competition of territory, which, by our natural location, should be ours.

On the other hand, for all freight going east by train, we have to pay a much higher rate over these lines, and we cannot compete with the manufacturer, such as a fence company, in Montreal or Hamilton in its own district, while they themselves can ship their commodity into our territory at the same rates as we ourselves.

I submitted also a communication from the Western Co-operative Fruit Company, resolutions passed by a company of fruit growers in Western Ontario, and a letter to Mr. R. F. Green, M.P., from the British Columbia Fruit Growers' Association, all strongly supporting the measure.

I should like to quote the finding of the commission appointed by the Saskatchewan Government:

This Commission reports that the grain of Canada pays more freight to reach Liverpool than does the grain of any other country in the world; also that there has been practically no change since 1909 in the cost of transporting a carload of wheat to Fort William or Port Arthur and selling it on commission. . . . . Were Winnipeg to Fort William the ultimate market for our wheat, it would be unnecessary to pursue the inquiry east of these points. Some of our wheat is finally disposed of at Winnipeg, of course, but the great bulk of it is not. Moreover, the price received for that which goes the farthest is what sets the price for the remainder throughout the season of heaviest marketing. It therefore concerns the farmer even more than it concerns anyone else what the relation is between the Winnipeg market and the importing markets of Europe, for upon the transportation and other connecting links between these markets will the price received by the farmer in one part depend.

Those were some of the statements placed before the Committee in 1914. In 1915-16 the war was on, and as this measure was looked upon as contentious, it was not taken up. In 1917, although the war was still on, the Railway Act was taken up by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Cochrane) and passed this House, but was held up in the Senate. During the discussion that took place I was able to submit many important matters to the Committee, among which was a letter I received from Mr. P. P. Woodbridge, secretary of the United Farmers of Alberta, as follows:

I am in receipt of yours of the 20th instant, together with the copy of Bill No. 2 and notes on same.

After discussing the proposed amendments with our president and several other members of our executive who happened to be available, I beg to advise you that we are entirely in sympathy with the object of clause 358 and unanimously endorse same. We believe, however, that as at present worded, the clause opens the way for a legal action as to the extent of its meaning.

Lines 2 and 3, clause 358, read at present, "extend and apply to traffic carried by any railway company," etc. We believe that to make this clause really effective it must be made to cover all water traffic, whether carried in boats owned by railway or other company or individual, and would respectfully suggest that the word 'railway' be eliminated from this clause, making it read, 'traffic carried by any company or individual,' etc., etc., or whatever amendment your committee might suggest which would affect the purpose hereinbefore outlined.

I merely call attention to this for the purpose of showing that I did make an earnest effort to bring this matter before Parliament from time to time. Then again at the present session instead of proceeding with the Bill which I introduced at an early period, I thought it was not wise to take up time with the various stages that would be necessary, and therefore, for the purpose of securing prompt action, I placed my amendment before the special committee of the House. It was defeated by a small majority, and to-night I believe I am acting in the public interest in bringing forward that amendment in Committee of the Whole and having a vote upon the question.

During the war every other country took measures to control its shipping but we apparently made no effort in that direction. The farmers, manufacturers, and shippers of Canada have been compelled to pay fifty, one hundred and fifty, and two hundred per cent more for the carriage of their goods by water than they formerly were compelled to pay. We are giving credits to Belgium, Italy, Greece, and Rumania to the extent of tens of millions of dollars for the purpose of carrying the products of farm and factory to those markets. But when you take into consideration the enormous tolls that are exacted on the inland vessels, and on the ocean-borne commerce, it is utterly impossible for us to expect, unless this amendment is accepted, that Canadian manufacturers and shippers will receive the benefit which they should receive

from the existing facilities. If this amendment is voted down it means keeping open the door for a further exploitation of the country's resources.

Let me call attention to some of the profits that these steamship owners have been making during the last few years. In 1912 the Canada Steamship Company formed a merger of six groups of vessels, the estimated value of which at that time was some $6,000,000. The company was floated for $12,500,000 of preferred stock, $12,000,000 of common stock, and $6,000,000 of bonds. And what happened? The rates increased. In 1914, I asked one of the prominent vessel owners what the increase in rates amounted to in 1913, and he said about twenty per cent. The rates have kept on increasing year after year until these men claim today that they have a capital investment of—or at least that the value of their industry is—$38,000,000, and they are paying the interest on $30,000,000 of that money. They are paying the interest not only on the preferred stock and on the bonds, but on the common stock as well. Let me give you a statement by Mr. Carruthers, president of the company, but who resigned during the present year, as it appears in the Canadian Railway and Marine World of last March. Mr. Carruthers left Montreal for the Pacific coast some time prior to the proposed meeting, and before doing so made the following remarks:

> I cannot admit the propriety of paying such a dividend, for several reasons, and in this attitude have received Mr. Newman's consistent sympathy and support. My principal reason for adopting the attitude described was that I considered the company's best interests were bound up in maintaining the dividend position of its premier capital issue, the preferred stock. In other words, this issue should be strengthened during a period of exceptional earnings, with such a reserve backing that the continuance of the regular rate would be assured for some years to come. My contention is that the disbursement should not be made until there is a strong liquid reserve behind the preferred. It was not the idea of the organizers of the company at its inception that the common should receive anything in the way of dividend until the company had gone through a period of years of experience, which would prove its earning capacity beyond question. In order that my attitude should not prove an embarrassment to the board, and so that the decision to declare the dividend might be considered unanimous, I have decided to resign the presidency and also from the board, and Mr. Newman joins me in my retirement.

That is a pretty strong statement made by the president in regard to the Canada Steamship Company. But when the company are not only paying dividends on all this stock, but have a surplus of $5,000,000, and claim that their assets amount to $38,000,000, hon. gentlemen can readily see whether they have been doing a reasonable or a fair business within the last six years. I know for a fact that many members of this House have been receiving telegrams and letters urging them to oppose this amendment, and it must be expected that practically every port in this country has supporters of this steamship organization. You can depend upon it that they are not going to be content with the sending of a few telegrams or letters voicing their opposition.

Now what else do I find in the report of this company? The capital stock I have already stated, and the depreciation reserve is $3,506,000. They paid in business profits war tax $960,000, and a surplus was left of $5,009,000. These figures show what one company can accomplish within a period of six short years. Is it to be imagined that a company that cleans up $30,000,000 in five or six years wants this legislation adopted? Remember that Canada is going to do a greater business on water than ever before. I expect a great expansion of our foreign trade when we control our trade routes, and our manufacturers and our shipping will develop. If this legislation passes it will help the man who tills the soil, and it will help the man who runs a factory or carries a dinner pail. If it should be defeated the responsibility must rest on the heads of those who vote against it. It is a safe, sane and business like proposition. It will provide control of our waterways in addition to the control of our railways. The shippers scattered throughout Canada cannot organize into a monopoly. We must therefore trust to the Railway Commission to look after their interests. I therefore appeal to every member of this committee to vote for this amendment. By doing so they will protect the interest of the many against the avariciousness and selfishness of the few.

In the early stages of my remarks I drew attention to the fact that the amendment which I propose does not ask for the control of ocean freight rates; it is confined entirely to lake, river, canal and coastwise trade. Therefore, when hon. gentlemen are casting votes for this amendment they must remember they are voting for the control by the Railway Commission of maximum freight rates. By that I mean that the vessel owners will be able to give as low a rate as they choose below the maximum, but that the Railway Commission will have the power to establish maximum freight

rates. Surely this is not an unreasonable request to make of this committee. I therefore strongly urge the members of this committee to vote for my amendment in order that we may control the great steamship monopolies that now exist in our country. I beg to move to amend clause 34 by adding after subparagraph (a) in the fourth line of the said clause the following subparagraphs:

(A) 1. With respect to any privilege or concession given by any company or express company or by any person owning or controlling any such steamboat or vessel as is in the next paragraph mentioned, and where any privilege or concession is given by any such person or by any company or express company to any person or class of business or in any part of Canada. the Board may order that such privilege or concession be discontinued or modified or granted to any other person or class of business, or in any other part of Canada, either the same or in a modified form.

(A) 2. With respect to the traffic accommodation, classification of freight, traffic agreements, tolls and tariffs to be furnished, made, entered into and charged in connection with and by steamboats, and other vessels carrying passengers or freight or both from one port or place in Canada to another port or place in Canada and with respect to any place where such steamboats and vessels shall call for traffic, the time of call and duration of stay and all tariffs, tolls, traffic agreements and classifications of freight, charged, entered into or adopted in connection with any such steamboat or vessel shall be submitted to the Board.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House at any great length in reply to the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) on this question. The Railway Bill is a very important one and one that has been before the House for the last two sessions. For a year or so previous to that we had men employed on this Act in order that it might be put in proper form. It is important that it should pass the House during the present session. It is urgent for many reasons. It is urgent on account of the necessity for the protection of the employees in connection with the operation of railways. It is also urgent in connection with the operation of the railways as a whole, and in the interest of the traffic that is carried. For these reasons, I hope that the Bill may go through during the present session. It has passed this House with the exception of the clause that the hon. member has referred to, and clause 374, which has been left over on account of the interest in it of the city of Toronto, the Hydro-Electric Commission and the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.

It is a very important question that the hon. member has brought before the Committee. I am sorry that his Bill, to which he has referred, was not proceeded with during the session, for the reason that we could have given more time to the discussion of the question and probably could have brought forth more facts bearing upon it than we are able to elicit this evening. The hon. member has referred to the letter of Sir Henry Drayton. From the tone of his remarks you would come to the conclusion that he is under the impression that Sir Henry Drayton is in favour of this amendment being passed by this House.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I read the letter and the letter distinctly says that he does not assume any responsibility.

Mr. J. D. REID: I admit that he does not assume any responsibility. But there is a part of the letter from which the hon. gentleman read that I think is very important in connection with this matter. On page 2 Sir Henry Drayton says:

If the policy of water regulation be adopted at all—

That gives me the impression that Sir Henry Drayton is not altogether in favour of the amendment as proposed by the hon. member.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: He does not take a position one way or the other.

Mr. J. D. REID: That part of the letter emphasizes very strongly that he is not altogether in favour of the amendment. The hon. member leads the House to believe that the traffic by water between Port Arthur and Montreal is not now, and never has been, under the Railway Commission, and that the water traffic rates on wheat and other products have never been under any regulation.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: As far as steamboats are concerned.

Mr. J. D. REID: As far as steamboats are concerned. In the Railway Act, which has been in force for many years, we have a clause:

The provisions of this Act in respect of tolls, tariffs and joint tariffs shall, so far as they are applicable, extend to the traffic carried by any company by sea or by inland water, between any ports or places in Canada, if the company owns, charters, uses, maintains or works, or is a party to any arrangement for using, maintaining or working vessels for carrying traffic by sea or by inland water between any such ports or places.

It is a well known fact that the Canadian Northern Railway Company until two or three years ago, when their vessels were

taken, or disposed of, for purposes in connection with the war, had a fleet of steamers plying between Port Arthur and Montreal carrying grain, and therefore they came under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. If there were any complaints about the freight rates between Port Arthur and Montreal, they have been for many years past, and are now, under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners in so far as this provision applies to vessels owned or controlled by railway companies.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Why object to this clause, then?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am coming to that a little later. One of the strongest points that the hon. member has urged why this amendment should pass is that it may afford reduced rates on the wheat shipments that come from the West to the East and for transportation overseas. The Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern for years not only had their own vessels, but had the chartering of other vessels. That traffic has been as much under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners as any part of the traffic going to Montreal. I only wish to mention that fact to assure hon. members from the West that there is nothing in the argument that freight rates between Port Arthur and Montreal may be lowered or changed from what they have been in the past.

Let me also take up at this point the hon. member's statement in reference to freight rates. He quoted the rates between the years 1911 and 1918. In 1911 the lowest average was between 4.24 and 6.50 between Port Arthur and Montreal. In 1912, if I took his statement down correctly, the average rate was about 5.77, or practically the same as in 1911. In the years 1913, 1914 and 1915 the rates were practically the same. In 1916 they commenced to jump; in 1917 they again increased, and in 1918 they still farther advanced. That is one of the reasons why the hon. member argues that these vessels should be put under the Board of Railway Commissioners. If it had only been on inland waters that these rates had been increased the argument might hold good, but the rates have increased not only between Port Arthur and Montreal but between Atlantic ports and British ports where the increases were far more in proportion than they were inland.

An hon. MEMBER: Three times as much.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. J. D. REID: Three times as much. And every vessel that could be taken out of the inland waters, was taken out and used for the Atlantic trade for the reason that they could get much higher rates than they were getting on the inland waters.

Now, those Atlantic ocean rates were fixed by the British Government, not by the ship owners, and of course the latter got the benefit. I mention that for this reason: It has been stated that the Canada Steamship Company have made enormous profits. Of course they have. Why? I know that from fifty to seventy-five of their vessels were built in the Old Country originally to cross the ocean. When the war came those boats were taken over, and the company got these enormously high freights and were able to make the profits stated by the hon. member.

The hon. member also stated, if I understood him correctly, that if this amendment passes it will only apply to lake, river, canal and coastwise trade. The amendment reads to this effect: With respect to the traffic accommodation, classification of freights, traffic agreements, tolls and tariffs to be furnished, made, entered into and charged in connection with and by steamboats, and other vessels engaged on a regular route carrying passengers or freight or both from one port or place in Canada to another port or place in Canada, and with respect to the places along the line of route, and so on, where such steamboats and vessels shall call for traffic. If I understand that amendment aright, it would apply to all inland waters, and therefore to the Muskoka lakes, the Rideau canal, Georgian bay, and so on. Let me say, if this amendment should pass, how I think it would affect our vessels. I stated a few minutes ago that I did not believe it would have the effect of reducing freight rates between Port Arthur and Montreal. At the present time the railways own a number of vessels and they are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I can speak for the Canadian National railways. When it was the Canadian Northern it had a number of vessels plying between Montreal and Port Arthur, which were under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners and any individual or company could at any time apply to the board to have those rates fixed when shipments were made by rail and lake. To-day we have some twenty or more vessels that are being constructed by the Marine and Fisheries Department for the Canadian National railway. Those vessels will ply between Port Arthur and Montreal, and

shippers will have it in their power at any time, if they find the railways are not treating them right in freight rates, to apply to the Board of Railway Commissioners to have the rates regulated on traffic originating on the railways.

This is how it would effect private owners of vessels as it appears to me. At the present moment individuals and companies own boats. The rates could not possibly be fixed permanently in the same way as railway rates. Suppose, for instance, that you fix a rate of 5 cents a bushel between Port Arthur and Montreal, as the hon. member states, and compel a Canadian boat to accept that rate; then no matter what might happen, that boat could not possibly vary from it.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The minister stated a moment ago that if the rate charged were unsatisfactory to the public all we had to do was complain to the Board of Railway Commissioners. Is it not a fact that that board have approved the rates on the mountain scale charged by the Edmonton and Dunvegan railway, running from Edmonton to Peace River landing?

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member has asked me a question which I am quite satisfied he must know I could not answer offhand. Had he given me notice I would be prepared to answer it. I do not know whether the question has ever been brought before the Railway Commission as to the regulation of a water rate between Port Arthur and Montreal. But they have power to regulate the railway freight rates, and they have also power to regulate the rates on freight originating on a Canadian railway and carried through to destination on a vessel owned or chartered by the railway company. Supposing the Railway Commission were to fix a certain rate for vessels plying between Port Arthur and Montreal to apply to all Canadian-owned vessels, our neighbours to the south of us could take advantage of it and secure the traffic, and it would be impossible for us to interfere. Let me give you an instance. To-day when a vessel goes into Port Arthur she does not know what rate she is going to get. We will say that the rate is fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners at 5 cents from Port Arthur to Montreal. The Canadian vessel cannot take any less than that rate.

Mr. HENDERS: Is it not the maximum rate that we are asking to have fixed?

Mr. J. D. REID: All right. At all events whatever rate is fixed, she applies for that rate. Look at the competition our vessels have to-day at Montreal. If an American vessel goes into Port Arthur—that is, assuming she can go through the canals—and she finds that she can get a higher rate by taking that grain to Montreal than by taking it to Buffalo, I will tell you what her owners will do, because I know what has been done in the past, and I have no doubt it will be done in the future.

They take a rate of three cents a bushel from Port Arthur to Ogdensburg, New York. The grain is there placed in an elevator and subsequently sent on barges to Montreal—and the American company can quote a rate which is a shade less than the rate quoted by the Canadian vessels. In other words, American vessels may carry that grain in American bottoms from one Canadian port to another Canadian port, and they cannot be interfered with. That is the competition that the Canadian bottoms have to meet to-day and will have to meet in the future. If there is any question about fixing the rates charged on Canadian vessels from Port Arthur to Buffalo, the American vessel men will simply say to the shippers in the West: ship your grain to Duluth and we will take it from Duluth to Buffalo.

We have very many people who are interested in water-borne traffic. Individuals or companies have put their money into vessels which ply on our inland waters. These enterprises are not public utilities, and to place them under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission would, in my opinion, interfere with shipbuilding in the future. The jurisdiction which is exercised by the Railway Commission so far as through traffic is concerned would seem to cover any possible chance of the imposition of extraordinary freight rates. I have watched the steamboat business in the past with a great deal of interest. Until the war started, I venture to say, the profits of vessel men were not very high; none of them made extraordinary profits. I hardly think it is fair to take the last three or four years of the war in order to show that excess profits have been made.

The hon. member read a great many letters expressing the opinion that his amendment should be adopted and that we should bring these vessels under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. It would take me an hour to read all the communications I have received from individuals and Boards of Trade protesting against any such legislation. If the amend-

ment was adopted, it would interfere in a great many ways with our other inland water transportation. Privately-owned tramp vessels running from Montreal to Port Arthur are glad to get freight for inland ports at very low rates; in fact, they take it at any rates they can possibly get. They take freight also at low rates to Port Arthur, because in doing so they are just that much ahead. Again, if this amendment is adopted it will affect the operation of motor-boats which carry passengers on our inland lakes, and other waters. On the St. Lawrence river, among the Thousand Islands and all the way between Montreal and Kingston, motor-boats carry passengers during the summer months. Under my hon. friend's proposal these boats could not carry passengers without first submitting their standard rates to the Board of Railway Commissioners.

I do not think the adoption of this amendment would be of any advantage to the shippers of the West. If I thought for a moment that such rates were being charged between Port Arthur and Montreal as were prejudicial to the people of the West I would be the first to introduce an amendment, or to bring down legislation to correct the wrong. But I am satisfied that the effect of the amendment would not be to reduce the rates. The Canadian Government owns 13,000 miles of railway—if it takes over the Grand Trunk it will own 20,000 miles. These railways operate steamboats, and the whole system is owned by the Government and controlled by Parliament. The freight rates between Port Arthur and the Georgian bay ports are subject to control; the rates between Port Arthur and Montreal can be controlled by the railways. As it has not been shown that there has been any unfairness, I think it would not be in the interest either of the public or of the mercantile marine of this country to have the Bill changed as proposed in the amendment.

Mr. ROBB: The Minister of Railways and I do not always agree, but to-night I find myself exactly in accord with the case as presented by him. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) may be actuated by the best motives, but I believe in all seriousness that his amendment would injure the very people whom he is hoping to help. As stated by the Minister of Railways, if the amendment moved by the hon. member were adopted, it would perhaps penalize more than any one else the men on the prairies who grow grain for export and who require to import coal to keep themselves warm in the winter time. I would go a little further than the Minister of Railways who, in my judgment, has recently, as Acting Minister of Customs, done something to increase rates on the Great Lakes. I refer particularly to the removal of the coastal privileges, to reciprocity in shipping. Every restriction that we place upon vessels operating from one Canadian port to another enables the fewer vessels remaining operating upon the Great Lakes to charge the people just a little bit higher rates. If a fixed rate might be made that would be profitable during the summer months, it would be a ruinous rate in November because a vessel cannot be operated at the same cost in November as it can during the summer when conditions of navigation are practically ideal. Rates are affected also by variation in the carrying capacity of vessels. Some vessels are able to carry grain at a lower rate than others and some vessels are able to carry coal at a lower rate than others. The speed of vessels also has an effect upon rates. A vessel that can make the round trip between the head of the lakes and Montreal in seven or eight days can operate much cheaper than the vessel that takes two weeks. If this amendment should go through it would create conditions that the Minister of Railways said would drive the business to Duluth. That was pointed out to our western friends at one time when they proposed to place certain restrictions on the inspection of grain at Fort William, and they discovered they were only driving the business over to Duluth away from Canadian trade routes. Therefore, I ask my western friends who are more particularly interested to look very carefully into this matter before giving their support to an amendment that will limit the number of vessels seeking cargoes at the head of the Great Lakes, and consequently enable the limited number of vessels to charge a higher rate. It will also discourage the building of new boats. If vessel owners charge rates which, as my hon. friend fears, may be fairly high, they will only be inviting competition and that competition will eventually regulate the rates. For these reasons I find myself in sympathy with the case as presented by the Minister of Railways, and I am compelled to vote against the amendment moved by the hon. member for East Lambton. I believe that if that amendment prevails, it will restrict the carrying capacity of vessels on the Great Lakes, and

will prevent tramp vessels from going up there seeking cargoes at perhaps a lower rate, whereas the lower rate, should it prevail, will eventually go back into the pockets of the men who grow the grain.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Coming from a city situated on one of the Great Lakes, I desire to say something on this question. I unfortunately was not present while the arguments were being put forth in the committee from time to time, as business called me away. The only arguments I have heard in favour of vessels being placed under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board are what I have heard here to-night, and no arguments from those who ship or receive goods by water have been produced to-night. Therefore, if persons who ship or receive goods by water are satisfied, I do not see why other persons should complain, and they utterly fail to produce evidence that anybody has suffered on account of the rates. The hon. member for East Lambton seems to be endeavouring to show that rail and water transportation are in the same position. They are in different positions entirely. Railways are established in certain districts and have monopolies of those districts, and if they were not under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board they could charge whatever rates they saw fit, and the Railway Board was appointed for the purpose of controlling those rates. As regards water transportation, the water is there; I can use it; you can use it; anybody who likes can use it. People can charge rates in competition with each other, and if any one is charging a higher rate than is commonly charged, competition will regulate the matter. I have not found any argument produced by the hon. member except in a circular letter that he sent out, and the argument produced there is as hopelessly weak as the argument he has made here to-night to convince any hon. member to vote in support of the amendment. The first paragraph in that circular letter goes on to show that all boats owned by the railway companies are under the Railway Board. It goes on to point out that shippers may take goods or leave them or refuse to call at certain points, or in other words, just do as they like. The hon. member has not undertaken to show that the boats referred to have ever refused to accept goods or have ever taken goods and charged an unreasonable price, but he makes a statement so broad that it would be utterly impossible to corner him so as to show that there was nothing in his argument. The next paragraph goes on to show that our coastal regulations give our vessels every advantage over foreign vessels and that as far as possible the right has been retained for the use of our vessels. This might have a tendency to increase rates instead of diminishing them, but such has not been the case. The water rates have, I consider, been very low, and I can assure the Committee that there is not in the city of Hamilton, from which I come, a firm which would not vote against the amendment. The next paragraph goes on to cite that the Government has established elevators in the West and has appointed a grain commissioner to grade the farmer's product; that they control the freight rates to Fort William, and when the grain reaches Fort William they are obliged to turn it over to a group of vessel owners who are not under any Government control whatever. The facts in connection with the case are different from what the hon. member has been endeavouring to lead the Committee to believe. The rates charged by the Canadian Pacific on wheat from Regina to Fort William is 15 cents per bushel; that is a distance of 777 miles, and when they turn this grain over to the group of vessel owners referred to, the latter carry the wheat from Fort William to Montreal, about twice the distance, for half the rate charged by the Canadian Pacific from Regina to Fort William. That practically means that the rate on the lakes is 25 per cent of what it is on the railways under the Railway Board. If that be true, and I will challenge the hon. member to contradict it, surely the hon. member does not want a vessel to carry freight for less than 25 per cent of the rate charged by the railways. If he does, he is expecting too much.

There is another clause in this circular sent out by the hon. member in which he says that he thinks the freight rates should be one-third less by water than by rail. I should like to read the last part of Mr Payne's letter on that point:

> Speaking broadly, it might be assumed with some degree of soundness that freight rates on our inland waterways are about one-third of that of the railways.

I will now read a letter from the Hamilton branch of the Canadian Manufacturers Association dated May 9, 1919, with reference to the Armstrong amendment:

> This matter has been very seriously taken up with the Transportation Dept. of the Hamil-

ton Branch, Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and I am directed to advise you that every manufacturer of Hamilton is unalterably opposed to this proposed change.

The differential in freight rates in favour of water transportation is being taken advantage of by Hamilton shippers and has been for years and has enabled our manufacturers to develop very heavy trade especially in the North-west provinces.

The normal tonnage shipped out of Hamilton by water yearly is 125,000 tons and about 80,000 tons of this goes to the Canadian Northwest.

All of the wholesale shippers of the city, including the grocery and hardware houses, are also strongly opposed to this amendment as they also take advantage of the differential in the rates by water, and these houses are dependent largely on their trade in the Canadian Northwest, their shipments travelling as far as British Columbia.

Another letter from the same association goes pretty far to show that the regulations regarding water traffic are very different from those regarding railway traffic, so much so that it is impossible for any Railway Board—and I have every confidence in the Railway Board—to look after water freight rates in the same way that it looks after railway rates. This letter says:

Steamship companies have no monopoly. They are given no franchise eliminating competition. They receive no assistance in the way of grants or subsidies. The water routes are open to all vessels and the greater the number of vessels competing for business the lower will be the rates.

If vessels are placed under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission they will be required to file tariffs. We submit that fixed rates for vessels are neither feasible, desirable, or necessary.

Fixed rates in the case of vessels are not feasible on account of:

1. Variation in carrying capacity.
2. Variation in speed.
3. Variation in cost of insurance.
4. Variation in cost of operation at different seasons of the year. (A fair rate in summer might be a ruinous rate in November.)
5. Variation in cost of operation because of:
   (a) Different depths of water in different years.
   (b) Different depths of water at different times in same year.
   (c) Difference in loading facilities at different elevators, wharves or ports.
   (d) Difference in unloading facilities at different elevators, wharves or ports.

Fixed rates in the case of vessels are not desirable because they would

(1) Result in an elimination of competition.

(2) Place Canadian vessels at a disadvantage in competing against U.S.A. boats whose rates in ordinary times are regulated only by the law of supply and demand.

(3) Result in vessels lying idle when set rate was unprofitable.

(4) Discourage the building of further vessels.

[Mr. T. J. Stewart.]

Fixed rates in the case of vessels are not necessary, because to get business now boats must

(1) Underbid the rail rate.

(2) Underbid or meet rate charged by boats already under Railway Commission.

(3) Offer fair rates or other boats will be built.

I also wish to read a letter from Mr. J. L. Payne, in whom the hon. member for East Lambton seems to have every confidence, and I think after listening to this letter he will be bound to admit that freight rates on the water are very reasonable as compared with freight rates on the railways:

Ottawa, 15th May, 1919.

Dear Mr. Stewart,

You have asked me to give you some comparison of railway freight rates and freight rates by water. In measuring freight rates it is the accepted practice to reduce all charges to the basis of per ton per mile. This takes into account very accurately the factor of distance. Unfortunately, we are without statistical information with respect to the general business of carriers by water; but it happens that we have for some years been getting in this department the facts with respect to the movement of wheat from the head of Lake Superior to various points eastward. This enables me to make a comparison of railway charges with vessel charges for the transportation of wheat.

The Canadian Pacific rate on wheat from Regina to Fort William is 24 cents per 100 pounds, which would be the equivalent of $4.80 per ton. The distance is 777 miles. By dividing the mileage into the freight charges per ton I find that the rate is .618 cent, or a little over six-tenths of a cent, per ton mile. By the same process, and using the same factors, the rate per ton per mile last year on water-borne wheat from Fort William to Montreal was .309. This is exactly half the railway rate. During the war, as you know, freight rates on the Great Lakes have been greatly increased. In 1915, for example, the rate to Montreal was but .132 per ton per mile. Even in 1918 it was as low as .158 from Fort William to Buffalo. Speaking broadly, it might be assumed with some degree of soundness that freight rates on our inland waterways are about one-third of the railway rates.

I think hon. gentlemen will be very much surprised when I say that on looking over the returns a couple of years ago I found that the city of Hamilton shipped by water twelve times the tonnage shipped by the city of Toronto. Toronto is five times the size of Hamilton, but, nevertheless, we shipped twelve times the tonnage they did by water. If, then, our shippers in the city of Hamilton are all satisfied with the freight rates, the Committee would surely accept evidence of that kind in preference to the evidence of an individual living at an inland point who is interested in getting the control of lake traffic in the hands

of the Railway Board, with the view perhaps at some future date of depriving those who live on waterways of the cheaper rate, and putting them on the same footing as those who live at inland points. The hon. member for East Lambton very carefully avoided producing the least bit of evidence from any of the ports like Montreal, Toronto, or Hamilton that do an enormous amount of shipping, because there was no dissatisfaction amongst shippers at those places. Speaking for the city of Hamilton, I have no hesitation in saying that it would be very very much against the wishes of the people of that city that this amendment should pass.

There is one other matter I want to refer to, and that is the fixing of a minimum freight rate. That would be most objectionable, and I will give the reason why. It is a common practice for a message to come to Hamilton from boat owners that John Jones, let us say, is sailing to Hamilton with a cargo shipped on such-and-such a date and will be ready to leave Hamilton on such-and-such a date; if you can arrange to give him a return cargo he will quote a very satisfactory price. Shippers in Hamilton do get a very satisfactory price in that way. Offers like this come every two or three weeks to shippers in the city of Hamilton. There is nothing objectionable in that practice, because it gives the shipper a cheaper rate; it costs less to deliver the goods to the middleman, who can sell the goods cheaper to the consumer in consequence. So far from hurting anybody, it is a benefit to all. I will not take up the time of the House any longer, but I felt it to be my duty to protest as strongly as I could against embodying this amendment in the Railway Act.

Mr. POWER: We in Quebec are in rather a peculiar position in regard to this amendment. We have petitioned various governments in past years to increase our railroad facilities, but without result. We have therefore come to the conclusion that our future lies on the water, and that we must do everything that we possible can to develop our port if we wish Quebec to take the place that it should have amongst the cities of Canada. But we are convinced that legislation such as this will have a very restrictive effect upon the development of the coastal and inland water trade. More than that, in respect to railways we have practically no competition. We have the Canadian Pacific railway, but it controls, throttles and strangles the city of Quebec. Its only competitor would seem to be the Government National railways; but so far, we have seen very little evidence of that system achieving the object which we wish it to attain. Therefore we are forced to fall back upon the coastal trade and the inland waters. The merchants of Quebec find that they are able to get goods from Montreal and from points on the Upper Lakes far more cheaply by boat than by railway; and they fear, and I think justly, that if the inland and coastal navigation were placed under the control of the Railway Board the result would be that the transportation rates would perhaps be almost equal, and the railroads would bring such pressure to bear upon the Railway Board that the special rates which our merchants now obtain would no longer be possible. The Board of Trade of Quebec has therefore placed itself on record as being absolutely opposed to this proposal. From a communication which that body has sent to me I quote the following extract in French:

(Translation.) I hope that you will appear for the Board of Trade of Quebec and urge our views, on the 30th instant, before the Special Committee to which has been referred Mr. Armstrong's proposed enactment that the inland water trade be placed under the control of the Railway Board.

Together with all the leading Boards of Trade of the Dominion, and more particularly that of Winnipeg, we are opposed to the proposed legislation because our merchants would lose the benefit of summer competition between the inland navigation or water transportation companies and the railways. In future, the freight rates of inland navigation companies would be determined and settled by the Railway Board, and no such company would be able to grant any special rate without first being expressly authorized to do so by the Railway Board.

That is to say, the Board of Trade of Quebec fears that if the proposed legislation passes, free competition will not be possible in future, and that at any time an inland navigation company wishes to grant a special rate to the merchants of that city it will be practically impossible owing to the lack of rapid means of communication and to the tardiness with which the Board will perforce have to give a decision on this matter. I do not want to tire the patience of the Committee by reading the communications which I have received on the subject, although I have a handful of them. I have had a communication from nearly every prominent shipper in Quebec, all resolutely opposed to the passage of the proposed enactment. I am sure that nobody in the House or in the country wishes to retard the development of our city and district, and therefore the

opinion of these men who know the situation thoroughly from a shipping standpoint should be respected. They have given this matter careful thought and consideration, and they find that it is absolutely impossible for the city and district of Quebec to continue in the path of progress upon which they have started if such an enactment as the one under consideration is passed. I ask the Committee to very carefully view the matter, not only from the local but from the national standpoint, and consider whether or not it is a good thing to stifle the progress and the industry of one of our national ports.

Mr. KEEFER: On behalf of the city of Port Arthur I ask the Committee to reject this amendment. The people of that city have taken a very active interest in this proposal both last year and this year. They have studied the question carefully from the standpoint of the vital effect it will have upon their interests. Port Arthur is dependent upon transportation from ship to railway, and the merchants, shippers, wholesalers, and other interests of that city, after careful consideration, are unalterably opposed to this legislation and to any interference with the vessel trade. One dislikes to differ with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) in presenting anything to this House because of his particularly genial manner in so doing, but I think he has not the experience in this matter of those who have always been dealing in ships and in the trade connected therewith. I do not intend reflecting in any way upon the Railway Board; but one cannot help thinking that if the railways are brought into competition with public bodies before the Board on the question as to what rates are to prevail, the influence of the railroads in their endeavour to raise the rates, must necessarily affect the board. A vessel to-day will carry a cargo equal to five train loads. Necessarily the freight rate by rail between the same points must always be much higher for that reason, and it will be to the interest of the railroads to pull up the freight rate by water, and especially in the case of through rates, instead of, by virtue of the competition, pulling it down.

The point made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Stewart) that you cannot in the case of these vessels have fixed rates is very true. There are times on the lakes when vessels are operating that it becomes either a question of taking freight at a very low rate or taking water ballast. For years before the war during the summer time we had coal coming from Cleveland to Port Arthur at thirty cents a ton, simply because the vessel owners would rather carry coal at that rate than carry water ballast. How can you have fixed rates unless those rates are regulated each month of the year? —and then you could not fix the rates definitely for each month according to the business that was offered. Many of the wholesalers and dealers in the West bring their goods to Port Arthur and store them there—I have seen acres of barbed wire so stored—waiting to be handled west in the winter, thus taking advantage of the low summer freight rate by boat. I am perfectly satisfied that if the Railway Commission is given the power to control the rates on these vessels the result will simply be to destroy competition, to interfere with the freedom that ought to prevail, and will tend to raise the rates. If there is anything the railroads desire it is to get control of the docks and get control, if they can, of the boats, and as long as you have a man who is able to build a boat and who is willing to enter the business and get what freight he can, and can get deliverance at a dock, you need not fear any monopoly as you do in the case of the railroads. I hope the Committee will consider very carefully before it passes any of the amendments suggested.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I would like to say a few words in reference to what the Hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid) and the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Power) have said. Coming from the district of Quebec where there is a large amount of traffic being carried by small boats plying between Quebec and lower St. Lawrence ports, I have followed this discussion with a good deal of interest. At nearly every place in my county along the banks of the St. Lawrence, there are five or six of these small boats plying between Quebec and these different places. These vessels have always made such freight and passenger rates as to them seemed fit and proper according to the circumstances and in accordance with the law of supply and demand. If this amendment were put into force these people would be placed in competition with large steamboat companies and also with the railway companies which would have the immediate effect of putting nearly every one of the small vessel owners out of business. It has always been deemed wise to leave water transportation free. As far as I am aware there have never been any excessive rates charged and I do not see why this amendment should

be adopted. It is not very often that I vote for the Government, but on the present occasion I find myself under the necessity of voting with the Minister of Railways.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I have noticed that the amendment has commanded a good deal of attention throughout Canada and that since its first introduction it has been followed by no class of people more closely than by the shippers on our lakes and rivers. It has been suggested to-night that almost every person who has made representations to this committee or to the House has been opposed to the amendment as brought down. I would remind the committee that the amendments that the hon. member has submitted in the past are different from the amendment which we have before us to-night and that all the arguments which have been made against the amendment seem to be based on the fact that the hon. gentleman fixed a minimum charge in connection with transporting persons and goods over these routes. It was also argued in the special railway committee the other day that should this Government assume the responsibility, through the Railway Board, of establishing rates on the lakes it might interfere with the shipment of grain from Western Canada because the determination of the price in Liverpool depends on the transportation charges. But if we fix the maximum charges we still find ourselves in the position that we have been in in the past, namely, that the transportation companies on the lakes may reduce their charges so as to meet the competitive rates for shipment to the Liverpool markets and the West will not be injured by it.

It is to be regretted that we have not before the Committee more facts on which to determine the issue in regard to the regulation of transportation rates by water. But I wish to discuss the matter on general principles. It has been said that a ship, or shipowner, does not require any franchise. If he does not require any franchise, he is that much better off. When a railway corporation gets a franchise, it is put to the expense of costly construction of railways through the length and breadth of the country but the great national highways which we have in addition to the railways are the rivers and lakes. These are highways which have been constructed by the Dominion Government. They have been dredged, canalized; they are guarded in season, they have their buoys placed in them and they have their lighthouses erected upon them. The Government has also erected, at a cost of many millions of dollars, docks for the purposes of shipping and the charges which have been collected recently are not in any way commensurate with the service which has been rendered. They start out with that great asset without the expenditure of one single dollar on the part of the men who own the ships. Is it too much, then, to ask this Government to go one step farther and say that where they have absolute jurisdiction over the railways they should have some slight jurisdiction over the boats that traverse those waters?

In the United States where there was a demand that water transportation should be reasonably checked by legislation, the same difficulties arose as had arisen in connection with land transportation. We found that they had their pernicious system of rebating. We found that one shipper could bid for the goods of different men at different prices and carry on an unfair competition. We found that they would not call at certain ports unless legislation was brought in to compel them to call at these ports. We found that in the United States, until 1916, in so far as inter-state commerce was concerned, they were an absolute law unto themselves and nobody except their own shipping jurisdiction had any authority to regulate them. It has been contended that it would do great harm and occasion a great hardship, to legislate in this matter.

But that is what was done in the United States. In 1916 they introduced in the United States a statute, not, as was suggested in the Committee when this matter was under discussion, as a war measure, but just simply for the purpose of regulating what might be termed a public utility, or what is known to everybody as a common carrier. There were subsequent amendments made to the Act, twice, in 1918, and these amendments were the branches of the law which particularly had reference to the war phase of it. The United States to-day controls its shipping on the Great Lakes, as well as its foreign shipping, under that statute. They have authority whereby they can fix their rates, examine agreements entered into between various companies and whereby they can compel the publication of tariffs of rates in reference to marine transportation. Every possible evil which arose in connection with railway transportation in the United States arose in connection with water transporta-

tion, and these matters were dealt with by the Shipping Act in 1916.

What is the position with reference to the navigation companies? There can be no question that not very long ago there were a large number of these companies owning a few small boats on the rivers and lakes. But these independent companies are being absorbed very rapidly by large corporations. We find that the principal of these are the Dominion Marine Association, the Montreal Transportation Company, the Canada Steamships lines, the Great Lakes Transportation Company, the St. Lawrence and Chicago Steam Navigation Company, and the Ottawa Transportation Company.

There is being created in this country a monopoly in connection with our inland steamship service just as a monopoly was being created in connection with our railways. Although the opposition to this amendment is so loud and so strenuous, because it is feared that the poor shippers will have to pay higher rates, no person can tell this House that when we get a combine and a monopoly of the water transportation companies, such as is growing at the present time, that combine, that monopoly, is being created for the purpose of the reduction of freight rates by water. It is said that we will lose competition, that there will be fewer boats to carry our grain from the West. But, so long as there are a hundred thousand, or a million, or a hundred million, bushels of grain to be carried from the head of the Great Lakes to Buffalo or to Montreal, just so long will there be competition among shippers to carry that grain.

A public service corporation in the form of a common carrier is just as great a public service corporation as we can have in this country, and it should be as amenable to regulation as any other public service body. We are rapidly coming to the time when it requires a great deal of money to organize these transportation bodies. When we have that money placed in them we have created a monopoly by reason of the large investment made for the purpose of carrying on its operations. And when we have such a monopoly in public service work the Government should step in and either take it over or exercise jurisdiction for control of its operations.

It seems to me that there is nothing unreasonable in the amendment, and that this Government could well take a step in a forward direction by at least adopting the amendment and proceeding to establish maximum rates of transportation charges imposed by these corporations.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am going to support the amendment. In British Columbia we have a coastal service which is practically monopolized by the Union Steamship Company, and that company is taking advantage of the situation to discriminate against certain ports of call. I am informed that at one place called Gibson's Landing, which is about thirty miles from Vancouver, some of the residents had a misunderstanding with this company, and by way of retaliation the company cut out the call there. Now, if we had a regulating body for these steamship companies it would be impossible for them to discriminate in that manner. It seems to me that there can be no real objection to the Board of Railway Commissioners having jurisdiction over steamboat companies as well as over railway companies. If railway regulation has proved to be satisfactory—and I think every one admits that that is the case—then why should not similar regulation be satisfactory in the case of water transportation? I am in favour of this resolution.

Mr. J. F. REID: Several years ago the Council of Agriculture, on behalf of organized agriculture in the West, made representations to the Federal Government to have lake transportation regulated, and I am sorry to-night, Mr. Chairman, to see the Minister of Railways objecting to this amendment. It is a progressive movement, but our Minister of Railways sees fit to support private corporations—he sees fit to support a large monopoly, for that is what I understand the Canadian Steamship Company to be, and naturally those interested in it very much resent being brought under proper control. As the hon. member for East Lambton stated, he is not asking that the rates be controlled exactly, but that a maximum rate be set; and if steamship companies choose to carry freight at a lower rate than the maximum by all means let them do so

means let them do so.

I was very glad to hear that Mr. Carruthers when he discovered what kind of a company he was in—this Canada Steamship Company—pulled out to save himself.

The effect of the excessive rates charged on the lakes for the transportation of our wheat to the seaboard has a very adverse effect on business, for it tends to stagnation, and in fact sometimes causes a blockade. When the transaction of selling wheat at Port Arthur takes place the exporter, not knowing the rates he will have to pay

when his grain is shipped out, naturally charges the highest rate that has been in existence, and to make himself absolutely sure he charges a higher rate than what he would need to do if the rates were fixed. Thus this excessive rate which he is obliged to charge affects the producer and also the consumer, and thereby tends to stagnate trade. The wheat is held up in the elevators, which very often are filled to capacity, and all the available box cars are resorted to for storage, and the initial elevators are also congested, simply because the exporter has no guarantee as to the rate he will have to pay on exporting the grain. Not only does it affect the producer of the grain, but it also affects every business man in the country. It is a well known fact that if the farmer cannot sell his produce he cannot pay his debts to the business man, and if the business man does not get his money from the farmer how can he continue in business?

I hope to see this amendment carried. This is not a party government any more, we do not need to wonder what will the party think; what we need to be concerned about is what will the people think of this progressive movement? The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb), I think, was very anxious lest the westerners freeze in the winter time, and he wanted to see them get their coal supply as cheaply as possible. I venture to say that if the rates were under control, those of us in the West who do use coal brought up to Port Arthur by boat would at least get it as cheap or cheaper than we do today.

The hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Stewart) remarked that the steamships on the lakes get no benefit from the Government. I think he did not mean to say that, because he surely knows that any ship plying on the lakes of Canada has the benefit of the aids to navigation provided by the Government, As has been stated by the hon. member for East Lambton, when the proposed extensions and improvements to navigation are completed they will have cost this country over $400,000,000. That enormous expenditure is for the deepening of channels and the construction of canals and locks, and our steamships plying on the lakes will have the benefit and the free use of those aids to navigation. Yet they say: We get no help from the Government; therefore our rates should not be brought under the control of the State.

This matter affects one of the most important links in our transportation system. We are approaching the time when we shall be up against the keenest competition on the wheat market at Liverpool that we have ever seen. The countries of the world that were producing wheat in the past will again turn to that production, and Western Canadian wheat must be subjected to such a very long haul both by rail and by water, that if the rates are not cut down to an equitable basis we shall not be able to compete with our wheat on the markets of the world. The Committee should be very careful in considering this proposed amendment; the matter is of vital importance not only to the farmers of Western Canada and to the businessmen as well, but to the Dominion as a whole. It is our surplus products that will eventually pay our huge debt.

Mr. BRISTOL: There have been one or two statements in connection with this discussion which, I think, in the interests of the people should be cleared up in the minds of a few hon. members. I do not think it necessary to clear them up in the minds of business men, because I do not know of any Board of Trade, any shipper, any elevator man, any grain man, or any man who is interested in the shipping of the country in a practical way and has an accurate knowledge of shipping conditions in Canada, who has either made a complaint or expressed a desire for this legislation. Therefore it is only fair to say to my hon. friend (Mr. J. F. Reid) that there are one or two facts which the people to whom I have referred know much better than I do, and which I think it is proper to present for his consideration. One of them is this. The price of the wheat of the world is fixed at Liverpool. All wheat meets there, whether it comes from the Argentine, from Canada, or from the United States. Wheat from the Canadian West has to go to Liverpool, and it is in the public interest that it get there as cheaply as possible. There are two routes which it can take: via Buffalo and New York, or via Port Colborne and Montreal. That is the first competition that is presented to every shipping company that is not controlled by a railroad corporation; and they have to beat that Buffalo-New York route if they are to ship via Montreal. Let me tell you why. The rate of freight from New York to Liverpool has always determined the rate from Montreal to Liverpool. To meet that rate the Canadian boats have to beat the Buffalo-New York rate; they have to get to Montreal cheaper if they are to pay the addi-

tional ocean rate from Montreal to Liverpool. Why is it that the ocean freight rate is higher from Montreal to Liverpool than it is from New York to Liverpool? It is a very simple matter. New York, of course, is a centre of commerce of the United States. It is on one end of the so-called Atlantic triangle. Boats go to South America, from South America to New York and from New York to Liverpool, in all cases with full cargoes; therefore they are able to carry cheaper. The other point in favour of New York is the insurance rate, which is very high on the St. Lawrence route. I have heard many shipping men say that if Canada was to do full justice to her West the Canadian Government would have to take care of this insurance question and put Montreal and Quebec on a better footing of competition with New York.

That is one of the points. The other is this: It is true that the Canada Steamship line has the largest number of ships on the Great Lakes, but it has by no means a monopoly. Mr. Playfair's line is a keen competitor of Canada Steamships, or of any other line that operates on the Great Lakes. If the money had been put into it that imagination has painted to-night there would be some orders forthcoming for the Canadian shipyards—and there are none. Nobody wants to build ships, not even the Government of Canada, in order to secure the enormous profit which has been pictured to-night, but which exists only in imagination. If profits have been made in shipping during the war it has not been on the Great Lakes, but on the high seas. When the war started Great Britain appealed to every steamship company on the Great Lakes to put as many boats as they could on the high seas, because it was absolutely necessary, in view of the submarine warfare, to do everything possible to get tonnage. Canada Steamship Company put a certain number of their ships on the high seas, spending a large amount of money to fit them out. About nine of their ships were torpedoed. The British Government commandeered some of their ships at the rate of twelve shillings a ton dead weight, and out of those ships the British Government made for the British Exchequer probably £50 a ton dead weight or more. I have always contended that that should have gone into the treasury of Canada, and I still think so. The British shipping companies during the first two years of the war made on the high seas from 200 to 1,000 per cent. Great Britain had control of the high seas, and it was fortunate that she had; otherwise the British Empire would have become bankrupt. Then the British Government took hold of the shipping on the high seas, gave the shipping companies twelve shillings a ton deadweight and made as high as $300 and $350 a ton deadweight out of these very ships. That was the situation on the high seas. But when you come to fix rates, what the shippers have always wanted is absolute flexibility of rate. That is, they want to be able to trade on the rate from hour to hour and from day to day. The railway company has a special charter. It has rights of expropriation. If it is twenty miles from any other line of railway, naturally you have to regulate the rates, because it could charge anything it thought proper; but that does not apply to vessels on the Great Lakes. Anybody can build them; anybody can own them; anybody can operate them; the lakes are free to all. On the other hand, the railway companies operate under special legislation and with special privileges. When you have that flexibility of rate you get higher rates or lower rates, as the conditions vary.

My hon. friend spoke of the rate being as high as four, six or seven cents. Let me tell you the reason. As our ports freeze up in the winter, there is tremendous competition in the matter of getting cargoes on the last boats going out of the lake, in order to avoid the enormously high rate that would have to be paid to the railways. This accounts for the rate being six, seven or eight cents at the end of the season. If you fix a maximum rate, the only one who gets the benefit is the American vessel man, who will come in and take any freight he can get. The American shipping men can pay higher rates and take the grain by an American route because they have the advantage of the New York rate. If I believed that this amendment would cheapen the rate for the West, I would vote for it as a wise measure. But I assure you that the ships have to beat the railway rate; they have to beat the New York route, and they have the competition among themselves. If you want to benefit the Canadian farmer, you will have to get a lower rate on the high seas, and build up a merchant marine such as the Minister of Marine has been advocating. You will have to get a lower rate from Montreal to Liverpool in order to beat the New York route.

Mr. HENDERS: We have reached the time in the history of Canada when public utilities are in a large measure coming

under public supervision or control. So far as I can see, no valid reason has been presented to-night for not bringing shipping rates under control of the Railway Commission. Years ago it was found absolutely necessary in the interest of transportation to bring railway rates under the control of the Federal Government. Every argument that has been used here to-night against the bringing of the shipping interests under the control of the Government was used at that time against the bringing of the railways under that control. We have had years of experience with railways under government control through the board that is now operating, and we have no complaint against that control. Everybody is of the opinion, I believe, that it was a good thing in the interest of Canada that transportation by rail was brought under the supervision of the Railway Board.

Mr. ROBB: How much more does it cost to carry a bushel of grain from Fort William to Montreal than it did three years ago?

Mr. HENDERS: When I am through, the hon. member may ask his question. I want to present my argument and the hon. member has had an opportunity of presenting his. Every argument that was used in favour of bringing the railways under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board might be and has been reasonably put forward to-night why we should bring the shipping interests under some similar control. Now that we have tested out the value of control by the Railway Board, I believe we are quite safe in asking also that our water transportation mediums might be brought under similar control.

A great deal has been said to-night about fixing rates, and it was said that by fixing rates you preclude shipping companies from any right they might wish to exercise of carrying goods at a lower rate than the rate fixed. If it was a fixed rate, then the argument would hold good, but when it is not a fixed rate, but a maximum rate we are asking for, there is no argument in the statement. Ships can lower their rates as much as they see fit; all we ask is that there be a maximum rate beyond which they cannot go. Therefore, all that has been said along the line of interfering with railways reducing rates in order to get business, does not obtain here at all, and there is no argument in it.

Four years ago this matter came under consideration in the West. The interests represented by the producers of one of the most important commodities we have to ship in this country gave careful consideration to this question at the time. They passed resolutions urging that the Government of Canada should bring Canadian shipping interests under the control of some board, and a request made by a large producing interest like that should have consideration. There are two classes of people affected directly by the control of rates; one is the producer and the other is the consumer. I claim that the producing interests of Canada are practically a unit in asking for the fixing of a maximum rate. I claim further that the great consuming interests of Canada are largely behind those asking for the fixing of a maximum rate. The resolutions that have come here have come from boards of trade, from manufacturing associations and from wholesalers. These are people occupying a middle position, and it matters very little to them what attitude they take as regards fixing of rates. It affects them very little whether the rate is increased or not, because all they have to do is to add the increase to the cost of the goods and pass it on to the consumer. Both the producer and the consumer who are affected by the fixing of rates are largely if not entirely in favour of the amendment, and I therefore desire to urge as strongly as I can upon the Government the importance of giving careful consideration to this amendment. If the Government vote against this amendment, this will be another case where the statement may be made that the high cost of living is not being dealt with sympathetically by them.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The hon. member for Toronto Centre(Mr. Bristol) put his finger on the pulse of the situation as regards the steamship companies when he said that what they wished to maintain was a flexibility in rates. If that is interpreted in another way, it means that the steamship companies wish to be in a position which will enable them to discriminate between shippers and to quote to shippers that are within the circle a rate that they will not give to those who are without. It just narrows the water-borne traffic situation down to this, that no man in business anywhere in Canada to-day can undertake to enter into a contract for the delivery of a commodity anywhere in Canada if it has to be transported by water, and know that he is going to get transportation at all or that he is going to get it within a certain radii of rates, because at the time

the goods are ready to be shipped, he is absolutely at the mercy of the steamship companies. The hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Stewart) challenged the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) to cite an instance where discrimination had taken place or where a steamship company had failed to carry out its contract. I can cite a case where a steamship company entered into a contract to transport a large volume of freight, and because, in the interim between the time the contract was signed and the time the goods were to be transported, conditions had developed that made it possible for them to get any rate they asked, they repudiated their contract notwithstanding the fact that by so doing they placed the shipper of those goods in a position that meant ultimate bankruptcy. I know perfectly well the hon. member will say that the shipper had his recourse in the courts. That is true, and the shipper took recourse and the case has been before the courts for four years, and I anticipate that in all human probability it will be before the courts for as long a time as the steamship company can keep it there. In the meantime what about the goods that have to be transported? The situation in connection with the transportation on the Upper Lakes narrows down to this, to say nothing of rates, that the shipper is at the mercy of one or two large transportation companies that will take his freight if it suits them to take it and that will leave it on the docks if it does not suit them to take it, and there is no possible means by which the shipper can get redress.

After we have spent $400,000,000 in developing a waterway for the transportation of the commerce of this country, and large sums to protect that waterway for the steamers, it is only fair to the shippers that there should be some control over the rates in order that the steamship companies should not be permitted to do just as they like. I do not intend to enter into the question of the profits that have been made, but anybody who knows conditions on the Great Lakes knows that there has been a tremendous increase in the rates on the Upper Lakes from 1914 onwards. We hear a great deal about the increase of thirty-five to forty per cent in railway rates, but I know instances where there was an increase in water rates of 200 per cent on a certain commodity within four or five months during 1915-16. I cannot see any logical reason why the amendment of the hon. member for East Lambton should not carry. I am not sufficiently expert to know whether all the details are as they should be, but the principle involved is simply this: That we have as much right to control water-borne traffic as we have to control railway traffic, and I have no doubt whatever that the Railway Commission could work out the details so as to do justice to all concerned.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Amendment (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) negatived; yeas 36, nays 61.

Section agreed to.

On section 210—prior contracts:

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) has moved to amend this section by adding after the word "agreement" in the fifth line, the following words, "or notice thereof by caveat or otherwise."

Mr. J. D. REID: I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. J. D. REID: We have just one other section to consider, No. 374, which I shall ask the Committee to consider on Wednesday of next week.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—WAYS AND MEANS—SUPPLY BILL.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $28,933,622.56 being one-sixth of the amount of each item set forth in the Main Estimates for the year ending 31st March, 1920, not yet adopted, be granted to His Majesty for the year ending 31st March, 1920.

Motion agreed to, resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolutions concurred in.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE 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 31st March, 1920, the sum of $148,211,640.39 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir Thomas White moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 123 to provide for His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1920.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

On the motion of Sir THOMAS WHITE the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

Friday, May 30, 1919

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual report of Railway Statistics for the year ended 31st March, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT.

LAND FOR SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT TO BE WITHDRAWN FROM FOREST RESERVES.

On the Order for the introduction of Bills:

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I desire to introduce a Bill to amend the Forest Reserves and Parks Act. Although notice has been given, yesterday being a holiday it does not appear on the Order Paper to-day. In view of the necessity of the Act being considered at an early date in order that the reductions from the Forest Reserves for the purpose of Soldiers' settlement may be made available in the following month, I would like time to be saved to the extent of three or four days by having the introduction gone on with to-day. The purpose of the Bill is to take from certain of our forest reserves some areas that have been inspected and found fit for agricultural purposes. I therefore beg to move, with the consent of the House, for leave to introduce Bill No. 125, to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF HOUSE TO INQUIRE INTO COST OF FOODSTUFFS, ETC.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): moved:

That a Special Committee of the House consisting of Messrs. Nicholson (Algoma), Stevens, Reid (Mackenzie), Douglas (Strathcona), Davis, Hocken, Sutherland, Fielding, Davidson, Nesbitt, McCoig, Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.), Devlin, Vien and Euler, be appointed for the purpose of inquiring forwith as to the prices charged throughout Canada for foodstuffs, clothing, fuel and other necessaries of life, and as to the rates of profit made thereon by dealers and others concerned in their production, distribution and sale; also as to rentals of dwelling houses in industrial centres of Canada and rates of return of capital invested therein, with power to send for persons, papers and records, examine witnesses under oath, engage accountants and other necessary assistants and to report to the House from time to time the result of their inquiry with any recommendations they may make with a view to effecting a reduction in such prices and rentals.

Motion agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL UNREST IN CANADA.

STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER ON LABOUR SITUATION IN TORONTO.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Would the Government state if they have anything new in regard to the strike? It is important to the House. The hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) is back from Winnipeg.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): We have a very reassuring telegram this morning from Senator Robertson at Winnipeg, who reports that the condition is greatly improved there to-day. He says that the railway mail clerks, 110 in number, who went out at first, returned within the time limit given them to return, and that there are numerous applications, very largely from returned soldiers, for positions in the post office. Further, a great many of the employees of the city have returned to work; the clerical staff has returned in a body. The whole situation is so greatly improved that he purposes to leave for Ottawa to-morrow morning.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is understood that a delegation waited upon the Prime Minister yesterday. Will the right hon. gentleman tell the House if he reached any conclusion with them?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We spent nearly the whole day—from ten o'clock in the morning until seven o'clock in the evening—endeavouring to arrive at an arrangement which would compose the differences between the employees and employers, or, failing to arrive at an agreement, we strongly urged that the questions in difference should be submitted either to an investigation by a Royal Commission or to arbitration. There was an approach towards an agreement, but no agreement was finally

reached. A great many proposals on one side and the other were put forward, and the final result, about seven o'clock in the evening, was that the employers made a proposal in writing which, I think, was furnished to the press, and which was to be submitted by the representatives of the labour organizations to the men in Toronto. I believe it was so presented, but the men did not see fit to accept it. The chief question under discussion yesterday was the granting of a week of forty-four hours, and it was upon that question that the employers finally decided to offer arbitration. We endeavoured to have the offer accompanied with some other conditions which possibly might have made it more acceptable, but it was presented finally in the form which has been made public. I understand that a considerable number of men have gone out on strike in Toronto to-day.

JUDGES' ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Meighen, Bill No. 104, to amend the Judges' Act was read a second time, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—One additional judge provided for in British Columbia:

Mr. BUREAU: Is it proposed to change the number of judges, or make a change in the salaries in British Columbia?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no change made in the salaries; the Bill provides for the addition of one judge to the County Court Bench of British Columbia.

Mr. STEVENS: Has the minister, since we last discussed the matter of judges' salaries, arrived at a decision to increase the salary of the county court judges of British Columbia which I think it was very fully demonstrated and agreed to on the former occasion, is altogether too small? I think the Acting Minister of Justice at that time suggested that he expected the Minister of Justice would return to Canada in time to deal with the matter; but inasmuch as there seems to be no indication of the latter's return at present, I would ask the acting minister to give that phase of the question his consideration now that we have such a Bill before us as the present one and remedy what is, without any doubt, a grave injustice to those judges.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I stated on the occasion of the consideration of the resolution which preceded this Bill was as stated by the hon. gentleman. Since that time, during much of which intervening period I have been absent, it transpires that the Minister of Justice will not probably be back for any substantial portion at least of this session. Consequently I feel that the responsibility is on me of making a recommendation on the subject which the hon. gentleman has brought to my attention. As to what the decision of the Government will be I could not now say, but I can inform the hon. gentleman that an answer will be given him some day next week.

Mr. FULTON: I was not present when this matter was discussed in the House a week or two ago, but I would like to support the attitude of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stevens) in regard to it. I notice that on the former occasion it was stated that there was no discrimination so far as the salaries of the county court judges throughout the Dominion are concerned. That is true as regards the salaries of county court judges under that title, but I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Justice if it is not a fact that the judges in the province of Quebec who hold a similar position to the county court judges in the other provinces are not paid higher salaries? If I am not mistaken the Superior court judges in that province hold positions equivalent to those of county court judges in the other provinces, and are paid higher salaries than those County Court judges are. I also noticed that in the debate the other day the point was made that in the other provinces the salaries of the County Court judges are augmented by the provinces themselves. That, I think, is clear proof that the salaries are not considered adequate, and I think no member of the House would for a moment urge that a stipend of $3,000 a year is by any means suitable for a County Court judge under existing conditions. I believe that British Columbia is the only province, in the West at least, that does not add to the salaries given these judges by the Dominion Government. In considering what the salary ought to be it seems to me that the Dominion Government has nothing whatever to do with additions to judicial salaries which the provinces may make. In British Columbia up to some twenty years ago the salary was enhanced by the provincial government appointing each County Court judge a stipendary magistrate, which carried with it an additional $500. That system was done away with something like twenty years ago, and there is now only one judge in the province who receives that additional

salary. The change did not affect those judges who were acting as stipendary magistrates at the time, but was applied to those who have since been appointed. I would strongly urge that the question of an increase in salary for these judges be not only given consideration, but favourable consideration, by the Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend is under a misapprehension as regards the Superior Court judges of the province of Quebec. In that province we have the district of Montreal and the district of Quebec, where the judges of the Superior Court receive an annual salary of $7,000. Then there are rural districts where a judge of the Superior Court administers justice—not for one county, as in Ontario and the other English-speaking provinces, but for several counties forming one district—and they receive an annual stipend of $5,000 a year.

Mr. FULTON: Is the jurisdiction of those judges limited in any way?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not at all. They have even a larger jurisdiction than the judges of the Superior Court in Montreal, because in the rural districts these judges not only hear civil cases, but also cases which in that city are passed upon by the judges of the Circuit Court. They likewise hear the Criminal Court cases which in Montreal and Quebec are dealt with by the judges of the Court of King's Bench. We have no such courts as County Courts in our province.

Mr. PARDEE: Has the Government decided to increase the salaries of the County Court judges in Ontario as it has been asked to do for some considerable time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have just stated in reply to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) that I would bring the subject to the attention of Council by way of recommendation in the immediate future, and will make a statement on the subject some time next week.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad indeed that the Acting Minister of Justice has decided to deal with this question. When it was before us on a previous occasion I tried to make clear what my own views were on the subject, and I am not going to take up the time of the Committee by repeating them now. I do not know what the views of the minister may be as to the salary that should be paid to these judges, but in view of the fact that we are granting salaries of $6,000 and $7,000 to officials in the Government service who are not doing any more important work than that which devolves upon the judges of the County Court, I would certainly suggest to the minister, if the suggestion is of any assistance to him, that the salaries of County Court judges should not be less than $5,000. The case of the judges in the province of British Columbia has been advanced, and in the representations on their behalf I absolutely concur. However, I have no special request to make for the judges of one province more than those of another; I think the County Court judges throughout the country should receive the same salary. I might say, though, that it has been brought to my notice that in the chief city of Manitoba, the province of the Acting Minister of Justice, the County Court judge only receives $3,000 a year, whereas in Halifax and St. John, and other large provincial centres, the County Court judges receive $3,500.

There is no reason why the leading County Court judge in the metropolitan city of Manitoba should get less than a County Court judge at Halifax or St. John. The minister will have in mind the leading County Court judge in Winnipeg. I am not acquainted with him and do not know his name, but no doubt the minister knows him well; I understand that he is a capable man and ranks favourably with those occupying similar positions in other leading cities of the Dominion.

I submit that the Superior Court judges in all the provinces should receive the same salary. In Nova Scotia, for instance, the Superior Court judges do not get the same salary as judges performing similar duties in Quebec and Ontario. I shall not take the comparison further west; but these judges are all in the same class; they administer the same laws and exercise the same jurisdiction, and their salaries should be uniform. The minister pointed out the other day that the difference between the salaries of some of the judges in New Brunswick and Manitoba was due to the fact that some of them were judges of the Court of Appeal. That does not apply to Nova Scotia, because our Circuit Court judges are judges of Appeal. The province has elected that for all time the judges of the Circuit Court shall be also judges of the Court of Appeal, and as these judges are satisfactorily doing the work of both courts, they should receive the same salary as the Superior Court judges in other provinces. It would bring about good feeling and harmony in all the courts if judges performing similar

duties throughout Canada were all treated alike.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend's proposed recommendation apply to all the provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No proposed recommendation is in being as yet. Now that the responsibility apparently cannot be taken by the minister himself, I intend to make a recommendation to Council in the premises and to make a statement to Parliament next week as to what the position is.

Mr. FIELDING: In the discussion that took place a day or two ago in regard to the Civil Service, an hon. member laid down the rule—which seemed to be an excellent one—that if we had fewer officials and paid them better, good results would follow. Is that not a good rule to apply to the judges? I notice that, by legislation of Ontario, there is to be a considerable reduction in the number of County Court judges in that province. In this case we are proposing to increase the number of judges in British Columbia. I have not sufficient knowledge of British Columbia to offer an opinion in the matter, but it seems odd that at a time when Ontario is cutting down the number of its judges British Columbia finds it necessary to make an increase. I know the difficulty that arises owing to the jurisdiction of the provinces in the matter of the courts and the fact that the Dominion has to provide the judges and pay the bills. I know this is a layman's view and that laymen ought not to say much about these things; but there is a wide-spread opinion that the rule of having fewer officials and paying them better is a good one to apply to the judges as well as to other branches of the public service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am thoroughly in agreement with my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), so much so that I addressed a communication to the attorneys general of all the provinces, British Columbia among the others, looking to provincial legislation for reduction in the provinces. A practical response has come from Ontario in very substantial reductions, indeed. This Bill, however, provides for the filling of a vacancy created by the Legislature of British Columbia. In the northern portion of the island of Vancouver a considerable settlement has grown up, particularly in the coal-bearing regions, since the previous distribution of judges was made, which cannot be adequately served by the number of judges they now have.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. JACOBS: Do these judges in British Columbia receive also surrogate and other fees, as in Ontario, in order that their salary may be brought up to some kind of a living wage?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed that such is not the case.

Mr. MOWAT: If the minister inquired what was the opinion of the different Bars in the province on this subject, he would find that it is in favour of a substantial increase in the emolument of judges. Until twenty years ago the senior County Court judges received $2,600 a year and the junior judges $2,000 a year. That remuneration was, perhaps, good enough for the time when people were not so luxurious and so extravagant as they are now and when the incomes of merchants and millers and other people generally were low. But as the incomes of the townspeople increased it was felt that the judges should be put on a par with the persons whom they would meet in a business way, socially, or otherwise. It was not deemed proper that the judge, who had the affairs of the people in his hands for adjudication, should be thought to be a man living from hand to mouth. He should be an independent person and be able to take his place socially or any other way with the best people in the community. Accordingly, about twenty years ago the salaries were raised to $3,000. But the purchasing power of a dollar is only half what it was, and, following out the principle upon which this remuneration was fixed years ago, we must surely increase it so that it will meet the condition brought about by the decreased purchasing power of the dollar. I am glad that the minister received such a definite reply to his suggestion from Ontario. At the recent session of the Ontario Legislature they took away all the junior judges—whose remuneration has been $3,000, the same as the senior judges—except in two countries, York and Wentworth, where the judges have a great deal to do. Twenty-eight junior judgeships are done away with and the positions will not be filled; but when senior judgeships become vacant the positions will be filled from these junior judgeships. This will result in a very large saving in a few years—probably from $50,000 to $80,000. That sum might well be distributed among the seniors who are left in the different counties. A county court judge cannot at present keep up the social position which the people expect him to keep up, nor educate his family properly,

nor buy the necessary books to keep up with the literary and social events of the day, unless he has a salary of at least $5,000 a year, and I sincerely trust the Government will come to the conclusion that the remuneration of judges should not be less than that sum.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the minister made any appointments to judgeships in either Saskatchewan or Alberta lately? It has been brought to my notice by somebody, whose name I cannot recall at the moment, that certain judicial districts have been created by the legislature in one or the other or both of those provinces, but that no judges have been appointed, and that a great deal of hardship has been suffered in those districts on that account. It was stated that the judges who had to do the work lived so far away from where the court sat that it was difficult for them to get there, and when they got there, they were in a hurry to return to their own district, and that the administration of justice was suffering very much in those sections.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The cases to which the hon. member refers have been brought to my notice; indeed, they existed prior to my assuming the duties of Acting Minister of Justice. They were subsisting while the minister himself was here. I have not made a recommendation as to filling the vacancies; indeed, I have made no recommendation as to filling any judicial vacancy in Canada. It may be that concurrently with the consideration of the salary question, I shall have to give consideration also to filling these vacancies. The reason why I did not make a recommendation was this. I certainly was not convinced that the provincial Government, say of Saskatchewan, would not be able by a readjustment of judicial districts so to provide that the present bench could render efficient service. I addressed a letter accordingly to the Attorney General, but I have not been informed of any action having been taken. There is no doubt at all that the Attorney General of the province would be in a much better position than I to judge as to the feasibility of my suggestion. I fear that his attitude is unfavourable.

Mr. DEVLIN: Has the department any intention of increasing the salaries of judges of the Superior Court of Quebec? This question has been mooted for a number of years, and the excuse always given was the necessity of first adjusting the salaries of judges of the county courts of Ontario; and it was stated that when that was done the Government or the department intended to take up the question as regards Superior Court judges. Many of these judges are earning far less than civil servants and they are not able to keep up with the dignity of the position. In many instances they are barely able to make both ends meet, and that is not in accord with the positions they hold as they should be far above all possibilty of want, because they have very serious duties to perform. I hope the minister has the question under consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The discussion opened with a contrast drawn by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Fulton) between the salaries of judges in Quebec and those of judges in other provinces. He pointed out that Superior Court judges in Quebec received $5,000 while county court judges in other provinces received $3,000. There is, however, a difference in jurisdiction, but there is in Quebec really no bench corresponding in jurisdiction and certainly no bench corresponding in salary with the county, or district court bench, as it may be called, of the other provinces. I have not progressed with the subject far enough to say that I have reached any intention at all. The whole subject has to be considered as one—a Dominion wide subject.

Referring to the observations of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) as to the opinion of the Bar of Canada, I have received from members of the Bar and from Bar associations, resolutions large in number and influential in signatures, all in favour of a substantial increase to judges. That body of opinion has left no doubt in the mind of the department as to what it considers should be done. I can only add that as yet I have not received any favourable resolutions from Grain Growers' associations or from the Labour Temple.

Mr. JACOBS: May I bring to the attention of the minister a matter which arises out of the discussion this afternoon with regard to increasing judges' salaries? I trust that some of the Quebec judges—I do not know about judges in the other provinces—will see their way clear towards rendering judgment within say three or four years after a case has been placed before them for decision. This is a matter which ought to engage the attention of the Department of Justice. The delays in the matter of handing down judgments have almost approached a scandal. I confess that

when I see the judgments over which some judges have been spending so much time, I am mystified as to the long delays. Within the last few years there have been made to the bench appointments of several men who probably consider that they have been placed there simply as pensioners, because little is ever done by these gentlemen to see that speedy judgments are handed down. I speak about this matter advisedly, and while probably I am somewhat out of order, I hope that bringing this matter to the attention of the Committee will make some of these judges understand that they are, after all, servants of the public, as other people in the Civil Service are, and that they must do their duty as other employees in the Government service do.

Mr. PROULX: I do not think the position of judges is as lamentable as was stated by some hon. members this afternoon and the other day. A judge, besides receiving a salary while on the bench, can, after a certain number of years, get a retiring allowance. After fifteen years, he can retire on an allowance equal to two-thirds of his salary, and after twenty or twenty-five years, on an allowance equal to his salary. If one looks through the judges' accounts, one will find that there are in this country quite a few retired judges receiving large retiring allowances, some $8,000, some $7,000 and some less. There is a provision in the law that if a judge, through physical disability becomes incapable of discharging the duties of his office he is entitled to receive a liberal allowance, amounting in some cases to two-thirds of his salary and at least to one-half. We must also take into consideration the fact that judges are not liable for income tax, while members of other professions are. Therefore, the Acting Minister of Justice should take these things into consideration when he receives recommendations to increase judges' salaries. The cost of living to-day is so high that everybody is asking for an increase in salary, but there would be no necessity for increasing salaries if the Government took measures to lower the cost of living. Some of the civil servants have been granted an increase in salary; too much, I think. The Government has appointed a commission to re-classify the Service, and should have awaited their report before raising the salaries of the deputy ministers, because if the report finds their salaries too high the Government would find it rather difficult to decrease them. I hope that the Committee which has been appointed to inquire into the cost of living will bring about a reduction in the cost of living, and if that is the result the salaries which we have paid to the judges since 1905 would then be sufficient, and the country would save the large amount involved in this proposed increase.

Mr. TOLMIE: As a layman representative from British Columbia, I wish to endorse heartily the suggestion that the salaries of the County Court and other judges be adequately increased. When we take into consideration the importance of the position which the judges occupy and the heavy responsibilities that rest on their shoulders, I think it is highly dangerous for us to allow these men to go on living from hand to mouth. I think their salaries should be so increased as to put them on a footing where they could hold their own in a social way.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have just been reminded that it was in 1905 that substantial increases were made in the salaries of the judges. I was in the House then, but I really forget whether the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada received an increase at that time. I have been informed that they did not. I think it is only fair that the minister should bear these judges in mind when dealing with salary increases.

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose there is no danger of the judges going on strike for an increase.

Mr. BURNHAM: It seems to me that the reason for this application for an increase in salary is sound, because recompense or pay is given for the purpose of allowing the recipient to maintain the struggle for existence. That being the case, it logically follows that when the struggle for existence becomes more intense the pay should increase, and that applies to every branch of industry, to the workingman and the professional man. If this is not done, we must have unrest even among the judges; if the unrest becomes acute it becomes a riot; if it becomes more acute still and the struggle more intense, it becomes a revolution. We must surely expect to observe the common logic of facts. If pay, therefore, is a reasonable recompense, the pay must be increased as the struggle for existence becomes more intense.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I understand that on several occasions the Acting Minister of Justice has had drawn to his attention the case of the King's Bench judges in the province of Manitoba, who, I am informed,

are not getting the same salaries as the judges in other provinces doing the same class of work. I understand that the minister is considering their case, and I should like to ask whether action will be taken by the Government to put these judges on the same basis as judges in other provinces doing the same work.

Mr. JACOBS: In Manitoba, they rely on Royal Commissions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No action has as yet been taken, but in the general consideration their case will have a place in the front rank.

Mr. McKENZIE: I observe that the minister from Nova Scotia (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and the Acting Minister of Justice are sitting together, and I would point out that there is a vacancy in the judiciary of district No. 6 in the province of Nova Scotia, the County Court judge having died a good many months ago. This is a large district with a good deal of work and the judge from Pictou, I think, has had to be recalled to this district. As this appointment must be made, I think the sooner it is made the better.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is one of about seven appointments that are waiting.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice) moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 81, to amend the Interpretation Act, be concurred in. He said:

The Senate merely provides that the term "Superior Court" when used with reference to British Columbia means the Court of Appeal and also the Supreme Court of that province. That point was not covered in the original Bill. Otherwise, the Bill is as before.

Motion agreed to, and amendment concurred in.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Agriculture—salaries, including Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner at $5,000, Seed Commissioner at $5,000, Director of Experimental Farms at $4,000, Live Stock Commissioner at $3,600, and Dominion Entomologist at $3,600, $465,737.50.

Mr. McKENZIE: Can the minister give the Committee any sort of horoscope as to the future development of agriculture in this country, especially as regards a greater interest in farming and a desire for increased production? Does he find on the part of the people a tendency to stay on the farms or are they drifting away?

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): I have never been any good at casting horoscopes, and I do not care to venture into that field now. The question raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition is, of course, an important one, but I cannot give, with any degree of accuracy, the number of people that have left the farms in Canada during the past year, or the number of those who have taken up farming. At present there is some difficulty in certain parts of Canada in securing an adequate supply of farm labour. This, I think, is due perhaps to the natural unrest that has ensued from the trying experiences through which the country has passed during the last four years. Generally speaking, agricultural conditions throughout Canada are good at the present time. A brief survey of agricultural results for the past year shows that in the Western Provinces the crop has suffered from drought and frost. However, with the abundant optimism characteristic of the Prairie Provinces, the farmers have settled down to work, and according to the most reliable information I have been able to obtain, there has been planted this year a larger acreage in cereals than was the case even last year, and I am very happy to say that the crops in Western Canada this spring have been planted in better condition than for several years past. We had an abundance of moisture practically all over the Prairie Provinces, and the prospects at the time of seeding and immediately after were excellent. Of course, our final crop returns will depend almost entirely on weather conditions during June and July. There is not such a fortunate condition of affairs in Ontario. There has been a great deal of rain in this province, and there have been difficulties in getting seeding completed, so that on the whole the situation is somewhat backward. However, it is not too much to hope that we may have good returns from Ontario and Quebec. Conditions in the Maritime Provinces are very good as far as we can gather.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We largely increased our production last year in Quebec.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, that is true as regards Quebec. A fine effort was made to

increase production there last year and good results were obtained. The conditions for the future are of course somewhat unsettled, as I have already stated; but there is every indication that excellent markets will be found for all our agricultural products for the next couple of years, at any rate.

Mr. JACOBS: And at fair prices?

Mr. CRERAR: At good prices. I do not know whether I have looked into the horoscope sufficiently to satisfy the leader of the Opposition, but I trust this information will be of some benefit.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was pleased to get this information from the hon. minister. We have no opportunity in the House of hearing any opinions from the Minister of Agriculture except when he comes with his Estimates, and I have always felt, as I feel now, that the prominence is not given in this House to the Agricultural Department that it is entitled to and should always have had. I put my questions not with any intention of embarrassing the minister but merely to give him an opportunity of dealing with his department and
4 p.m. giving the people to understand that its importance is duly recognized. When we have any questions before us in connection with agriculture and farmers generally we are dealing with a large and important subject which is at the very foundation of the prosperity of the country, and the more prominence we give to agriculture and the more attention it receives at our hands, the more readily will the farmer or the man who intends going on the farm be impressed with the importance of rural life and the fact that he is engaging in an industry which the members of this House realize as vital to the prosperity of the nation. This was my object in drawing out the minister as to what has been done and the prospects of agricultural life in Canada for the years to come.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think the minister understands the necessity for greater and more scientific agricultural production in the future. All the financial and economic authorities who have lately given their views as regards present conditions in Canada have insisted on the fact that what is needed is greater production The chief industry of Canada is above all farming. This is a great farming community and the more we can attract the people to country life the more we shall do in the way of restoring the country to a basis of sound economy and prosperity. There must be more production along scientific lines. Although I am not much over the fifty-year mark, there has been in my day and generation quite a change in the method of agriculture. I shall not speak for other sections of the country, but the section with which I am most familiar. Even in the constituency of Gaspé, where the people are fishermen and farmers simultaneously, I have noticed during the last twenty years a change for the better in agricultural methods. This, I am pleased to say, is due in a large degree to the very progressive education given our farmers by the Department of Agriculture in Quebec, and also, I must say, by the officials of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa. I do not know how the other provinces regard the lectures given to farmers, but speaking for my constituency of Gaspé I can say that the people are always pleased to meet the lecturers sent by the Department of Agriculture and that they quietly, without any great demonstration, adopt the methods suggested by the lecturers. In addition to this, the small experimental farms, not to speak of the largest, have produced the best results. If there is one expenditure to which the minister should commit himself more in the future, it is for the multiplication of these small farms.

I have in my mind especially the recommendations made by Professor Robertson in the report of the Commission on Technical Education. These latter recommendations have been published in pamphlet form and I have found them very instructive indeed. If I had any advice to offer my hon. friend it would be to try and live up to the recommendations made by Professor Robertson. I must compliment the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa upon having given to the district to which I belong politically—the district of Quebec—the magnificent experimental farm located in the constituency of my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). The agricultural school at St. Anne de la Pocatière is a Quebec institution and a very progressive one, but, since its establishment at the request of my hon. friend from Kamouraska, the Government has supplemented the work of that school by the establishment of an experimental farm and, following the establishment of the farm, there have been exhibitions every year which would be of interest even to the farmers of the other provinces of Canada.

While I am in a laudatory mood, might I not congratulate sincerely the Minister of Agriculture upon the appointment which he has made of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. I must be frank, sincere and honest in my appreciation of the good work accomplished by the Department of Agriculture. The farmers who sit in this House and the farmers in the country—at least the farmers in our part of the country—appreciate the great work which was done some years ago by the Hon. Sydney Fisher. He changed completely the complexion of the department and gave to it a very high standing in the country. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) enjoys to a large degree the confidence of the public because, as we know, he is a farmer and he is proud of it. In the appointment of his officials he has done the right thing in making them without regard to political considerations. He has appointed Mr. Grisdale and I have noticed that in the press and on both sides of politics that appointment has been hailed as a progressive step. Mr. Grisdale has had a long experience. He is known throughout Canada. He is a modest, humble official but stern and sturdy in the discharge of his official duties. He has another great advantage which we cannot ignore. He speaks both languages fluently. How can you expect to reach the different farming communities in the different provinces if the officers of the department cannot be understood in the literature which they send out to every section of the country or in the lectures which they deliver to their farming audiences? By appointing Mr. Grisdale you have appointed the best officer in the department to a position which he will fill, we know, with great profit to the country. Besides, any farmer from my province can come to him, speak in his own language and be answered and understood as if he were speaking to one of his own fellow countrymen. I congratulate my hon. friend on this appointment. I hope that under Mr. Grisdale the department will continue the traditions established by the predecessor of my hon. friend the Hon. Sydney Fisher, who was really the friend of the farmer.

Mr. CRERAR: I quite appreciate the suggestion made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) respecting a survey of agricultural conditions in Canada. I might perhaps, at the risk of wearying the Committee a little bit, give some more information on that subject. The fact is patent that almost all of our agricultural produce has its price fixed in the outside markets of the world. There is scarcely any agricultural products produced in Canada that we are not exporting to some extent. I find that the total value of these exports for the year ended March 31, 1919 was almost $400,000,000. I quite believe that that amount is capable of great expansion. Unfortunately, there are many districts in Canada where there is a lack of appreciation on the part of the farmers of the value of management in their business and of quality in their production. We enjoy to-day, for instance, in the markets of Great Britain the first position in so far as our bacon exports are concerned.

Mr. McMASTER: Even better than Denmark?

Mr. CRERAR: Even better than Denmark. That is due to the type of bacon hog that is produced in Canada. We also have the premier position in Great Britain with respect to our cheese industry, the foundation of which was laid many years ago by Dr. Robertson who has done much excellent work for agriculture in Canada. I have endeavoured on all occasions to impress upon Canadian farmers the importance of quality in their production. Particularly is there need for that in regard to the quality of the beef that we export to the European market. I was surprised to learn from the representatives of the British Ministry of Food that Canadian beef was regarded as inferior to the article imported from Argentina and the United States. We have had within the past year, several conferences with representatives of the Canadian breeders and live stock men's associations. This problem with others has been discussed with them and we have taken every possible means to impress upon, and to bring home to them, the importance of this matter, and I think this has resulted in a quickened interest in it.

There is no reason why Canada, having in mind its geographical location, should not attain a very high place indeed in agriculture. We are closer to the European markets, and especially the great consuming market of the United Kingdom, than any other country outside of Europe, and the trade routes by which our produce reaches those markets traverse the temperate zone. When one considers that a vessel can make three trips from Canada to Liverpool in the time required for one trip from Melbourne to Liverpool, and two trips from Canada to Liverpool in the time consumed by a trip from Buenos Aires to Liverpool, our advantage in that respect is readily seen.

Mr. McMASTER: With reference to the conferences concerning beef production, what is the reason for the inferiority of our position as compared to the Argentine and the United States?

Mr. CRERAR: The Argentine dressed carcases of beef will probably average eight hundred to eight hundred and fifty pounds, whereas those of Canada will run from six hundred to six hundred and fifty pounds per carcass. Those from the United States are somewhere in between those figures.

Mr. McMASTER: Is there any difference in the quality of the meat?

Mr. CRERAR: The quality improves with the weight of the carcass. As I say, the matter has been receiving attention, and, as it is a question of breeding the right kind of stock, the remedy is a very simple one. I was alluding to the advantages which Canada possesses in respect to the British market; I was about to allude also to the advantages, the growing advantages, which we enjoy in regard to the market to the south of us. There is, at the present time, every evidence that the industrial expansion and development in the United States will be in a greater ratio hereafter than its agricultural development; and respecting some agricultural products it would appear that already the United States is approaching the position of being an importing country. When that time comes Canada will occupy a splendid position in respect of these markets; and I think that in the United States in the next twenty-five years —indeed even in the next ten years—we will see a great consuming market growing up for such of our agricultural products as cheese, butter, milk, honey, and meat of various kinds, and also cereals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Provided the tariff is no bar?

Mr. CRERAR: Always provided, of course, that no unnatural barrier will be raised against our products.

Mr. McMASTER: I remember some years ago looking into the question of cheese importations by the United States. At that time, and I presume there are now, unless the war has changed the situation, tremendous importations into the republic to the South of what I think are called fancy cheeses—cheeses that come from Switzerland, Italy and other countries, and are somewhat different from the ordinary cheese. It struck me at that time that there was a tremendous field for Canadian endeavour in the manufacture and exportation to the American market of fancy cheeses, and I would like to know whether the Government has looked into this matter, and what steps, if any, it has taken to encourage the production of fancy cheeses in Canada.

Mr. CRERAR: That matter has been receiving the attention of the department. I am not much of a connoisseur in cheese, if I might apply the term to that article, but I may say that we are making, for instance, at the Central Experimental Farm in this city, one of the best fancy cheeses produced in America. The cheeses to which the hon. gentleman alludes are imported from Europe; some people have a fancy for eating Swiss, Dutch, or Canadian cheese, as the case may be. Personally, I have never been able to see very much difference between them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend was speaking of dressed beef. Let us return to the animal itself. With reference to the embargo in Great Britain on Canadian cattle, I notice that some papers in the United Kingdom are referring to it occasionally and are asking the British authorities to lift that embargo, which has been a sort of a stigma against Canadian cattle. My hon. friend probably knows the merits of the question better than I do. He knows that for years the British authorities have ordered our cattle to be slaughtered at the landing ports in the United Kingdom, practically at Liverpool, under the pretext that they were diseased and suffering from pleuro-pneumonia. It has been established beyond a doubt, however, that our cattle are absolutely free from that disease, and if my hon. friend wants the best available evidence on the subject, I might refer him to the testimony of the late Sir Charles Tupper. I must say to the credit of the old Conservative chieftain that while he was our High Commissioner in London he waged a bonny fight for Canada on that question. He states in his memoirs how on several occasions he approached the Board of Trade in England in order to have the embargo removed, and he offered to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the excuse given by the British authorities for the exclusion of Canadian cattle was in the nature of a very flimsy pretext. Being a medical man himself who, in his day, was renowned as a practitioner, he even went so far as to present himself at the abattoirs in Liverpool where, removing his coat and rolling up his shirt sleeves, his hands dripping with the blood of the animal, he made tests which proved beyond

contradiction that the excuse given by the British authorities for the embargo was no excuse at all. However, nothing was done to meet the wishes of Canada, and the agitation for the lifting of the embargo went on for years. Finally the question was brought up when the Imperial Conferences began to be held, and I have noticed that the question was raised on the occasion of each of these conferences in London. It was brought up first by Sir Charles Tupper, then by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and finally, if I mistake not, by the present Prime Minister. It appears that a few months ago the enforcement of the embargo was a lively question in the Old Country, and my attention has been directed to the fact that certain of the press of the United Kingdom are now asking the British authorities to lift it. Were any steps taken during the Prime Minister's stay in London with a view to carrying out this policy, which appeals to every true Canadian and to every cattle-raiser in Canada?

Mr. CRERAR: The restriction was imposed on Canadian cattle about twenty-five years ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Thirty years ago.

Mr. CRERAR: The alleged reason was the existence of pleuro-pneumonia in Canadian herds. The evidence was supposed to rest upon the case of one particular animal that was said to have had the disease when it landed at Liverpool. It is very clear, however, that the disease did not exist in Canada. Nevertheless, an embargo was placed upon Canadian cattle, and it has remained in force ever since, despite the efforts that have been made to have it removed. I am not familiar with the steps that were taken to this end by the Government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—

Mr. LEMIEUX: By every Government.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes. I am not thoroughly familiar with the steps that were taken, but I do know that at the Imperial Conference in 1917 the matter was brought up, and it was brought up again last year. Dr. Robertson went overseas last June in a representative capacity for the Department of Agriculture to look into the food situation and to gather what information he could as to future food prospects generally and as to how Canada could best co-operate in assisting the Allies. I asked him at that time to assist the Prime Minister who was then in Great Britain, to bring this matter in the proper way before the British authorities. That was done. Dr. Robertson again went over with the Prime Minister when he left Canada last year to attend the Peace Conference. We had gathered all the data and information that we could in Canada bearing upon the matter, and he has been active in taking the matter up with the British authorities since that time. In February we sent to Great Britain the Live Stock Commissioner for Canada to supply any additional information that might be required. Various breeders were interviewed and everything possible was done to remove the misconception existing in the minds of many British stockmen with regard to the probability of this disease or any other disease coming from Canada. I think we were able to convince them that Canada has a clean bill of health in regard to her live stock. I venture the assertion that there is no country in the world which guards the health of animals more carefully than Canada does. The matter is at present under consideration. All I can say is that we are hopeful that something will be done and that these markets may be opened up to us, at least in some degree, or as they were prior to the imposition of the embargo.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend any idea of the amount of the total export from Canada?

Mr. P. R. McGIBBON: I have been keeping in touch with the minister and his work during the year and I find that we have the right man in the right place. There is every reason to say that he has been doing good work. The experimental farms, large and small, are doing good work. There is a small one in the county which I represent; it is well situated and furnishes much useful information. The officials at that experimental farm station give instructions upon the cultivation of corn, grain and potatoes and information with regard to different kinds of soil, and so on. It is a great benefit to the county, and I wish the minister would do even a little more in the way of improving it. The farm is easy of access—a good gravel road leads to it—but we are wanting a little in equipment; we want better tools and machinery. A farm needs a lot of machinery; it is about as easy to equip a mill as it is to equip a farm with the right machinery. A great deal of the unrest that prevails in this country is due to the fact that not enough of us are on the farm. The farm will have to be made more attractive; the work will have to be made a little easier. With the assistance of the Government a

great deal can be done in a few years along this line. The present minister has had two or three years' experience; he is still a young man, and I would be sorry to see him drop out. I hope that the reports in the press that he is about to resign are not true. Although we differ in politics, yet I can say that he is doing his best for the farming interests of the country. The farmers have never been attended to as they should be. This country has been throwing bouquets in the way of titles to exploiters, the railroad men, the financiers. It is true that some dropped on good soil, but some certainly dropped on stony ground. I have yet to hear of the farmer who received a title, although many farmers have richly earned them. Farmers have spent half a lifetime in securing the best seed wheat that could be produced and sending it among the farmers, thus assisting in the raising of enormous crops in three western provinces. In this part of the country men have spent a lifetime perfecting stock—horses, cattle, cows, pigs, sheep, and everything that belongs to the farm; yet I do not see that the Government has thrown titles on any of their shoulders. I am sorry that titles are cut out, so far as that goes, because I would like to see some conferred upon the farmers.

Mr. McMASTER: They do not want them.

Mr. P. R. McGIBBON: Farming is the great industry of Canada. We can go ahead with manufacturing and railroading, but farming is the backbone of any country. As the county that I represent is composed principally of farmers I hope that the Government will keep to their good course and do all they can to encourage the farming industry.

In my judgment, the high cost of produce is the principal cause of strikes in this country, because a man's salary will not buy suitable clothes, provisions and food for himself and his family. We must, therefore, reduce the price of provisions, and the only way to do that is for more of us to go on the land, to cultivate the soil and to produce. We have in Canada one of the greatest countries the sun shines on and we may be proud of the country we inherit. We have in Canada sufficient land for a hundred million people. I have been informed that in the Peace river district there is room for thousands upon thousands of people, and that one can find there the very best of farming land. Settlers can go into that district for the next fifty years and yet there will be room. It is a district that is not nearly as cold as Manitoba or some of the other western provinces. We should cut out politics and get to farming, as it is the only thing that is going to save this country.

Mr. BOYCE: I intended to say a few words before my hon. friend (Mr. P. R. McGibbon) took the floor, but he has said every thing so well and so favourably to the cause of the farmers that he has left me with very little to say. I do not know whether he is a farmer or not, but if he is a farmer, I am sure he is a good one. He is, at least, a very good speaker on the subject, and he has put our cause in a very nice form. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux), who, I understand, is a lawyer, has shown some familiarity with a topic of interest to farmers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am a farmer also.

Mr. BOYCE: To hear the hon. member, I think he would be a very good one. The farming community of Canada is at the present time in a favourable position as regards the minister who now presides over the Department of Agriculture. We have a fine, practical Minister of Agriculture, and I think it would be hard to get any one to equal him. Further than that, he has a deputy who is well known throughout this Dominion and who has endeared himself to the farming community by his practical knowledge of agriculture. I refer to Professor Grisdale, a man whom I am pleased to say I have known for many years. He knows all the ins and outs of the farmers' requirements as well as, if not better than, any other man in Canada or possibly in any other country. Canada has been very fortunate in her choice of officials in regard to agriculture, and we need such officials now more than at any other time in our history. During the last few years, farmers have had difficulties like all other people, but I think we have suffered more than people of any other calling. It seems probable, moreover, that we are going to suffer some hardships this year on account of the backwardness of the season and of having so much rain that we can hardly get our crops in. But it is the duty of every one, no matter what his calling may be, to co-operate with the rest of the community and use his best efforts to make our soil produce as much as possible. Nothing but agricultural production will enable us to get rid of the tremendous burden of public debt which has accumulated. Agriculture is the

backbone of this country and as one who has been a farmer all his life I have no hesitation in saying that if this country were farmed as it should be, the land at present under cultivation would produce over a hundred per cent more than it does now. If we also take into account the many millions of acres the plough has not yet touched what will be the result? Not long ago, I was out West and every four or five miles there was an elevator. Not one of these elevators was built for fun; they were built to hold grain, and when they are full the returns to this country will, I am sure, surprise every one. A year or two of good crops in this Canada of ours would nearly wipe out the national debt. The money may not go as revenue direct to the Government, but it will go to individuals. We shall have the money, and when we have the money, the country will be the richer by that amount. I am glad that we have live men at the head of the Department of Agriculture, because we require live men and men who have an interest in the work and welfare of the country and I have no doubt that those men will use their efforts to the best advantage of Canada.

Mr. TURGEON: My purpose in rising is to let it be understood that the appreciation of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) and of his deputy is not confined to the provinces of Quebec, and Ontario. Coming from New Brunswick, a province in which there are the two races and languages, I may say that the reputation of the minister is as high there as it is in Quebec. During the last few years the farmers of New Brunswick have taken new heart in their industry and have doubled their production. The deputy minister is also well known in the district from which I come, to the French Acadians as well as to the Scotch, Irish and English, and I am sure the new appointment meets with their approval and good wishes, and that it will encourage the farming community in that section of Canada.

Some years ago, just before the Liberal party went out of power, I had been in hopes of having an experimental farm established at Petit Rocher which would be a central part for all the people of northern New Brunswick, from the Matapedia district to the Miramichi.

We have along these shores shipping facilities, wharfs, breakwaters and harbours by which steamer communication would be established with the other side of Bay des Chaleurs. Besides railway connections there is in that portion of the country the best and most improved highway in the province and one that is second to none in Canada. An experimental farm of modest dimensions could be established to start with, and I am sure it could be very rapidly extended. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to take note of my remarks and to see during the recess, whether it be short or long, what he can do in the matter in the interest of the farmers of northern New Brunswick. Farming is the basic industry of this country. In the early days of the session, I brought to the attention of the Government the necessity of readjusting the tariff so as to encourage the farming community before seeding commenced.

If that had been done, the labour situation would have been bettered and there would not be the unrest there is throughout the country to-day. To-day, again, I urge the Minister of Agriculture to take my remarks into consideration. He knows that I am with him in his desire to advance the interests of the farming industry, not only in the West but in the East as well. I can assure him that the farmers of the East are in harmony with the farmers of the West in their aspirations and in their economic views, and there is no danger of a cleavage between the people of the East and the people of the West. The only place in Canada where there is a cleavage is in Central Canada, where the unrest prevails to-day. We hope before long that unrest will be settled.

Mr. CRERAR: I appreciate very much the remarks that have been made expressing satisfaction with the appointment of the deputy minister. It was to me, personally, a source of much satisfaction that I was able to prevail on Dr. Grisdale to accept this position. I think he knows agriculture generally throughout Canada better than any other man—at all events better than any other man I have met.

With regard to the policy of the department in making appointments, we are following wherever possible the principle of promotion within the department rather than going outside for officials. I think that principle is sound in every respect and encourages those within the department, no matter what their position may be, to put forth their best efforts.

The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. McGibbon) dwelt on the importance of experimental farms as a means of agricultural education. I quite agree that the experimental and demonstration farms are one of the best means of bringing home to

our farmers the advantages of better methods of cultivation and production generally. It must be borne in mind, however, that these farms, as their names imply, are largely experimental. We have in Canada to-day, outside of the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa, 20 experimental farms and stations, 3 tobacco stations, 7 sub-experimental farms or substations as we call them, and 44 illustration farms. I look to the development of the illustration farm as perhaps the best means of bringing within the reach of the average farmer a knowledge of better methods of cultivation and general improvement in agricultural methods. These illustration farms are worked on the following plan. A district is selected and examined, and one of the best farmers of the district who is willing to undertake the work is asked to associate himself with the work of the experimental farms. A certain plot of his land is set apart, and he cultivates this plot under the direction and supervision of the representative of the department, who visits him at stated periods. In Western Canada last fall, in the drought-stricken area, we had one or two striking illustrations of the value of this work, particularly as to the effect of proper soil cultivation on the retention of moisture in the soil, with consequent greater production. That work is being actively carried on. The purely experimental farm is, of course, of great value, but the illustration farm can at a small expense be brought within the reach of almost every farmer.

There is another point, and a very important one. It is a conclusion I have reached as the result of my experience in the department and of the study I have been able to give the subject generally. There is expended in Canada through the Federal and Provincial Departments of Agriculture approximately $7,500,000 annually. I am convinced that from the national point of view we are not getting the results from that expenditure that might be secured. In my judgment, there should be closer co-operation and better co-ordination between the federal and provincial activities. I found on making inquiries that in many cases federal and provincial activities were overlapping—that both federal and provincial departments were in certain cases carrying on the same line of work. Now that is a waste of effort, and I might add also, a waste of money. At this particular time, when our national expenditure is mounting very rapidly, and we shall have to face in the future heavy taxation and probably difficulties in raising the necessary revenue it is of the greatest importance, not only in the field of agriculture, but in every other field, that there should be the closest co-operation and co-ordination between federal and provincial activities. I have already mentioned this matter to a few provincial ministers of agriculture, and they were quite sympathetic to the idea. This is an important matter, and I hope it will be more fully inquired into during this year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What were the total exports of cattle last year?

Mr. CRERAR: The total exports of cattle last year, according to the figures supplied me by the Statistical Department, amounted to over 300,000 head.

Mr. McMASTER: On the hoof?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: One of the reasons that led up to the exportation of cattle was the embargo placed on dairy products in the month of September. In the month of August the United States commandeered sixty per cent of the butter then in cold storage in that country, at a price ranging from 45 at 46 cents.

The House will bear in mind that the action of the United States was in reference to butter then in store in the cold storages throughout that country. This butter was commandeered for shipment overseas, and it is interesting to note that only a very small quantity of it ever went overseas. It was held in cold storage through lack of shipping or for some other reason, and recently some of it has come into Canada. Our Government, following the action of the United States, after inquiry discovered that there was 25,000,000 pounds of butter then in the cold storages of Canada. Did they commandeer that butter in the cold storages? No, Mr. Chairman. They allowed it to go by but commandeered the production of the farm and also the milk supply for the whole month of October and part of the month of November at a price ranging from 46 to 46½ cents, Montreal freight. I am not sure that the Minister of Agriculture is responsible, but he is a member of the Government that is responsible. The real iniquity of this matter was the fact that that policy was advised by the Produce Purchasing Commission. The chairman of the Produce Purchasing Commission was Mr. James Alexander, a produce merchant of Montreal, and another mem-

ber of the commission was Mr. Robert Ballantyne of Lovell and Christmas, produce merchants of Montreal.

Mr. CRERAR: No, he was not.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Alexander was chairman, and I understood Mr. Ballantyne was on the committee in an advisory capacity. But it makes no difference. These gentlemen, taking advantage of what they knew was going to happen, wired to their agents in Western Canada and bought up all the butter held by the factories in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and partly in Alberta, before the advance in price. Immediately in the United States prices began to go up. Milk and cream were on the free list, and the farmers along the international line and quite a distance away from the line discovered that they could sell their milk in the United States at $3.55 on a 3 per cent butter-fat basis, which worked out at about $4.05 for extra good milk per 100 pounds. As against that, the price at which it was commandeered in Canada would give them from $1.75 to $2.05 and very naturally the flow of milk started to the United States. When the Government discovered this they placed an embargo on milk and cream, going into the United States, so that this condition obtained for the month of October and part of November, and if I mistake not it was February before the embargo was totally raised. My friends from the western provinces who year in and year out have told us of the greater prices that have prevailed in the Minneapolis market for wheat can very well understand how the eastern dairyman felt when he discovered that his neighbour across the line was receiving from $1 to $1.50 per 100 pounds more for milk than he was. When the farmer discovered that he could not ship his milk or cream owing to the embargo he decided to sell his cow, and that largely explains the great increase in the exports in cattle into the United States from all parts of Canada, and explains also why the cities to-day are suffering, or at any rate did suffer all winter.

Mr. BOYCE: Does the hon. member mean to say that milk sold for $4 per 100 pounds?

Mr. ROBB: It sold at $3.55 on a 3 per cent butter-fat basis, and for better milk it ran as high as $4.05. If my hon. friend has any doubt whatever I can show him the official figures.

5 p.m.

Mr. BOYCE: I shall be glad to see them later, because I cannot for a moment see how the price could be $4.05 for milk in Canada. That would be over $1 for butter.

Mr. ROBB: That was in the United States, and I venture to say the minister will not contradict this statement. Now Mr. Chairman, that is one way in which this Government was "encouraging" greater production and helping the farming industry. I submit to the minister that the sooner he removes all these restrictions from the products of the farm the better it will be for this country. We cannot improve farming and encourage greater production by penalizing the farmer. The farmer is just as intelligent as the man in the city, and when he reads that the produce dealers in the cities have taken advantage of the action of this Government to advance prices while his products are kept low it naturally makes him sore, and that is one of the reasons for the great unrest throughout the country at the present time. The trouble is due to one restriction or another placed on the people from time to time.

Mr. CRERAR: In reply to the hon. member, I may say that there is no country which has been engaged in the war during the last three or four years in which fewer restrictions have been imposed on the people than in Canada. In respect of the restrictions on the exportation of milk and other products to the United States, what was the situation that existed in August last, at a time when the struggle between the German armies and the Allies had reached its greatest intensity in Europe? The British people were practically face to face with a situation where butter could not be secured, and their rations were down to half an ounce per person per week. They requested the food Administrations of the United States and Canada to take some action that would relieve them in this respect. It was essential that the morale of the British and French people should be kept at its highest possible point at that time, and as a result of their request the United States Food Administration commandeered outright, if my memory is correct, 60 per cent of the butter supplies then in cold storage in the United States. Coupled with this question is also the matter of the price of the article at home. The United States commandeered supplies in stock without limitations as to prices, and the result was that within a few weeks, due to the withdrawal from consumption of

this large quantity of butter, prices in the United States rapidly rose until they advanced some 12 to 18 cents per pound over what they had previously been.

Mr. McMASTER: The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) stated that this butter that was commandeered by the American Government did not get across, or at least not all of it.

Mr. CRERAR: I have no information as to that. If it did not get across it was probably due to the fact that they were obliged to keep some at home to cope with the rapid increase in prices as a result of commandeering. In Canada, under the regulations of the Food Board, limitations of price in butter was not fixed, but the margins of profit that could be taken by dealers in butter, whether cold storage, merchants or others, were fixed definitely by regulations under the Food Board.

These dealers were obliged to produce evidence that they were selling their butter within the margin of profit that had been allowed. In devising a method of meeting the request of the British Food Ministry for supplies of butter the Canadian Food Board were faced with the problem of trying to secure that butter without abnormally increasing the price in Canada. The price of the butter in cold storage and in wholesale dealers' hands was already limited in this respect, that the margin of profit on it was limited, and since the butter had already gone into their hands at prices prevailing when they purchased, the selling price was practically established.

I want to assure the Committee, and particularly the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon, that this question was most carefully considered by myself, by the expert officials in the department and also by the Dairy Produce Commission, of whom I shall have a word to say in a moment. After we had gathered all the facts that were available we reached the conclusion that the better method in Canada would be to commandeer the production of butter from the factories in Canada for a stated period. An order was issued to that effect. The period covered five weeks' production. The price was fixed at Montreal, if my memory serves me, at a cent or a cent and a half a pound over what the Dairy Produce Commission had been paying theretofore.

Mr. ROBB: If the first statement of the minister was correct, that they wanted the butter in the Mother Country, will he explain how they arrived at the conclusion that it would be better to take it from the farms in that way for a period extending into November than by taking it immediately out of cold storage?

Mr. CRERAR: Because we could get it as rapidly as we could fill the shipping space that was available to send it overseas. We found this situation: Due to the commandeering order in the United States and the lack of control over the margin of profit in that country, the butter price had gone up, as I have stated, from 12 to 18 cents a pound, and it was fully that much higher in the United States than in Canada. One thing obviously resulted. The Canadian farmers found a market in the United States available and they found that they could get much higher prices there for milk and cream than they could get in Canada under the commandeering order. Of course, they naturally commenced to take advantage of this. Hon. members will appreciate that if this was permitted those farmers who were so situated in Canada that they could ship their milk and cream to the United States, would be in a position of great advantage over those other farmers who could not avail themselves of that facility. Moreover, the principal purpose for which this requisition order had been issued would be to a large degree defeated. We wanted to get butter to supply Great Britain but we wanted to do it with fairness to all the interests concerned. We did not want to do it in a way that would unduly enhance the price to the Canadian consumers and we wanted to deal fairly with the farmers who were producing it. The price was fixed at one and one and a half cents a pound higher than that which hitherto had been paid and an embargo restriction was imposed on the shipment of milk and cream to the United States. It was not imposed in the absolute sense that the hon. member for Huntingdon has suggested. Those farmers who had a market, or who had their regular customers in the United States were permitted to send out the same amount of milk and cream they had hitherto been sending in order that they might retain their connections for the period of this temporary disturbance. Consequently, they continued to enjoy that right during the whole period of the embargo. Every farmer however who had not a market already established in the United States was prevented from sending his milk and cream out. That was retained in Canada for the purpose of producing butter for shipment overseas. The quantity of butter that was manufactured in these factories during this period

amounted to something over 5,000,000 pounds.

The hon. member has alluded to the Dairy Produce Commission which was really the agent of the British Ministry of Food in purchasing dairy products in Canada. That commission had as its chairman, and its chief administrative officer, Mr. James Alexander of Montreal who is one of the oldest cheese dealers in the city. I want to say—and I have very intimate knowledge of the facts—that Mr. Alexander gave freely and unstintedly his time and attention to the work that he had in hand. I have had repeated evidence from the officials of the British Ministry of Food as to their satisfaction with the manner in which that work was carried on. In addition there were on that Dairy Produce Commission, Mr. Ruddick, the Dairy Commissioner of Canada, and there were also two representatives of the farmers, or milk producers, of Canada, Mr. James Donaldson, of Atwood, president of the Western Ontario Dairymen's Association, and Mr. Guerin, of Quebec. Every step in this whole proposal was considered fully by the members of the Dairy Produce Commission on which, as I have stated, there were two farmers representing the dairying interests in Canada. The commission were in entire agreement as to the policy that should be followed. It is a mistake to think that the milk and cream producers in Canada were not directly represented in that matter. They were directly represented by the two representatives of the Dairyman's associations. The Dairy Produce Commission has wound up its work. The importation of butter and dairy products into Great Britain has been decontrolled and is now back in the hands of private traders. I wish to say in conclusion that in my judgment—and I have a fair knowledge in connection with it—the Dairy Produce Commission has rendered excellent service not only to the British Ministry of Food but also to the producers of Canada.

Mr. ROBB: How many pounds of butter does the minister say the transaction represented?

Mr. CRERAR: Between five and six million pounds according to my memory. I have not the figures here and it is some months since I looked at them.

Mr. ROBB: Is it not true that, as a result of commandeering the products of the prairie factories, about 1,000,000 pounds of butter came in from New Zealand, and did not the farmers of Western Canada put up a big howl to the minister because they had lost the British Columbia market?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not think there is very much in that statement. As a matter of fact I do not recall any great howl made to the Minister of Agriculture by the dairymen or creameries of the prairies in respect to the British Columbia market.

I wish to allude to a point mentioned by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb), and that is the charge that private dealers in Montreal had benefited by virtue of having inside information before the commandeering order was made public. I know that charge has been made, but I want to say on my responsibility as a minister that I do not think there is any foundation for it; from the best information I have been able to get there is not. I may be mistaken in that regard, but I do not think I am.

With regard to the importation of New Zealand butter into Canada. This butter has for years been coming into the Dominion. Owing to the lack of tonnage available from New Zealand to Great Britain, large surpluses of butter have accumulated in the former country, and the vessels that occasionally traded between British Columbia and the Australian Dominions carried the commodity. To-day New Zealand butter is being laid down in British Columbia at a cheaper rate than it can be produced in the Prairie Provinces, and I expect that condition will continue for some time to come. It is a case of having a large surplus in a country that has been unable to find its usual market, and the expansion of our own dairy trade not being what we might otherwise have expected.

Mr. PROULX: Would the minister say how much Canadian butter is exported to the United States?

Mr. CRERAR: I am sorry to say that I have not any definite information on the point, but I am advised that the exports have been very slight. Recently, I believe, there have been some shipments to the United States on account of the higher prices prevailing there.

Mr. PROULX: I saw it reported in the newspapers that a large quantity of Canadian butter was exported to the United States and that it accounted for the commodity being so dear in Canada.

Mr. CRERAR: I noticed the same report in the newspapers, and I believe it is correct that within the last few weeks several carloads of butter have gone to the United

States. I fancy that condition will be readjusted now that the local supplies there are being increased and marketed.

Mr. J. F. REID: I wish to congratulate the minister on the very popular appointment which he has made to the position of Deputy Minister of Agriculture. Now that the minister and his deputy are both farmers we may expect great results from the administration of this department. Heretofore it would seem to have been essential that we should have a lawyer as deputy minister. Personally, I fail to see any connection between the law and the agricultural industry. I am, therefore, glad that the Government has got away from any such policy, and that in consequence we are likely to see most beneficial results as far as the development of agriculture is concerned. For one thing I would like to see the Government establish more experimental farms. To my mind there could not be a better investment than to add to their number. Let me give a specific instance of the value of these farms. It will be recalled that the late Dr. Saunders, who in his life time was Director of Experimental Farms, after a very prolonged and tedious series of experiments produced a distinct type of wheat called Marquis Wheat. That particular variety has been of the utmost benefit to Canada, and I venture to assert has brought millions of dollars to this country. In Western Canada we are practically getting away altogether from the growing of the old Red Fife Wheat; and I understand that when the farmers of Ontario brought samples of that wheat from the West for seed purposes and tried them, they found that they could grow spring wheat through the agency of the Marquis. At present we have in Saskatchewan Mr. Seager Wheeler, who is doubtless known by reputation to many of the members of this House. Mr. Wheeler is a veritable wizard in producing and propagating different varieties of grain, and, as is well known, is the winner of the world's championship in wheat. At the present time he is experimenting with two other distinct varieties of wheat, the Kitchener and the Red Bobs. I think the Government should do something to encourage Mr. Wheeler in carrying on his work. For a long time he has spent almost all his time in experimenting along these lines, and now, I understand, his health is breaking down. Mr. Wheeler's work has been of very great value, not only to the growers but to the consumers of wheat in this country. I mention these facts so that the minister may give his careful consideration to the matter.

Another thing I would like to draw attention to is the live stock situation. If a careful survey were taken to-day of our live stock resources, principally cattle, I believe it would be found that the situation in Canada to-day is not as good as it was, say, ten years ago. I believe that is because pure-bred sires are not being imported into Canada from the Old Country where they breed the best stock in the world. I am informed that the Argentine buyers, when they go to the United Kingdom, purchase not only pure-bred sires but female stock; they buy the very best that can be found on the market. As regards Canada I do not wish to say a word against our importers of pure-bred live stock, but with them it seems to be a matter of dollars and cents and very naturally they figure on how many dollars they can make out of a transaction. I think if our Government were to import some of the best of the different types of pure-bred cattle—pure-bred sires at least and a few of the females—and then possibly let them out on some terms, or sell them to the stock raisers of the Dominion, so that we would have a continuous stream of the best pure-bred animals coming into Canada, it would be a splendid thing for our live stock industry.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has mentioned a matter which I am very much interested in, and which I had intended bringing to the attention of the minister, and that is the good work which Mr. Seagar Wheeler, of Saskatchewan, has been carrying on in the development of different varieties of wheat. While he was not the discoverer of Marquis wheat, Mr. Wheeler, by a process of selection, I believe, greatly improved upon the original discovery. For the information of the Committee I would like to read certain information as evidence of what Mr. Wheeler has done. As a result of his own effort, and without any assistance whatever, he is advertising Canada as a wheat producing country more than any other man that I know of. He has done this entirely at his own expense, and mainly through exhibiting the results of his experiments at exhibitions and wheat seed fairs in the United States. Let me enumerate some of the prizes he has won in competition with the Western States as well as with various competitors from Canada.

1911.—New York Land Show. Won world's prize, first and sweepstakes, $1,000 in gold, offered for the best hard red spring wheat grown on the continent. Won this prize with Marquis wheat, then almost unknown.

1914.—Won sweepstakes at International Farm Congress, Wichita, Kansas, winning again with Marquis wheat.

1915.—Won sweepstakes with Marquis wheat at International Farm Congress at Denver, Colorado. Also first prize at International Irrigation Congress, Bassano, Alberta. Won highest honours for sheaf of Kitchener wheat at Denver.

1916.—Won sweepstakes for fourth time, this year at International Farm Congress at El Paso, Texas, with Kitchener wheat, discovered by Mr. Wheeler.

1917.—Mr. Wheeler was hailed out in 1916, but exhibited a sheaf of Red Bobs Wheat, which he discovered, at International Farm Congress, Peoria, Illinois, and carried off sweepstakes.

1918.—Won sweepstakes for fifth time for best bushel of hard spring wheat, winning this time against very strong competition at the International Soil Products Exposition, Kansas City. Won with Marquis wheat again. Also won first for sheaf of hard red wheat.

But Mr. Wheeler did not confine his efforts to wheat. Here are some of the prizes he won for oats:

1915.—Victory Oats. Won sweepstakes with a sheaf exhibit at International Farm Congress, Denver, Colorado.

1917.—Won second prize in sheaf exhibit at International Farm Congress.

1918.—Won first prize for sheaf exhibit at International Soil Products Exposition at Kansas City, Kansas.

He has taken up also the improvement of barley. The following are some of the prizes that he has won in this connection:

1914.—Won third prize at International Irrigation Congress, Calgary, Alta.

1915.—Won first prize for sheaf exhibit, International Farm Congress, Denver, Colorado.

1916.—Won first and sweepstakes at International Farm Congress, El Paso, Texas.

1917.—First prize for sheaf exhibit, International Farm Congress, Peoria, Ill.

1918.—Won first prize, International Soil Products Exposition, Kansas City, Kansas.

This man should have some recognition from the Department of Agriculture.

An hon. MEMBER: Give him a knighthood.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: Well, I would be in favour of knighting him if we had not voted against knighthood the other day. Many men in Canada have received knighthoods who do not deserve them as much as Mr. Wheeler, on his humble farm in Saskatchewan. His services have been a real benefit to the public. No man can make two blades of grass grow where formerly there was only one without doing a great benefit to his country. I have personal knowledge of this man's work. He came to Canada from England in 1885, arriving at Moosejaw in the midst of those trying years when most people were discouraged from farming in Western Canada. From 1883 to 1887 there were almost continuous crop failures owing to the fact that, without irrigation, there was not enough moisture to produce vegetation. Wheeler, who was a young boy at the time, showed his interest in agriculture by first cultivating a garden in low-lying ground along a creek that ran through the town of Moosejaw. He carried the necessary water in a bucket and had a beautiful garden growing while no one else in the town was making any attempt to produce vegetables. He afterwards moved to the north country, and I have read you the result of his efforts along the line of the improvement of cereals. The least the Government could do is recognize this man's efforts by assisting him in some way, even if only to the extent of a grant of $1,000 or $1,500 a year, to put him beyond worry so far as his living is concerned and to enable him to devote all his thought and energy to the work in which he is specially interested and for which he is particularly well fitted, the development of our cereals. I strongly recommend that the minister give this matter his careful consideration.

Mr. BEST: One of the most important things in connection with farming is the selection of good, clean seed. The sowing of seed which contains wild seeds not only curtails the amount of the grain produced, but leaves the land in a wild state and gives rise to much additional work and trouble for years to come. As the machinery for properly cleaning grain costs a good deal of money, it is beyond the reach of the average farmer. It is up to the minister, therefore, to see that the people of Ontario are provided with an elevator at some convenient place, where they may store their grain and have it re-cleaned and dried if necessary. I think I am not going beyond the truth when I say that had we had an elevator in some convenient place in Ontario last year half of its cost would have been made up by the saving of the beans that were lost in that province because of the lack of facilities for properly cleaning them. In the eastern part of the province the condition is not so bad, because Montreal is within easy reach. But the farmers lost three or four cents a bushel on the grain shipped by rail from Toronto to Montreal; it was inspected when it arrived there and they had to take what they could get for it. I am not much in favour of every-

thing going to the large centres, but if this grain could be re-cleaned properly, say at Toronto, where there are good railway facilities, and if there was proper elevator accommodation, with all the necessary machinery for cleaning, thousands of dollars would be saved for the people of Ontario. Some years ago much seed wheat was shipped out of Ontario to Western Canada. A good deal of that wheat was not properly cleaned and was not in proper condition when it was sent out. During the past winter thousands of bushels of oats have been shipped from Ontario to Western Canada for seed. The farmers received from sixty to seventy cents a bushel for those oats, whereas if the oats had been cleaned they could have got from seventy-five to eighty cents a bushel. The farmers were losing from five to ten cents a bushel on those oats, because cleaning would cost only a few cents a bushel. The Government has received deputations asking that an elevator be established in some convenient place in Ontario, and I hope the minister will see that we have one built for the convenience and benefit of the farmers. I believe the outlay would be paid for almost every year.

Mr. COWAN: We have in southwestern Saskatchewan and through the south end of Alberta what may be termed a semi-arid district. It is a district in which we have not up to the present had anything like sufficient moisture to satisfy the needs of farming. My opinion is that it is only a question of years when that difficulty will be overcome because, with settlement and cultivation in Western Canada, we have largely overcome that same drawback in other districts. Many Americans who have come into that district and who have previously lived in somewhat similar, and possibly worse, districts, on the American side, claim that if the Government would change the seed to suit that district and use what is termed drouth-resisting varieties of seed, the farmers there would be able to grow more grain than they are now growing, and to make a success of farming. Are there any objections or obstacles to the use of these drouth-resisting varieties in that district? Is it impossible to sell grain of that variety in this country, and would farmers have to go to the United States to find a market if they went into the raising of grain of that kind?

Mr. CRERAR: I think the hon. member is alluding to Durum wheat.

Mr. COWAN: The minister probably knows that the Western Development Company, whose president is Mr. J. H. Haslam, has been raising the greatest objection to present methods. He has informed me that he has been negotiating with the department, and I understand several others have been doing the same thing. Whatever they are asking for is what I refer to.

Mr. CRERAR: Some experiments have been carried on in our western experimental stations and farms with drouth-resisting wheats and especially Durum wheat, which is grown very largely in Southern Dakota and Minnesota.

Mr. McMASTER: It is a soft wheat.

Mr. CRERAR: It is a softer variety of wheat than we produce in Canada. Our inspection regulations do not at present provide specifically for it. While I am not certain, I believe that in the amendments proposed to be made to the Grain Act, in all likelihood at the present session of Parliament, there is one providing for this. During the last two years quite a number of farmers have been growing these varieties in a small way and the results have been satisfactory. As to the market for this wheat, while it is not as valuable a wheat as the varieties we have been growing in Western Canada, it has excellent qualities for blending and mixing purposes, and I have no doubt if we grew it here, a satisfactory market could be found for it. The matter is now engaging the attention of the officials of the department.

I want to say a word or two in respect to the proposal advanced by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J. F. Reid) and the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. J. R. Wilson), namely, for some recognition of the splendid work that has been done by Mr. Seager Wheeler, of Rosthern, Sask.

Mr. JACOBS: He should be knighted.

Mr. CRERAR: I know Mr. Wheeler personally, and I have known for many years of the splendid work he has been doing and the advertisement, to say the least, that his wonderful series of prize-winning achievements in international expositions has given to Western Canada. This proposal that his work should be recognized by the Federal Department of Agriculture was placed before me many months ago, and I gave considerable thought to it. There is, of course, one difficulty. In matters of Government, precedents are always dangerous to establish, and while I fully recognize the value of the work Mr. Wheeler has done, I have not been able up to the present to convince myself that that recog-

nition should come from the Federal Department. Without in any way desiring to throw the responsibility elsewhere, I consider this a matter in which the Provincial Government might, to better advantage, give the recognition. In the realm of agriculture there are certain things that should be done by provincial departments of agriculture and certain other things that fall more naturally into the federal field Mr. Seager Wheeler has rendered excellent service to the grain growers of Western Canada; indeed, I know of no other individual farmer who has done more.

I should like to refer also to the remarks of the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) as regards the advisability and, indeed the necessity, of providing elevator facilities in Ontario. That is a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Department of Trade and Commerce, which has charge of grain elevators. Some time ago quite a representative delegation waited on the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. A. K. Maclean) and urged upon him the advisability of building at once at some suitably located point in Ontario an elevator that would serve the purposes and needs set out by the hon. member for Dufferin. I believe the matter is now under the consideration of that department. I am not certain, but I think the Board of Grain Commissioners have been asked to make some report upon the advisability and utility of the proposal.

Mr. McMASTER: It is always gratifying to hear a Cabinet minister lay down principles of sound economics, and the minister is to be congratulated on his desire not to create a precedent of giving money grants. But it seems to me that as this Mr. Seager Wheeler has been doing great work for the country, there should be some way in which he could be assisted in that work, and I have a suggestion to make to the minister in that connection. A little while ago the minister spoke about illustration stations which, I understand, are on farms belonging to private farmers.

Mr. J. F. REID: Demonstration stations?

Mr. McMASTER: Well, demonstration stations, but the distinction between demonstrating and illustrating how to do a thing is a distinction without very much difference. Why not make a demonstration station of the farm on which this gentleman does his experimental work and give him, for conducting this experimental or demonstration station, some adequate remuneration which will enable him, without thought for the morrow as regards his own personal fortune, to pursue his own experiments which, I understand from hon. members from the West, have been of material advantage to our country?

Mr. CRERAR: The suggestion of the hon. member will be taken into very careful consideration. I might point out, however, that the work that Mr. Wheeler has specialized in is different from that carried on at the illustration farms. His great contribution to agriculture in Western Canada has been the breeding and cross-breeding of different varieties of wheat.

Mr. LEGER: While I appreciate very much the intention of the Government to assist the farmers throughout the country, I would suggest that a little more be done for the farmers of the Maritime Provinces. In New Brunswick some years ago the production of wheat was almost nil, until the Provincial Government took the matter in hand and assisted the farmers by bonusing small grist mills and distributing wheat seed. The province had practically abandoned the growing of wheat because of the lack of mills to grind it, but now the Provincial Government bonuses any one who will build a mill, and the result is that the production of wheat has increased by 300 to 400 per cent. The mills are doing very well, but there are not enough of them throughout the province. The bonus granted by the Provincial Government is not large enough, and I would therefore suggest that the Dominion Government join hands with the Provincial Government in encouraging the building of mills. In the county where I live you can go for fifty miles without seeing a grist mill. That condition practically prohibits the raising of wheat, and the farmers might just as well take up some other work. I know a party in my own county who is willing to build a mill but has not the means, in view of the high cost of labour and materials. If the Government would bonus those who erect grist mills for grinding and cleaning the wheat, it would certainly encourage production and be of great advantage to the farmers. It is very necessary that the farmers should have clean wheat seed.

Mr. ROBB: I notice there is no item in the Estimates for exhibitions. Has that feature been dropped?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: I have a suggestion to make to the minister, and one that I

have thought of more than once, in connection with the great wheat industry of Canada. I believe we can grow and mature a brand of wheat in the Yukon which would be of great value to the wheat growers on our western plains. It may be news to some hon. gentlemen to know that we do grow wheat in the Yukon.

Mr. JACOBS: Golden grain.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: It is just as golden and worth a little more than that grown on the plains.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does it cost to grow a bushel of wheat in the Yukon?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: That is a mere trifle. I have not figured it out on the bushel basis, but we have demonstrated that wheat of a very fine quality will mature in the Yukon. Recently, the Yukon Development League, an organization for the advancement of Yukon affairs, provided a dinner in Dawson and every article of food on the table was grown in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. McKENZIE: How many diners were present?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: A large number. Some years ago I brought down and laid on the table of the House a sample of our Yukon wheat, and it created considerable interest. Afterwards I sent it to the seed analyst at the Experimental Station here, and he planted one hundred grains taken at random out of the sack. He was surprised, and I was delighted, to find that every one of those grains germinated, showing the vitality of the wheat we grow in the Yukon. There is a small agricultural station at Dawson, and my suggestion is that the minister select different types of wheat and have them grown there, to see if we cannot grow a type of wheat in the Yukon which will require a shorter season than any wheat grown in Saskatchewan, Alberta or Manitoba. I make that suggestion because I think there are some potentialities. We have so much sunlight in the Yukon in the summer that grain grows very rapidly, and the number of growing days would consequently be less than on the prairies.

Mr. CRERAR: That suggestion has already been acted upon. We have in the Yukon a small experimental station that is maintained at a cost of slightly under $2,000 a year, and I am informed that we are already experimenting at that station with three or four different varieties of wheat to see if we can produce the splendid results which my hon. friend anticipates, and which I hope will be realized.

In regard to the suggestion that we should bonus grist mills in New Brunswick, I am afraid that would be of doubtful value, and I frankly state I do not think the suggestion will be acted upon. If any special assistance is required for this industry in New Brunswick I think it should be contributed by the people who are immediately to benefit from it. The grist mills of New Brunswick could not in any sense be considered a national enterprise. I have certain views on the virtues of the bonus principle generally, but I shall not trouble the Committee with them now.

Mr. JACOBS: A bonus is sometimes useful in a doubtful constituency.

Mr. ARGUE: I should like the minister to consider the advisability of having an experimental farm in that so-called arid district in the southeast part of Saskatchewan. I have lived there now for fifteen years, since the first furrows were ploughed and the first crops grown, and in that length of time we have lost two crops. I believe that if we had had an experimental farm there a good deal of expense could have been saved in connection with seed which we have been compelled for two seasons to send to that district to help the farmers. Last year the Government for this purpose withdrew a section of land that was put on the market for sale, and I would like the minister to consider the advisability of making a start in that section of the country in establishing an experimental farm. Even if it were only on a small scale it would be a great benefit.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the first few items here might pass, but there are some things that hon. members wish to say on other phases of the very prolific and important subject we have been discussing. Perhaps the minister might agree to leave such matters as live stock commissioners and directors of experimental farms.

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. members for Chateauguay-Huntingdon requested that a certain item on which there would be general discussion might be held over. I shall be willing to do that. The general Estimates are found on page 58. We could leave No. 53 with the understanding that any general discussion could again take place, when that item came up. That would give members not in the House today an opportunity to bring forward matters they might wish to discuss.

Mr. McKENZIE: In 1913 or about that time, when the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) was Minister of Agriculture, we used to discuss the advisability of establishing not altogether demonstration farms but small farms for the development of agriculture. The idea was that some of the $10,000,000 set apart for the development of the industry could be utilized in buying small farms in the neighbourhood of industrial centres, say, for instance, near the steel works in the county from which I come, where there are thousands of farmers' sons, and men from Ireland, England and Scotland who make marvellous developments of little bits of land about their houses. It was thought that if the Government could establish thirty or forty or even twenty small farms of between twenty-five and forty acres each, with house and barn, and give a small start in the way of developing these farms, and then sell them, men would be very anxious and willing to go in for the scheme. The idea has been developed in the West by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I understand they have built houses on certain sections of land; and they sell not only the bare land but the houses and barns and some equipment. In that way they have given a great boom to agriculture in that part of the country. We have in Nova Scotia millions of acres that are unoccupied, and it is not unusual to find a man owning four or five hundred acres and living on it with his wife, being able to scratch a bare living out of perhaps five per cent of the land. That land to which I refer could be used to great advantage if people could be found to take an interest in agriculture, and I am sure the Government would lose no money if they undertook this project. All they need is courage and enterprise, and they would find these little farms would be successful and would give a fresh impetus to agriculture. It was thought in the early days that the thing would be practicable, and there was some co-operation between the honourable gentleman (Mr. Burrell) and the Minister of Agriculture for Nova Scotia. Some start was made in the buying of old farms but the matter was not looked after properly and nothing of importance has really been done. What is absolutely essential for the development of the country is that it shall be a place in which the ordinary man can live in comfort, and the only way in which that can be achieved is to encourage the farmer to produce and enable him to sell at reasonable prices. The only advantage to the farmer is the profit he makes, and if he can make a large profit it is better for the country. He may make a fair profit on a small quantity, but if he can make a proportionate profit on large quantities of produce there is a beneficial result all round. It is absolutely necessary for the Department of Agriculture to make a departure from the rut in which we have been moving for the last twenty-five years, and to show what can be done along these lines. I have no particular line to indicate to the minister, but I have suggested what might be done in the neighbourhood of large centres. I have spoken of Cape Breton because I know men there who are ready to take hold of these little farms if they are put within their reach. They have not the means themselves to buy lands and put up houses, but if they were helped up to that stage they would jump at the proposition. The market is there and they could sell their produce, and there are young men from the Old Country who are enterprising enough to do very well if they were given a start. Another thing I might point out is the desirability of encouraging the extension of tram cars that are in touch with agricultural land so as to encourage the farmer. Companies might be encouraged to push their lines into the country. These things cost money, but the minister in charge of the department must have courage to depart from the old line and not hesitate to spend money abundantly so long as good results can be obtained. We want to make Canada produce something proportionate to its capacity for production.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In connection with the distribution of literature, I have noticed that literature is printed in both languages and when any one applies to the department he can get either French or English copies. I want to inform the minister—and this can be confirmed by the deputy minister—that the best agent of the department in my province is the curé, who is generally the honorary president and sometimes the secretary of what we call the Circles Agricoles. There is one in every county, and sometimes one in every parish, and in the pulpit on nearly every Sunday of the year in these rural districts the curé will spend a portion of his time speaking to the farmers on agricultural matters.

I would like my hon. friend to send the literature which is issued by the department in French—not all, but the most essential bulletins—to the curés of the province of Quebec, so as to secure their devotion to the cause. Because the great issue of the day is the necessity of getting our

people back to the land and improving living conditions in the rural districts. I have offered these remarks now because unfortunately, I shall not be able to be present this evening.

Mr. CRERAR: I can say to the hon. gentleman that the suggestion which he has made will be acted upon.

At six o'clock the House resumed and took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 120 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eleanor Margaret Webster.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 121 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jean Donaldson Sifton.—Mr. McMaster.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply.

Experimental Farms—maintenance of Central Farm, and establishment and maintaining of additional branch stations, $1,200,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain the increase in this item? I would also like him to give the Committee some information with regard to the advantage of the experimental farms and stations in different parts of the country. For instance, what advantage has the Experimental Farm at Ottawa been?

Mr. CRERAR: That matter was discussed very fully this afternoon. I believe the hon. member (Mr. Cahill) was not present. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the discussion that has already taken place, I think he will get the information he desires. The work that is carried on at the Central farm at Ottawa is very largely of an experimental character. I might illustrate that by the statement that Marquis wheat, which has been of immense value to Canada, was the product of experiments carried on at the farm at Ottawa. That is only one of many similar experiments that have been successfully carried out here.

Mr. CAHILL: Have they discovered anything since the Marquis wheat?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, and they are working on a new wheat now. Some hon. members asked as to the occasion for the increase in the vote for experimental farms. It is accounted for very largely by the increase in wages and in the cost of the materials generally that are necessary in the operation of the farm. There is also a provision for the establishment of branch farms and stations.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Where are the stations proposed to be established?

Mr. CRERAR: No definite locations have as yet been located for the new experimental farms. Provision is made so that, if it is considered advisable to extend the work in the direction of experimental stations, it can be done. There is also a considerable portion of the vote for the further development of experimental farms that are already established, such as the farm at Kapuskasing, Ontario, and some farms in Quebec.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Have you any branch stations in Ontario now?

Mr. CRERAR: We have the tobacco station at Harrow, Essex county, and the experimental farm at Kapuskasing.

Mr. SEXSMITH: How many branch stations are there in the Dominion?

Mr. CRERAR: Twenty experimental farms and experimental stations.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Are these stations for experimental purposes?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes; there is really no difference between an experimental station and an experimental farm. They practically carry on the same work.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Would the minister give us the information as to the cost of the experimental farm at Ottawa?

Mr. CRERAR: The estimate for the Central Experimental Farm for the present year is $364,000 as follows:

Animal husbandry	$40,318
Bees	2,500
Botanical branch	26,000
Cereals	29,000
Chemistry	5,000
Director's office	3,000
Fibre production	20,000
Extension and publicity	25,000
Farm expenses (farm labour)	10,000
Field husbandry	13,000
Forage plants	8,000
Horticulture	39,000
Illustration stations	28,000
Poultry	15,200
Tobacco	28,000
General expenditure in connection with Canadian Expeditionary Force	19,000
Pure bred live stock	63,000

The amount in connection with the Canadian Expeditionary Force is the amount

required to make up the difference between the civil and military pay of the men who went to the front.

Mr. CAHILL: Who is the director of the farm?

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Archibald, succeeding Dr. Grisdale, who has been made deputy minister.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Is there a permanent superintendent of the Charlottetown Experimental Farm?

Mr. CRERAR: The Superintendent of the experimental farm at Charlottetown was given leave of absence to go overseas to do special work in connection with the Khaki University. As soon as that work is completed, he will return to his post.

Mr. CAHILL: What expenditure is proposed at the Kapuskasing Farm and the Spirit Lake Farm, and what were the results of the work last year?

Mr. CRERAR: The estimate for the Kapuskasing Farm for the present year is $40,525. During last year considerable land was acquired and brought under cultivation; new buildings were erected and the equipment of the farm was generally improved in order that the work could be more effectively carried on. For the Spirit Lake farm the estimate this year is $44,500, for practically the same kind of work.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: A great deal of trouble has been experienced by the farmers because of the fact that they cannot get results from the Paris green which is now being sold for use in poisoning the potato beetle. Has any investigation been made into this matter at the Central Experimental Farm or any of the branch stations, or at the laboratories?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know that any experiments have been carried on to test the efficacy of the Paris green that has been sold. Paris green must, under the regulations of the Inland Revenue Department, come up to certain standards before it may be sold.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: It is subject to inspection?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, under the Inland Revenue Act.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount of the vote for experimental farms last year was expended?

Mr. CRERAR: I am informed by the deputy that the total amount voted last year was expended.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the minister think that it will be necessary to have this extra amount this year? Does he think it is a good time to increase the expenditure? I am sorry to note that every minister is making increased expenditures; I had hoped that the democratic Minister of Agriculture would cut down expenditures, not increase them. I note also that no minister is able to explain these increased expenditures. It simply is " an item we may need some time in the future"; or it is explained that " we are making provision for something we practically do not know anything about, but we want to have enough in our estimates; in other words, we want to keep up with the other twenty or so ministers; we want to increase our expenditures regardless of whether we need the money or not." They seem to have the idea that the country is looking for increased expenditures—for full steam ahead without regard to where the money is coming from. The minister should explain to the Committee just what he thinks of the whole system of the Department of Agriculture as at present constituted, particularly of this Central Experimental Farm and the other——

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. gentleman is entering upon a subject which was discussed very fully on the Civil Government Estimates this afternoon when he was absent. I certainly cannot allow a repetition of the same arguments to-night.

Mr. CAHILL: We are considering an item of $1,200,000 for experimental farms, and I wish to ask the minister if he believes that the present system of experimental farms is the best method of bringing about the better use of seeds, the raising of better stock, and so on. This farm at Spirit Lake is in my constituency, in the far north. There is another farm at Kapuskasing, only a few miles away; one is in Quebec and the other is in Ontario. Something like $80,000 a year is being spent on these farms—an extraordinarily large amount. Moreover, the expenditure on the Experimental Farm at Ottawa seems to be entirely out of proportion to the results that are being obtained. The minister tells us that they developed a kind of wheat there some years ago. The older members of the House tell me, however, that that argument has been practically worked to death here; that seems to be the only explanation each year for increasing the expenditure. Does the minister not think that a better system might be worked out by distributing smaller farms throughout the country and doing the

work on a purely business basis in the different provinces? These large farms in Ottawa and at other points are purely experimental farms. A demonstration farm is quite different from an experimental farm. A demonstration farm would show the farmers in the community how to improve their seed, their stock, and their conditions generally; the experimental farm would seem to make experiments from which the independent farmer can obtain no profit. Does not the minister think that this money could be more profitably expended on demonstration farms?

Mr. CRERAR: Had the hon. member been here this afternoon he would have obtained at least the greater part of the information he now seeks. In every country that is making any effort to secure sound agricultural development, experimental farms and stations and demonstration stations are maintained.

As to the increase which the hon. member criticises, the matter resolves itself simply into this, that if we are to pay the increased cost of operation, such as the increase in wages and the higher cost of material, due to causes over which the Department of Agriculture has no control, then, if we are to keep the vote at the same amount as last year, we shall have to cut down the efficiency of the farms, and that would not be a wise move nor justified in any way. The development of agriculture in every country in the world is becoming more and more dependent upon the application of sound, scientific methods, not only in respect to methods of cultivation as to cereals, fruits and vegetables, but in the field of animal husbandry, which is of immense importance. For instance, as was pointed out this afternoon, the beef animals produced in Canada are inferior to those produced in the Argentine and in the United States. Experiments which are being carried on at several stations and farms, demonstrate conclusively the advantages of producing higher class animals at practically the same or even slightly lower cost than inferior animals. Those facts are published, and they are also made known to those who visit the farms and personally acquaint themselves with the experiments that are being carried on. We have passed the time when the utility and advantages of experimental farms and stations can be successfully challenged. It is, perhaps, an open question as to what is the best method of carrying on the work. I said this afternoon, and I will repeat it now for the information of the hon. member, that from the information we are gathering it seems that the establishment of illustration farms will probably prove the most effective method of bringing the farmers closely and directly in touch with the advantages of the work that is being carried on.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the difference in the weights of cattle from range country and from Eastern Canada? Where do the ranchers procure the information that a certain class of cattle is better than others? For instance, are there any herds at the Ottawa Experimental Farm? What are the heavier cattle and what are the classes that are best suited to the different sections of Canada for beef and other purposes?

Mr. CRERAR: The department does not carry on any experiments on ranching farm scale, that is, where cattle run out on ranges. The experiments are conducted for instance, with dairy cattle as to what is the best type, the advantages that come from certain strains of breeding, in milk production and in the butter-fat quality of the cream that is produced. Feeding experiments in cattle have been carried out not only at the Central Experimental Farm but at branch farms, to determine what profit there is to the individual carrying on work along the same line, and some very interesting results have been found. I am safe in saying that hundreds of thousands of bulletins dealing with these various matters are distributed free to the farmers, and the increasing interest in the work is manifested by the large number of additional inquiries that are coming in all the time for this information.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the department at any of its experimental stations throughout Canada, east or west, make recommendations to the stock raiser as to what class of cattle is best adapted to certain districts? I understood the minister to say that the weight of these beef cattle had been increased; in other words, that the standard of beef throughout Canada had been raised. If that be so, in what way was it brought about by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. CRERAR: I have already stated the work that is carried on at those farms, and I do not know that I can add anything to the information I have given.

Mr. CAHILL: Is anything done for the stock raiser?

Mr. CRERAR: Certainly, the whole thing is designed to help the stock raiser. He has the advantage of coming to the farm—as stock raisers do in large numbers—to see for himself the result of the work carried on. In addition the results of these experiments are published in pamphlet form and distributed to thousands and thousands of stock raisers throughout Canada. These pamphlets give a description of the experiments and their actual results.

Mr. MYERS: Is there included in the Estimates an amount for an experimental farm to be established at Eston, Saskatchewan? I think the minister has had some communications from that district which is quite similar to the district described by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Argue) this afternoon.

Mr. CRERAR: We have a general appropriation for the establishment of new farms. We shall not, I am afraid, be able to go very far this year in that direction. We have, of course, on the one hand, as we had this afternoon, several hon. members urging that this work be extended and more illustration and demonstration farms established; then we have to-night the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) claiming that the brakes should be put on and the expenditure reduced. We have endeavoured to strike a fair middle course and have included in our Estimates a sum that will, we hope, enable us to establish possibly a few new experimental stations during the year, and the point to which the hon. member alludes and which has already been brought to my notice will receive consideration.

Mr. MYERS: There is no farm in that particular district, and I think, as it is in an area that has been drought-stricken for several years, a great deal of good will be derived from the establishment of an experimental farm there.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What is the policy of the Government regarding farms which the minister suggests might be established this year? Will they be established in old settled districts or in new districts, perhaps, where there are few settlers, with the idea of showing what those districts might produce?

Mr. CRERAR: These matters will all be taken into consideration before a decision is reached as to the location of any new farms that may be undertaken. I am unable to state at present where these farms will be located. The suggestion of the hon. member which has some merit in it will be carefully considered.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I should like to follow up my remarks by saying that there is a district in northern Manitoba which is generally looked upon as being not much good agriculturally, but we are quite satisfied that proper demonstration would show it to be a real agricultural district. It is not the only district in Canada which had hitherto been regarded in that light and yet has proved to be good. There are other districts which if gone after systematically could be shown to be good productive districts.

Mr. J. FERNAND FAFARD (translation): Does the minister intend to do away with the duties now levied on fertilizers?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. This has nothing to do with experimental farms.

Mr. FAFARD: Mr. Chairman, I think that the question of fertilizers has much to do with experimental farms.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The item under consideration concerns the establishment and maintenance of experimental farms, and surely it has nothing to do with fertilizers, or with duties to be paid on fertilizers. When we reach that item I shall draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How many experimental farms are there in the province of Quebec?

Mr. CRERAR: Four experimental farms and stations: at Lennoxville, Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Kamouraska, and Spirit Lake. There is also a tobacco station at Farnham.

For the administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act, $149,200.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose this would include what is popularly known as the potato bug?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the department discovered any effective means of exterminating that visitor?

Mr. CRERAR: The department has carried out quite a variety of experiments with different insecticides used in spraying, and the results obtained conclusively show that with proper care and proper treatment the

pest can be pretty well controlled, if not entirely eradicated.

Mr. McKENZIE: I can understand insecticides killing the pest for the time being, but next year they are as bad as ever. Has the department any knowledge as to whether they remain in the soil and come out again another year, or are they of a migratory character? Can you prevent reproduction of the pest?

Mr. CRERAR: The difficulty in completely eradicating the pest in any district is due mainly to the fact that all farmers will not spray. The result is that in every district certain fields remain infected. I do not quite understand the process by which the potato bug is reproduced, but experiments have demonstrated conclusively that if spraying is consistently done by all the farmers in the district the pest can be eradicated.

Mr. CAHILL: How many employees are there in this branch, and what are the salaries? I notice an increase in this item.

Mr. CRERAR: The increase is due to increases in salary and in the cost of materials for experiments. Insecticides of various kinds, as well as the appliances and equipment with which to conduct the experiments, have increased in price. Provision is also made for three additional assistants, necessitated by new lines of investigational work that are being carried out. I regard this as one of the important branches of our agricultural work, and it is really very interesting to follow the experimental work closely and see the results that can be obtained in the destruction of these pests that very greatly depreciate the value of our field crops.

Mr. CAHILL: Would wheat rust come under this head?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, we are carrying out experiments along that line.

Mr. PEDLOW: This item is for the enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act. Would the elimination of food profiteers be in order under this heading?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member must be serious.

Mr. CRERAR: We have not yet been able to find an insecticide that will look after them.

Mr. PEDLOW: I noticed in the press that a considerable quantity of cold storage provisions was destroyed in Montreal, and I was wondering if any part of this money would be used for obviating the necessity of destroying foodstuffs.

For the development of the dairying industry, and the improvement of transportation, sale and trade in food and other products, $155,000.

Mr. CRERAR: This is the same amount as last year. Last year's vote was a little more than sufficient to meet our requirements.

Mr. CAHILL: Are experiments made in dairying at only the Central Farm, or at other farms such as Spirit Lake and Indian Head?

Mr. CRERAR: We have two experimental stations carrying on that work, one in Ontario, and another in New Brunswick. The Policy of the department for several years past has been to give assistance in the development of a refrigeration service, particularly on the railways.

Mr. McKENZIE: This item deals with the "sale and trade in food and other products." Does that imply that the department has to do with cold storage cars, for instance? Does the department furnish cold storage for the transportation of fish and other perishable products which are carried from one place to another?

This matter is of the greatest importance The fishermen along the coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island complain that while there are cold storage cars they are very poorly equipped and a very large percentage of fish and other products put into cold storage become unfit for human food before they reach their destination. It is necessary that fish should be kept cool and well iced from one stage of transportation to another until it is finally disposed. It has been complained that this matter is not attended to, and that the ice which is provided when the food leaves the point of shipment melts and is not renewed, the fish being destroyed. If this item is intended to cover that particular phase of transportation and bring it within the scope of the Department of Agriculture, I would seriously press upon the minister the necessity of having the most complete system that can possibly be devised. Attention should be given not only to what forces itself upon the department, but every encouragement should be given to see that proper care is exercised in transportation with a view to obtaining the best and most profitable results. I have always thought—and I have brought the matter to the attention of the Govern-

ment several times—that in addition to provision for the proper care of food on transit in cars, there should be a suitable place of reception for the cars themselves when they reach their destination, some sort of cold storage shed where the car might be kept free from contamination until the freight is finally unloaded. These cars, I understand, are sometimes allowed to stand in the yard uncared for and in many cases valuable food such as fish decays and becomes unfit for consumption, and has to be thrown away. I am not quite sure that this comes within the purview of the Department of Agriculture, but the item seems to suggest that it does. If it does, I cannot too strongly urge upon the minister, and in any event upon the department which may deal with the matter, the great importance of this phase of the transportation question.

Mr. CRERAR: This item covers only transportation of dairy products and fruits; it does not include fish, which is covered by an item in the Marine and Fisheries Department. Assistance is given to promote, and also by way of investigation to ascertain, the advantages to the producer from the use of proper refrigeration service in the transportation of these perishable commodities. I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition that the matter is one of very great importance. The advantage of cold storage and proper refrigeration, not only in rail but in ocean transportation, has not, I venture to say, been fully recognized by the producers and the people generally. To assist in this work the Government, as has already been stated in the House on previous occasions, have made provision for the erection of a public cold storage plant on the harbour front of Montreal under the control of the Board of Harbour Commissioners for that port. This is to accomplish the very purpose which the leader of the Opposition refers to, namely, that commodities may have a suitable place of storage pending their further shipment. A portion of this grant is used for cow testing in the ordinary dairy herds. We have a staff of inspectors, and farmers are encouraged to test the milk production of their various animals. Very remarkable results have been obtained, and many farmers are weeding out unprofitable animals. There is also provision for cargo inspection in the shipment of perishable commodities overseas. There is a cargo inspection not only at the port of landing but also in the United Kingdom. Self-registering thermometers are used in the storage compartments of the vessels, and complete records of temperatures are taken on the way across, which records are preserved in the files of the department. Further, there is some small provision for the drafting of plans of suitable dairy buildings. Very often inquiries are received from creameries and cheese factories and persons interested in the dairy business for suggestions as to suitable buildings to meet their requirements, and we are endeavouring to provide for these necessities. These are the matters that are mainly covered by the items included under this head. The development of our dairying industry in Canada is of great importance. Great Britain imports about 500,000,000 pounds of butter annually and Canada supplies a very small portion of that, not more than a few million pounds. Britain's annual imports in eggs are also enormous, but Canada supplies only a few millions of dozens. In order to take full advantage of that market and to hold it we have to do two or three important things. First, we must secure the best possible standard of quality in our product, and in the various activities of the department we are endeavouring to impress that fact on producers. Second,—and this is of equal importance—there must be proper facilities for shipment. If you ship a carload of butter from Montreal, Halifax or any other port and leave it standing on the wharf for a day or two in hot weather, deterioration sets in and the original quality of the butter can never be restored. Therefore, proper cold storage facilities and proper refrigeration service on vessels are of the greatest importance. The business of this branch generally is to study that field, and by experiment, investigation and inquiry, to discover the best possible methods that can be used to achieve these results.

Mr. McKENZIE: Have we succeeded in Canada in obtaining a perfectly safe refrigerator car for the transportation of perishable food such as butter or fruit? The difficulty has been that although we have been reputed to have refrigerator cars suitable for the carrying of such goods, the cars used have been altogether inadequate, and great losses have been incurred by the use of them. Is there any experiment or improvement in this matter? Are we advancing any nearer the goal of our ambition to have a perfectly good refrigerator car?

Mr. CRERAR: Experiments have been conducted with ice-cooled cars and brine-tank-cooled cars, and the result would seem

to indicate that the latter is the more efficient method. These experiments have been carried on over a considerable period of time, and the results carefully noted and compared. The results that have been obtained so far, I think, prove beyond any question of doubt the great advantage there is in using proper care in the shipment of the stuff and the character of the cold storage used. You can have a refrigerator car that is ice-cooled, but if the detail of the work is not properly carried out from the time the car leaves its point of origin until it reaches its destination, your experiment will be likely to turn out badly. The whole effort of the department is directed towards ascertaining what are the best methods of carrying out the work for the purpose of getting the results desired.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Can the minister give any information about the amount of oleomargarine that has been manufactured and sold in Canada?

Mr. CRERAR: The dairy commissioner informs me that 14,000,000 pounds have been sold in Canada since the prohibition was lifted in October, 1917, of which about 8,000,000 pounds was manufactured in Canada.

Mr. SEXSMITH: What firms are manufacturing it?

Mr. CRERAR: The Harris Abattoir and Swift's are the two principal firms manufacturing it.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I suppose this oleomargarine is being sold under strict regulations?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, under strict regulations both as to manufacture and sale.

Mr. SEXSMITH: And quality?

Mr. CRERAR: And quality.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the process of acquainting the farmers and dairymen with information pointing to the desirability of testing their cows and so getting a better grade of stock? To what extent does the department encourage that sort of thing?

Mr. CRERAR: The number of cows tested last year was 27,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Where?

Mr. CRERAR: All over Canada, but mainly in the great dairying provinces of Ontario and Quebec. This work is being carried on in conjunction with cheese factories and creameries where the cheesemaker or the buttermaker has the expert knowledge necessary to carry out the test successfully.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I understand some change is being made in the system of cow testing. A year or two ago there were certain districts in charge of representatives of the department who carried on the work. Is the operation now being carried on as successfully as it was under the old system?

Mr. CRERAR: The work was carried out formerly by inspectors appointed by the department but that was abandoned and the department now is endeavouring to have the cheesemakers and buttermakers do the work of the inspectors. The department pays the cheesemaker or buttermaker a small fee per cow tested. That supplements the revenue that he gets from his work, and we find that the work can be extended to a greater degree with less cost than under the other system.

Mr. SEXSMITH: What success have you had in getting the cheesemakers to do the work?

Mr. CRERAR: First class.

Towards the encouragement of cold storage warehouses for the better preservation and handling of perishable food products, $25,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What is this item?

Mr. CRERAR: In 1908 by legislative enactment, provision was made for bonusing the building of cold storage warehouses throughout Canada. The regulations provided that the Government, where such warehouses should be built, would provide thirty per cent of the cost of construction. This was spread over several years. A total of over $650,000 had been paid out from the time of the inauguration of this policy until the commencement of the war. Since 1914 no new subsidies have been paid with the exception of a contract that had been made prior to the commencement of the war.

Mr. CAHILL: Where?

Mr. CRERAR: In Saskatoon. The matter has been under the consideration of the department and recently a decision was reached and embodied in an Order in Council, passed under a provision of the Act, that we will cease giving assistance to the development of private cold storage houses. There is a provision still that assistance may be given in the case of a municipally owned cold storage warehouse and in future the aid will be confined to such.

Mr. COWAN: Did the Government retain any control over the cold storage warehouses for the 30 per cent of the $650,000, which was given to the proprietors?

Mr. CRERAR: There was a measure of control over the storage rates charged by these warehouses. As a matter of fact, the system has not worked out very satisfactorily from the point of view of the public. Generally the persons or the companies building the storage were engaged in the business themselves and it was somewhat difficult to regulate them under the provisions of the Act. We are considering now the passage of regulations providing for the licensing of cold storage and a little closer control in so far as returns are concerned.

9 p.m.

Mr. COWAN: I would suppose that some of this cold storage would be reserved for the public use. Could a farmer require a company to give him space or could the company sell the entire space to one or two parties?

Mr. CRERAR: Farmers or others can get space if it is available. But there is no provision that these cold storage warehouses shall keep a certain amount of space available for the public and the result is that generally the private dealer who owns the storage uses the whole of it. As long as there is space available the public can get it.

Mr. COWAN: I think in framing the regulations it would be proper to provide that a certain portion of the space should be reserved for the public. I believe that would very effectually break up the scheme that is being carried out at the present time.

Mr. CRERAR: As a rule the public get what they want, but I doubt if the Government has any such power of control as the hon. gentleman suggests should be exercised.

Mr. COWAN: I think it should have that power.

Mr. LEGER: How many cold storage warehouses are there in New Brunswick, and where are they situated?

Mr. CRERAR: There are two in New Brunswick to which we are paying a subsidy, one at Woodstock and the other at St. John.

Mr. CAHILL: The policy of giving subsidies to private cold storage plants has been abandoned, and I gather that the minister is not very much in favour of it. What is the Government's present policy now with regard to cold storage plants in Canada?

Mr. CRERAR: As I stated this afternoon, the Government has provided something over $1,000,000 for the erection of a cold storage plant on the harbour front at Montreal. As to further developments, while the Government's policy has not been definitely decided upon, my own personal view is that the plan adopted in the case of Montreal should be extended to other shipping points.

Mr. CAHILL: Do you think that it will be extended?

Mr. CRERAR: I think eventually that it will. There is great merit in the idea that it would be better from the point of view of public cold storage—at any rate so it seems to me—if municipalities would undertake the erection of municipal cold storage plants.

Mr. CRERAR: That has already been done in some Western towns. I recall New Westminster as one in particular, where the corporation of the city and the council of the adjoining municipality have combined for the erection of a municipal cold storage plant which shall be available for the merchants of the city, and the farmers from the adjacent county who want to take advantage of it.

Mr. CAHILL: Does not the minister think that if the duty were taken off cold storage plants it might facilitate the establishment of numerous plants throughout the country? Does he not think it would be an advantage to do that?

Mr. COWAN: What a question!

Mr. CRERAR: I think it might possibly help.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Do I understand that this item we are considering relates to all classes of food commodities, including fish?

Mr. CRERAR: No.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: The item in the Estimates speaks of cold storage warehouses "for the better preservation and handling of food products," but has no reference to fish?

Mr. CRERAR: I stated in reply to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) that it applied only to fruit and dairy products. Fish is provided for in the fisheries estimates.

Mr. PEDLOW: To what extent does the Government exercise supervision over cold storage plants? For instance, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) yesterday drew the Government's attention to the large quantity, in fact tons, of foodstuffs that had been destroyed in the city of Montreal. Would not prevention be a much better plan than destruction in such cases? If the Government has the right to supervise the cold storage plants of the country, would it not be wisdom on its part to insist that the owners dispose of the products in cold storage before they become rotten and have to be destroyed?

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. gentleman raises a very broad problem. In the particular case to which he refers, I believe the goods were out of condition before they were stored. I have not the slightest hesitation in stating that if it were not for the existing cold storage plants in Canada probably the loss and deterioration of food stuffs would be very much greater than it is. Whether the Government should exercise that control over food commodities which the hon. gentleman suggests is, at any rate, a debatable question. These cold storage plants, as I understand it, are subject to municipal regulations in that respect, and personally I think it always well for the municipality to deal with such matters rather than apply Federal control to them. In other words, it is better on principle to have the municipal power invoked, wherever it can be done successfully, rather than the Federal power in a matter of that kind.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understand that under the terms of the vote we are considering, the Government exercises a certain control over these cold storage plants. Is it not a crime to allow good food stuffs to go to waste, and should not the Government step in and compel the owners of the plants to dispose of those food stuffs before they become unfit for human consumption and have to be destroyed?

Mr. CRERAR: A certain control has been exercised, but, as I have already stated, it has not been found very effective, particularly after the subsidies have been earned, for the reason that the private owner of the cold storage plant very often requires this space for himself. I think that in the main, however, the public have been very well served. As to the other point which the hon. gentleman raises, and urges upon the Government, namely that it should take the power to order the sale of commodities at certain times, it has no relation to the item under discussion, and is a question upon which I am not prepared to express an opinion.

Mr. COWAN: Under the Act under which assistance was granted towards the construction of these various cold storage plants, that aid was given to only one plant in each locality, a policy which has not met with the expectations of the Government. I would like to ask, would the existence of that one plant in a municipality be a barrier to that municipality getting the aid that will be extended under the present scheme?

Mr. CRERAR: Offhand, I would not care to give a definite answer at the moment.

Mr. COWAN: I hope the minister will take that point into consideration.

Mr. CRERAR: I shall do so.

Mr. PELLETIER: Are we to understand that in the case of publicly-owned plants the Government intends to grant subsidies as it has heretofore done in the case of private companies? For example, suppose certain municipalities want to open cold storage plants, does the Government intend to give them assistance to the extent of thirty per cent of the cost of construction, or will it assist them at any time?

Mr. CRERAR: It will be open to municipalities that desire to establish municipally-owned cold storage plants within their districts to ask for assistance. If they do, their applications will be considered, and if everything is in order a provision exists for extending aid. As I have already stated the policy of granting assistance from the public fund will be discontinued as far as the building of private cold storage plants is concerned.

Mr. CAHILL: The Government has adopted public ownership in regard to railways, and I would ask if it is intended to adopt the same policy in respect of cold storage plants. I think if the Government did that, government ownership would be much more profitable and beneficial to the public generally than it might possibly be when applied in some other directions.

Mr. CRERAR: I have already stated that the Government has commenced by providing for the erection of a public cold storage plant at Montreal. I stated also that I was not in a position to say what the general policy of the Government in the matter would be.

Mr. CAHILL: How can we ascertain the policy of the Government with respect

to numerous matters that have arisen recently in the House? The ministers in charge of the Estimates are always unable to inform us in regard to the general policy of the Government. The Government seems to be largely a Government of individuals, each with his own particular department in mind and unable to say just how far that department may go. This matter of cold storage is one of the most serious questions that confront the Canadian people to-day, and the Government should have a policy with regard to it. The press would lead us to believe that the people controlling the packing and cold storage plants have been making exorbitant profits. Ministers of the Government have defended the character and business ability of some of the gentlemen who have made these exorbitant profits. Conditions in Canada to-day are not satisfactory to the labouring people; they have the impression that the cold storage plants are getting too much out of the producers and the consumers. Probably twenty-five to thirty-three and a third per cent of Canada's produce is wasted for the want of proper storage facilities. The erection of a plant at Montreal will not relieve the situation in all other parts of the country. The erection of cold storage plants in the United States or in European countries seems to be a simple matter. Having regard to our long shipping distances and to the general conditions in this country, it would be good business for the Government to find out what it would cost to build plants so that they may be able to give that information to the towns and cities of Canada. A cold storage plant is just as important as the hen-coop or pig-sty. If it is necessary to take the duty off certain articles to promote a policy of this kind the Government can do it, just as they took the duty off farm tractors. The Government should reduce the high cost of living by providing better cold storage facilities and by making the profiteers dispose of their food products before they are allowed to rot. The minister says he has no power to do these things. Why, with the War-time Elections Act and all the other various Acts which have vested power in the Government they are able to do anything. All it requires is courage, and if my hon. friend would show some courage in the direction of satisfying the common people, the poor people, the producers, rather than the profiteers, he would be in very much better grace in Canada than he is to-day. I hope that this matter will receive the serious consideration of the Minister and that he will look into the storage problem as one of the most serious problems that Canada faces.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is scarcely consistent; he has quite reversed the position he took a few moments ago, when he criticised very sharply an additional expenditure of $100,000 or so in a vote previously under discussion and urged that we should practice economy. In fact, he impressed me quite strongly by the earnestness of his appeal. Now he suggests that we embark on a policy that would involve the expenditure of millions. If the hon. gentleman wishes my opinion as to the policy that should be adopted—in fact, so far as announcement has been made or anything has been done it is the policy that has been adopted—it is the duty of the federal administration to provide the necessary facilities for the transportation of these products and for the care of them at ocean ports and, generally, to assist in the trade and commerce of the country. If the hon. gentleman has in mind the erection of cold storage plants in every city, town, and village in Canada, the proposition would be a very large one and might better be taken up by municipal enterprise. We have already decided on the policy of giving assistance by way of bonus to municipal cold storage plants. Any town in my hon. friend's constituency, any town or city in Canada, can say to the Government: We propose to erect a municipal cold storage plant and to make it available for the public—for merchants, farmers and all who want to use it; and the Government will upon certain conditions give assistance to the extent of thirty per cent of the cost of erecting such a plant. It would be well to test this policy out for a few years and see what results come from it, rather than to embark on an expenditure that might run into millions.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the Department providing any information of these towns and municipalities that desire cold storage plants?

Mr. CRERAR: The Dairy and Cold Storage branch gathers the best information that can secured in regard to this matter, has the information on file, and is prepared to submit plans, suggestions, and expert advice as to the kind of cold storage best suited to particular localities.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is it the intention of the Government to erect a cold storage plant at Halifax or at some other suitable place in

the Maritime Provinces? Such a plant would be of great assistance in building up an export trade. I understand the farmers in the Maritime Provinces are labouring under a severe handicap, as they have no cold storage plant and have to ship their products very long distances, such as to Montreal, at heavy expense, with the result, in many cases, that their live stock produces only about half as much as the same live stock would sell at on the Toronto market. If a cold storage plant were built at that point it would be a great help to the live stock industry in that part of Canada.

Mr. CRERAR: The suggestion will receive the consideration of the Government. No decision has been reached to erect a cold storage plant at Halifax or any other Atlantic port other than Montreal, where we have made a start.

Mr. LEGER: I would favour the idea of a Government-owned cold storage plant in the Maritime Provinces. With that I would urge the Government to have a good inspector to visit it frequently. If I am well informed, there are throughout Canada many cold storage warehouses full of foodstuffs which are held for higher prices. These cold storage warehouses should be visited by Government inspectors and the foodstuffs should be sold instead of being kept there to enhance prices. In that way the poor people of Canada would be benefited. These trusts or combines get together and fill up these warehouses with foodstuffs which they hold until the price goes up. As was said by an hon. member, a large quantity of foodstuffs was wasted in Montreal by being held in cold storage for higher prices. The cost of living is getting so high that it is almost impossible for the poor people to live, and the Government should take steps to cause cold storage warehouses to be emptied at a certain time of the year instead of being kept full of foodstuffs the year round, thus keeping the price up.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad the hon. member for Victoria city (Mr. Tolmie) has brought up the question of Government-owned cold storage warehouses at Atlantic ports. I understand the Department of Agriculture for Nova Scotia has been impressing upon the minister that some steps should be taken to erect at Halifax a cold storage plant somewhat similar to the one it is proposed to erect at Montreal. I have nothing to say against the building of a plant at Montreal, but I was told that one of the reasons why this cold storage plant was being erected at Montreal was to furnish facilities for the shipment of chilled or other beef at all seasons of the year. The minister knows well that shipping facilities at the port of Montreal are limited in season. For a considerable portion of the year that port is frozen up and vessels cannot come to or go away from it. Navigation is open in the harbour of Halifax 365 days of the year every year, and I am sure the same thing may be said of St. John, although not to the same easy extent as at Halifax. I do not know if there are any hon. members from New Brunswick here who may criticise me if I say anything about the high tide difficulties of the St. John harbour. It is, however, open all the year round and ships can come to and go from it. If the Government have decided that it is proper to spend $1,000,000 for the purpose of erecting a cold storage plant to be auxiliary to transhipment across the Atlantic, that plant should be at a place which shipping can go to and depart from at all seasons. That is, I think, a strong argument in favour of such facilities being erected at the ports of Halifax and St. John, or, if not at both, at least at one of them. In view of the fact that the Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture has put in its claim—and I have not heard that any particular claim was sent in from New Brunswick, although the one would require it just as much as the other—the minister should give some attention to the very legitimate request put forward. I understand the hon. member for Victoria city who has brought this matter to the attention of the minister is the president of a certain association that has to deal with agricultural matters throughout the province.

Mr. TOLMIE: The Canadian National Live Stock Council, made up of representatives from the Eastern and Western Live Stock Unions.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend is an authority on the question and I am glad he has brought this matter up. I should like to point out to the minister an extraordinary thing that happened in Nova Scotia last year. The farmers in several counties such as Pictou and Antigonish, the latter being exclusively a farming community, are excellent farmers. They discovered that the hay crop was not up to standard last

year, and they were obliged to sell off hundreds of their live stock. They sold them to a gentleman who could do nothing with them but take them to a place where they could be slaughtered and put into cold storage. As there was no cold storage warehouse in the Maritime Provinces, those cattle were carried alive to Montreal or Toronto, slaughtered and the meat kept in cold storage all winter. The beef was then shipped back over nearly 1,500 miles of railroad to Nova Scotia and sold to our miners, lumbermen and other people. The minister can readily understand the enormous increase that must necessarily be put upon the first cost of that article on account of its being handled in that manner.

Mr. CRERAR: There are no abattoir plants in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. McKENZIE: No, but I understand those interested in the cattle trade are quite ready to build abattoirs if cold storage facilities were provided, but it is too expensive for them to erect a cold storage plant, and they are, therefore, looking to the Government to do so. It would be a good investment and a good policy for the Government to build such a plant. Does the minister intend in connection with the cold storage plant at Montreal, to provide a place where a car could be run in?

In order to do that, the lower story of the building would have to be made something like a railway yard. If that could be provided, it would certainly save a great deal of handling and re-handling of the contents. It might be that these facilities would be made use of only once in a while, but they would certainly be a splendid thing to have. I have particularly in mind what happens to our cars of fish from the Maritime Provinces. Friday is the big fish day in cities, and Thursday or early Friday morning is the best time to sell a car of fish in Montreal or Toronto. If the car happens to get there on Monday or Tuesday and has to stand in the yard during the early part of the week, when there is not so much demand for fish, my information is, the fish deteriorates and becomes unfit for sale, often resulting in a total loss. If there was a place in the cold storage building into which a car could be run and kept until its contents were disposed of, the shippers would feel secure against waste, and it would be a great encouragement to them. If this can be brought about, and the plans are not too far advanced, I would certainly suggest that limited accommodation, at all events, of this character should be supplied in any cold storage warehouse that is to be erected.

Mr. CRERAR: The cold storage warehouse to be erected in Montreal will be under the control of the harbour commissioners. I know that they had competent engineers making inquiries, and the Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner, Mr. Ruddick, accompanied one of the engineers to several cities in the United States to look over the most up-to-date cold storage plants to be found in them. I have no doubt that as a result of their inquiries the most modern and up-to-date plant will be built in Montreal. I do not think the proposal advanced by the leader of the Opposition that a car should be run into the building, and the whole stored as a carload, is a practicable one. In fact, I think it would be very difficult, probably impossible, to carry out his suggestion. The most up-to-date facilities, however, will be provided for taking care of fish, fruit and any other perishable commodities that are shipped.

Now a word as to why Montreal was selected. Montreal, of course, is a summer port, and it is during the summer months when temperatures are high that the need for cold storage is greatest. For that reason Montreal was selected as the initial point. There is already a cold storage plant in St. John, under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Halifax is not as yet supplied with such a plant. I quite sympathize with the view expressed by the leader of the Opposition as to the necessity of proper abattoir and cold storage facilities in the province of Nova Scotia, or at any rate in one of the Maritime Provinces, and I presume Nova Scotia would be the most suitable, in order to encourage the development of the live stock industry in that part of Canada. It is quite true, as he has stated, that Nova Scotia cattle are at times shipped to Montreal for slaughter and the beef re-shipped for sale to the people of Nova Scotia. That on the face of it is an economic waste. At the request of the Provincial Department of Agriculture for Nova Scotia we have sent some of our officials to that province to make, in conjunction with the provincial officials, a survey of the whole situation with a view to ascertaining the best line of action to follow.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am sure that every hon. member of the House must have been deluged, as I was, during the early part of the session with petitions, signed by farmers throughout the province of On-

tario in favour of a cold storage plant for the city of Toronto. It was requested that these petitions be presented to the Government, and I am surprised that no member for the city of Toronto has spoken tonight in favour of a cold storage plant for that city. Have those interested in the matter in the city of Toronto approached the minister, and if so, what decision has he arrived at?

Mr. CRERAR: Petitions are the easiest things in the world to secure.

Mr. PEDLOW: I did not ask for them; they were sent to me.

Mr. CRERAR: As far as I recall we have had no requests from the city of Toronto for assistance in this respect, probably due to the fact that there is already a municipal cold storage in that town, in addition to several private plants.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the minister should withdraw that statement. Toronto would be very much offended at being spoken of as a "town."

Health of Animals, $465,000.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I would draw the minister's attention to a very serious state of affairs which was mentioned in the Committee on Agriculture. The statement was made there that during last year tuberculosis among beef cattle had increased, I think, from three to over four per cent, and in hogs from nine to nineteen per cent. That is a most alarming state of affairs, and I would ask what steps the department is taking to check this disease.

Mr. CRERAR: Tuberculosis amongst cattle has received the consideration of the qualified officials of the department, and the whole question has been closely and attentively studied. It is my intention to submit Supplementary Estimates for $50,000 for the purpose of inaugurating a system of accredited herds for pure-bred cattle. The tuberculosis trouble exists I believe in every country in the world. The United States authorities have recently undertaken a method of handling it and last year appropriated $500,000 for the purpose. I have been informed this year according to their Estimates it was intended to increase the appropriation to $1,000,000. I do not need to deal with the technical aspect of the plan they had in view. If the Committee desires further information in regard to that matter I am quite sure the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) who has made a close study of the matter will be pleased to give it. The matter is receiving the attention of qualified officials of the department. The problem is a somewhat difficult one to deal with.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: What is the cause of this rapid increase in the disease? There must be something unusual about it. Have the officials of the department endeavoured to ascertain the cause?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know that there has been any rapid increase in the spread of the disease, and I am unable to give specific causes for any increase?

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I would call the minister's attention to the statistics. I think there was an increase of 9 per cent in hogs.

Mr. CRERAR: What statistics?

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: They were given in the Agricultural Committee, and it is a most alarming state of affairs if there is going to be an increase in that ratio or anything like it.

Mr. CRERAR: I have no information as to that.

Mr. TOLMIE: That increase was over a period of six years. I am not sure of the exact figures given at that time, but I think that is it. I certainly would like to compliment the department on the distinct advance they are making in appropriating $50,000 for the purpose of introducing the accredited herd system. If we can hope to export cattle to the United States and hold that market, and if the embargo is removed from cattle going to Great Britain and we desire to ship cattle there, we must be sure that we send only healthy animals to those two markets; otherwise we cannot expect to retain them. The accredited herd system will give the advantage to the herd that is kept clean, and I sincerely hope that the breeders of the country will avail themselves of this opportunity to the fullest extent. I desire to congratulate the Health of animals Branch of the department on the work they have accomplished during the past few years. On several occasions we have had very serious outbreaks of infectious and contagious diseases immediately along the boundary line, and in nearly all cases none of the diseases have entered Canada. By preventing disease in that way through a close system of inspection we have been saved the loss of millions of dollars, and when we consider the small appropriation—I see there is an increase to a certain extent this year—and compare that appropriation with the

enormous value of the live stock in Canada, something between one and one and a half billions of dollars, it will be recognized that a very valuable work is being accomplished by this branch of the Department of Agriculture at a nominal cost.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any simple process by which an ordinary farmer can detect tuberculosis in herds or in the individual cow?

Mr. CRERAR: Ouly by the tuberculin test which has proved successful.

Mr. MOLLOY: Is this grant for salaries or for compensation for animals destroyed, or for both? The amount is $465,000.

Mr. CRERAR: It includes both; $70,000 is for compensation.

For the administration and enforcement of the Meat and Canned Foods Act, $442,000.

Mr. CRERAR: The increase here is due to the general increase in wages and to enlargement of the work. Under the Act qualified veterinary inspectors along with lay inspectors are kept in every abattoir and meat packing plant and canning establishment in Canada in order to insure the purety of the foods produced therein.

Mr. CAHILL: Has it not been customary for some years to keep inspectors in packing plants?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes. I am accounting for the increase in the vote which hon. members will see amounts to $63,000. It is due to the necessity of paying higher wages and salaries and also to an extension of the work. More inspectors are required every year.

Mr. MOLLOY: What salaries are paid the inspectors?

Mr. CRERAR: The salaries, I am informed, are from $1,400 to $1,800 for veterinarians.

Mr. MOLLOY: It commences at $1,400?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: I suppose this vote includes the inspection of twelve-ounce pounds of lobster cans under the law which my hon. friend's colleague is passing to make twelve ounces of lobster a pound. Does it include all canned goods?

Mr. CRERAR: It does not include canned fish, which comes under the Marine and Fisheries Department. It includes all other canned goods.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister know of any other class of producers who claim that twelve ounces of food make a pound avoirdupois?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know. I might be inclined to agree with the hon. member off hand, but the matter is not in this department and I must refer him to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. McKENZIE: There must be some canned commodities that it is intended to inspect or this amount would not be asked for. Do those who come within the jurisdiction of this department, and who engage in the canning of food other than lobster, say that twelve ounces make a pound avoirdupois?

Mr. CRERAR: I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Department of Agriculture insists on sixteen ounces to the pound.

Mr. PEDLOW: There is another industry that puts up its product in twelve ounces, and sometimes ten-ounce pounds. I refer to the manufacture of wool, which is put up in twelve-ounce and ten-ounce pounds, and even in eight-ounce pounds, according to the demands of the retail merchant.

Mr. CRERAR: It is not canned.

Publications Branch, $36,300.

Mr. McKENZIE: In this branch I think there is scope for improvement. I have been attempting to circulate the literature of the department for a great many years, and formerly I used to get a fair supply of material for distribution. The last time I applied, about two years ago, I was informed that I could get only a very limited supply, and that I would have to submit the names of my addressees to the department. Dealing with the large number of farmers to whom I would have to give literature I realized that a limited quantity would be only a source of embarrassment to me. I might select a few names and address material to them while the others would receive nothing, and from a political standpoint it would be better for me to send none at all. So that I did not send any. I do not think that members should be called upon to attend to a matter of this kind. Once the information is put into shape by the officers of the department who go to the pains of collecting their material the hardest part of the work is over, particularly when the literature is printed; and the department should see to it that this literature finds its way to the agriculturists of the country. It is a pity that tons of this material should be wasted

from year to year, and I strongly urge upon the minister that the officers who have charge of this branch should acquaint themselves with the names and addresses of the farmers from coast to coast. It is a large undertaking, but they can very readily get this information by applying to the agricultural societies in the several provinces. In this way they would get at least 75 or 80 per cent of the names of the farmers and as they have no postage to pay it would be a comparatively simple matter to send literature to the farmers. I wish to impress upon the minister the desirability of seeing that this information reaches those whom it will benefit. Undoubtedly it would be useful and might stimulate the farmer to greater efforts in the way of increased production, besides giving him new ideas. At all events it would impress him with the idea that the department is taking an interest in him and has his prosperity at heart. I know that only very few farmers of Canada receive any literature from the department. I would like to see literature relating to the farm finding its way into more houses and into the hands of more farmers than at present, for it would certainly have beneficial results.

Mr. CRERAR: There are probably between 650,000 and 700,000 farmers in Canada, and the publications branch have on their files the names of 240,000 farmers who are supplied with the class of bulletin they desire. I have found in my experience of several years that the best results are always obtained when the person who desires literature makes application for it in some form or other. Very often you get names from such a source as the voters' lists, and send circulars or pamphlets to the addresses there given, with the result that a large percentage of the literature thus sent finds its way into the waste basket. The evidence of interest on the part of the person applying for literature and the best guarantee that he will make proper use of it when he gets it, is the fact that he goes to the trouble of applying for it. However, I entirely agree with the leader of the Opposition as to the importance of the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not quite agree with the minister as to the way in which this matter should be attended to. Possibly his view is one way of looking at it, but it seems to suggest the argument that we should not send missionaries to the distant islands and remote parts of the earth until they have made application for some one to go and preach to them the gospel of the Nazarene. That is not the way in which the gospel is propagated. We send missionaries to the heathen and wake him up to the necessity of looking to the salvation of his soul, and in like manner we should send to the farmers, who need the information that we can give them, such literature as will be of benefit to them. If we did this we would create a desire on their part for more and more information, and applications would then be made in abundance. In many departments of life we are content to keep in the old rut, and if we do not assimilate new ideas we are apt to rest content with what was done by our grandfathers and fathers. The aim of the department should be to create a new interest in farming and they should not spare a few more dollars in putting necessary pamphlets and other useful records within the reach of the farmers if by so doing they can encourage them and stimulate an interest in rural life in Canada.

Mr. CRERAR: The missionary does not always act on his own initiative. I believe that Holy Writ records that the great St. Paul heard a call from Macedonia and proceeded thither, and I believe also that when we send missionaries to foreign lands we usually have repeated and earnest calls from those places for additional missionaries. The same applies in this matter. That is precisely the same method as we are following in the distribution of this literature. We aim to get it into the hands of the community, a desire for literature is produced and it is sent out.

Mr. McKENZIE: I must correct my hon. friend on the Pauline doctrine. The gospel was preached at Macedonia but some of the preachers went away and those of the Christian religion felt that somebody must come to them and help them along. Hence the Macedonian cry.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend has raised the Macedonian cry to-night.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Is the same policy of distribution followed in regard to the Agricultural Gazette as is followed in reference to the bulletins published by the department?

Mr. CRERAR: The Agricultural Gazette has only a limited circulation. It is distributed to teachers and colleges, agricultural institutes and district representatives in the various provinces. There are also a number of subscribers who pay a small

annual subscription. I am unable to state what the total circulation is.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: What is the fee?

Mr. CRERAR: One dollar a year.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: What does it cost the department to publish the Gazette?

Mr. CRERAR: There is an appropriation of $20,000. That covers printing, editorial work and generally the carrying on of the paper.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: I understood you to say that was the appropriation. Is it all expended?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Does that include the expenditure over and above the amount received from subscriptions?

Mr. CRERAR: The return from the subscription fees is very small indeed. Practically the whole circulation is a free circulation amongst agricultural institutes, agricultural representatives, etc.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: It seems to me that the policy of keeping a paper like that going is of somewhat doubtful soundness. The spending of $20,000 a year for a publication that is simply put on the shelves of libraries and places of that kind, and which really is of no benefit to the rank and file of the agricultural community, seems scarcely to be justified. It would appear to me that the policy of keeping up a publication of that kind for the purposes outlined is hardly consistent with the objects that we should have before us in voting these expenditures.

Mr. CRERAR: I think, perhaps, the criticism of the hon. gentleman has some weight. I am not altogether convinced of the present practical value of the Gazette. There is, however, this to say, that many special articles appear in this journal. For instance, the results of some experimental work that may have been carried on by the entomological department, as an illustration, or in any particular branch, or in some other field of activity in connection with agriculture, are often recorded in articles published in the Gazette. These articles go out to the agricultural district representatives. I believe that in practically all cases they keep their files complete and the Gazette really becomes a sort of reference library to these workers. This undoubtedly has value. I am not certain that the same results, or practically as good results could not be obtained if the Gazette were published quarterly instead of monthly, and that is under consideration now.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is not this journal of recent introduction? How many years ago was it commenced?

Mr. CRERAR: About six years ago it was brought into being.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think the department would be well advised to see that their publications do get into the hands of those for whom they are intended. It is foolishness to spend money for issuing pamphlets and publications of one kind and another and allow them to lie on the shelves of the department. You have been using Scriptural authority against any extensive work of that kind. I may be permitted to quote other Scriptural authority for the benefit of my hon. friend. The sower went out to sow his seed; some fell on stony ground and did not grow; some fell among thorns and the thorns grew up and choked the seed; some seed fell in good ground and produced an abundant harvest. You cannot expect to get results from a too limited distribution of literature. You should send out these pamphlets indiscriminately if you are to get good returns, because by that process you will develop a good mailing list. I would suggest that copies of the publications that the department has for distribution be sent out and distributed freely. That is the way storekeepers do. They do not expect to get results from every person to whom they send a publication. They send them out indiscriminately. Some of them are not even taken out of the mail box. There should be a wide distribution of these pamphlets, and if they are of value the farmers will want more and will write in for them.

Mr. CRERAR: That is precisely what we are finding out. We have over 240,000 names on our mailing list, and the total number of bulletins of all kinds distributed by the Publications Branch was very close to 3,000,000 last year. They were distributed at the request of 119,000 people.

Mr. LEGER: These pamphlets should be sent out in quantity to the provincial governments. The provincial governments are in touch with agricultural societies and they know where to direct the pamphlets to produce the best results. If the provincial government shipped them direct to the agricultural societies the farmers would have the benefit of them. Otherwise the Government does not know the names of the farmers throughout the country and they cannot be reached.

Mr. FAFARD: I would ask the hon. minister if there is a French publication for the French population.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, we issue the publications in French.

International Institute of Agriculture—to assist in maintenance thereof and to provide representation thereat—$10,000.

Mr. CRERAR: This vote, I would like to explain, is to provide for our membership in the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, with which practically all the countries of the world that are engaged to any extent in agriculture are identified. This vote is simply to cover our contributions thereto and to meet our expenses in connection therewith. The institute gathers agricultural statistics from all countries, and compiles and publishes them, and in that way seeks to disseminate accurate and complete information as to what is going on in these countries.

M. J. E. SINCLAIR: Does the vote include the expenses of sending a delegate to the meetings?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: How long is it since Canada sent a delegate to the meetings of the Institute?

Mr. CRERAR: I am advised that no delegate has been sent since the war broke out, but the sending of the delegate will now in all likelihood be resumed.

For the development of the live stock industry—$800,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: In connection with this vote, could the minister suggest any way by which the farmers throughout the country could obtain pure bred stock more cheaply than it is possible for them to do at present? I do not know very much about the subject, but I am told that the prices charged for pure bred animals are very high, and practically it is beyond the reach of the ordinary farmer to obtain them. I would like to know from the minister if there is any combine or corner in connection with pure bred stock? There are, of course, large farmers and wealthy people who "play the market" to some extent in connection with stock at this time. Perhaps I should not use the expression "play the market", but many such persons make a hobby of raising fine cattle and horses and selling them at fancy prices. That is very good and we ought to be thankful, doubtless, to the people whose predilections lead them in that direction; but what I would like to know is, how can pure bred stock be placed within reach of the ordinary farmers of the country without their paying such high prices as are charged? The Government may perhaps be taking some action along this line at present. I am satisfied, however, that there is not enough of it done, at all events in Nova Scotia, especially in the eastern part. There is need of further steps in this direction because I know that our cattle in many agricultural sections of the island of Cape Breton are not as good as they were twenty-five or thirty years ago. There is growing need of a revival in the matter of improved live stock, need of a better class of cattle and a better appreciation by the farmers of the advantage of having good stock rather than poor stock.

Mr. CRERAR: The point which the hon. gentleman has brought up is an important one. The federal Department of Agriculture does give specific assistance towards the promotion of the better breeding of live stock of all kinds. As far as cattle, sheep, and swine are concerned, it is given in this way: Provision is made for the supplying of pure-bred sires in each of these classes to associations of farmers that organize themselves and conform to certain regulations with which compliance is easy. The total number of sires that have been distributed in Canada is over two thousand. In other words, there were about two thousand of these associations in existence last year. Of that number, I am sorry to say, there were only twenty-nine in the province of Nova Scotia. The Department of Agriculture in that province carries on a somewhat similar work, but I am not at the moment able to give information as to the extent to which it does so, or as to the degree of success it has encountered. A very considerable portion of the expenditure contemplated by this vote is for this purpose. In the case of horses a percentage of the service fee is paid by the department, where the association is regularly formed, and its application has been regularly placed with the department. In all these cases as careful attention as possible is given to the securing of sound sires of the best quality available. There is no disguising the fact, however, that the general standard of our live stock, in cattle particularly,—in the beef types at any rate, —in Canada, is not as high as it might be. However, I believe that with the general spread of knowledge and the insistence on the need of improvement, we will make greater progress in the future than we have

made in the past. We very frequently find, as every hon. member knows, farmers who are very largely indifferent to the type of animals that they have. They do not seem to realize as clearly as they should that it costs as much and even more to raise a scrub animal than it does to produce stock of a good type.

Mr. MYERS: I notice an increase in this vote of $200,000. Is the increase due to a greater number of applications for pure-bred sires?

Mr. CRERAR: Not altogether. Some of the increases are due to advances in salaries and wages that have taken place in every branch of the department's work. I may say, however, for the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Myers) that we reduced the Estimate last year for this purpose by $200,000 or more. The present increase is to bring the appropriation back to what the amount was previous to that time. We restricted the work as much as possible last year in order to economize, but owing to the importance of the work, the vote has been restored to the old figure.

Mr. MYERS: A number of applications from the constituency which I represent were delayed in reaching the department. I believe the money asked for here will be well spent in improving the live stock of our country, but I think a little leniency or consideration should have been given to the associations referred to. I have had my attention drawn particularly to the case of one association where the secretary was ill at the time the application should have been forwarded. I brought this fact before the department, but no consideration was given to the case. I think that was very unfair indeed. These men had formed an association at considerable cost to themselves, but owing to the fact that the secretary was ill at the time the application should have gone in, it was somewhat late in reaching the department, and it was declined. Now the intention of this vote being to help the farmers, there should have been a certain amount of leniency displayed in that particular case—in fact two instances of the kind were brought to my notice. Of course, if there are regulations governing this matter, they should be observed, but in such cases as I am referring to, the fact that delay in making the application was caused by illness should have been taken into consideration.

Mr. CRERAR: I cannot agree with the conclusion of the hon. gentleman. The reason for the delay, if I remember rightly, was the prevalence of influenza in the district concerned. But it is important that regulations, particularly in governmental administration, should be lived up to. When a department establishes a definite regulation for the governance of its work and that regulation is not adhered to, that moment the department is in difficulty. The regulation which the hon. gentleman criticises provides that these applications must be lodged with the department prior to April 1; in the case to which he refers the application came in ten days or two weeks late. Fully fifty similar applications came in after the first of April, running all the way from one to three days late up to five weeks late. If you admit one and refuse another, where are you going to draw the line? If you admit them all, what is the use of the regulation? If we violate the regulation for one, we must violate it for all, or we shall be charged with discrimination, favoritism, political pull and all the other things of a like nature. While I regret to disappoint my hon. friend, nevertheless I am sure that on reflection he will see the reasonableness of the position taken by the department in the matter.

Mr. MYERS: It would be a different matter if we had had an ordinary year, but in view of the scourge of the epidemic I still believe that some discretion would have been exercised by the department.

Mr. CRERAR: Of course, the reasons given for delay would be as numerous as the delayed applications. If the secretary of the association, as the hon. member says, was ill, the president or some other member could have written the department, and that is all that would have been necessary.

Mr. DAVIS: I happen to be interested in a similar case. I quite understand that when an inspector goes into a district it would disorganize his work if he had to go back after a fixed date. In the case to which I refer the animal was inspected last year, and it was simply a matter of the application being delayed because of the influenza epidemic. Why could there not be some relaxation of the regulation in that case so that the application might be accepted later?

Mr. CRERAR: If you violate the regulation in one case, how are you going to avoid violating it in other cases?

Mr. DAVIS: Could you not make a special exception of a case like this?

Mr. CRERAR: I have found in my brief experience that special exceptions in Governmental administration are always exceedingly dangerous. I appreciate the position of this association, but each of the fifty applicants who were late could put up just as good an argument why his case should have special consideration.

Mr. MYERS: Possibly the minister does not take into consideration the loss occasioned by not having the privilege of using a sire in a particular year.

Mr. MOLLOY: The sheep industry has taken quite a bound in Manitoba during the last year or two. What is the procedure with regard to getting pure-bred sires for the purpose of breeding sheep?

Mr. CRERAR: Provision is made for assistance in breeding in the case of sheep as well as of swine. The provision for sheep is $17,000.

Mr. MOLLOY: Are the sires sold to the breeder?

Mr. CRERAR: No, they are placed at the disposal of the association after it is regularly formed and complies with the regulations. The basis of distribution is the same as in the case of cattle.

Mr. MOLLOY: I do not understand how an association could handle the rams. One man may have twenty sheep, and another five hundred. How many sires do you send out? You cannot travel a ram around the country as you would a stallion?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Is it not the opinion of the minister that some amendment to the regulation would be in order? I have a case similar to that mentioned by the member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) where a club that had been organized in 1918, wished to organize for 1919, using the same horse that they had used the previous year. This, Mr. Chairman, is a case where the same men wishing to use the same horse this year were refused permission by the department because they were some days late in getting their application in. I do not see why they should not have been granted the right to go ahead.

Mr. CRERAR: Why did they not get their application in on time?

Mr. JOHNSTON: They had some excuse; I do not know what it was. But it seems to me that where there is no change from the previous year, a delay of a day or two ought not to affect the case.

[Mr. Davis.]

Mr. CRERAR: I hope that the committee will not think I am taking too strong a position in this matter. The member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) has brought up a case, which in his judgment deserves as much consideration as the case of my hon. friend from Kindersley (Mr. Myers). But as I have said, each of the fifty applicants would consider that they had equally good arguments to advance in favour of the acceptance of their application. I venture to say that in all fifty cases the application could have been sent in on time if more careful attention had been given to the matter by the officers or by some member of the association. I have no doubt that the difficulties of getting the applications in were not such that they could not easily have been overcome. If there is any virtue in a regulation, it ought to be lived up to; if not, we might as well throw it away.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: What particular virtue is there in the regulation?

Mr. CRERAR: The work has to be planned out; and we must set a specified date in order that we may arrange to have the inspections completed. We may have applications coming in the last week in March from a hundred associations; we have to arrange our distributions and inspections accordingly.

Mr. MOLLOY: Does the Government sell pure bred sires to the breeders or how are they handled in the community? How many would be lent to a district in which there were say 500 or 1,000 sheep? There must be some basis. How are the sheep and hogs handled? Supposing I want a pure-bred ram of a certain breed, can I get it? Do I have to pay for it or is it loaned to me, and do other people have the use of it?

Mr. CRERAR: A club must have at least ten members before a sire is alloted to it, providing they conform to the regulations which are simple. I presume if one of the members had a flock of 100 sheep, he would probably have several sires with his flock The whole purpose of this assistance is to encourage the small breeder, the farmer who has two or three or six or a dozen sheep on his farm. Those are the farmers that are in the main taking advantage of this scheme.

Mr. SHAW: Is there a limit to the price paid by the department for sires purchased and if so, what is the usual price paid?

Mr. CRERAR: We endeavour to get as good a type of animal as can be purchased,

and I could not say what the average price would be. In stallions prices would run all the way from $500 to $1,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am very much interested in what the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) had to say about the cost of pure-bred sires. Under present conditions my experience has been, not working in this line of work as a hobby but rather as a business, that it costs at least from $150 to $200 to produce a yearling bull. If that price or even a bare advance on that may seem rather high to the purchaser of the animal, still when that animal is taken into a herd of twenty or thirty cows, the improvement in the first year, or at least by the second year, will easily pay for the initial outlay. For the man who is unable to pay out that much money for a sire, the Government has made it easy to get one through the plan which has been described to-night. Ten men can get together and secure the services of a sire. In British Columbia this has worked with great advantage, particularly in districts along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific and other isolated places where settlers have just gone in, where they have not got their farms cleaned up and where they are too poor to pay for a sire. Under ordinary circumstances in ten years from now these men would still be breeding scrub cattle; but by being afforded an opportunity of securing the services of a pure-bred sire under this plan, in five or ten years they have a fine lot of high-grade cattle worth far more money than the scrub cattle would be, and in addition to that ten men have been educated to the value of using pure-bred sires. When they are able to buy sires in future they will prefer to buy pure-breds instead of grades. While our live stock in Canada is worth a great deal of money and while we have made certain advances, we are still in our swaddling clothes as regards possible developments. It will be generally admitted that the quality of beef in this country is inferior when compared with that of Australia or of the Argentine Republic. It has, however, been proved on one or two occasions that we are quite capable of producing beef of first-class quality. I might cite the case of one or two Ontario breeders who have been able to take steers down to the great International show in Chicago and win the sweepstakes there in competition with the whole continent. On another occasion, Mr. James D. McGregor, of Brandon, Manitoba, took down a steer one year and won the sweepstakes, and the next year he took down a full brother of the first one and won the sweepstakes again, the only occasion when that was done by a single feeder or breeder. I am credibly informed that our beef, as we produce it, is very much inferior to that of the Argentine, as I have described, and that their average run of chilled beef placed on the market in the old country is equal to the average run of our Christmas beef to be found on the markets of this country. I am also informed that in the inspected abattoirs of Canada not more than 10 per cent of beef that is passed through is fit to export to the old country in competition with beef from the other countries I have mentioned. This shows that we have a vast field for improvement which can only be made by the use of pure-bred sires, and then by proper feeding and finishing before our animals are sent to the market. The Argentine stock raisers have never hesitated to pay high prices for bulls, in fact they go into the markets of Great Britain and pay more than the stock raisers of any other country, and they have recently paid as high as $30,000 for a single animal. In that country you will fine herds of from 1,000 to 3,000 head very uniform throughout, whereas in this country you would find a few hundred really good animals and the rest would be very ordinary, showing that there is a great deal to be done in the improvement of beef cattle in Canada. How this should be done is a matter for deep consideration by the officials of our Department of Agriculture. One way to do it would be to begin at the bottom by inducing stock raisers to breed better animals and put them on the market in better condition. To do this there is no better plan that I know of than to offer liberal prizes at our fat stock shows and live stock exhibitions. This plan has been carried out for many years at Chicago, and the quality of the beef has steadily improved. In addition to this the man who has a carload of beef in better finished condition to offer for sale will receive two or three cents a pound more than the man who has his beef in an unfinished state.

Coming to dairy cattle, I cannot pass without drawing the attention of the committee to the fact that one of our Canadian breeders, Mr. I. B. Hanmer, of Norwich, Ontario, has recently bred a cow which has broken the world's record, having produced just under 52 pounds of butter in seven days. Hon. members will realize what achievement this cow has made when they take into consideration the fact that the average dairy cow of Canada would not pro-

duce more than about one pound per day, while this cow averaged between seven and eight pounds per day. We have in this country cattle that have produced over 30,000 pounds of milk in one year. The average dairy cow of Canada produces less than 4,000 pounds, showing what a splendid field for improvement there is, and this can be accomplished only by the use of pure-bred sires and also by feeding in a way such as I have described and by the dissemination of agricultural education.

Coming to sheep, I think this country is in a most disgraceful condition. We have less than 3,000,000 sheep in the whole of the Dominion as compared with 90,000,000 to 100,000,000 in Australia and about 40,000,000 in Great Britain. Here is an excellent opportunity to develop a valuable industry, an industry that will be valuable not only to the straight stock farmer but to the grain farmer of the West in keeping down weeds. Sheep are a class of live stock that can be produced very largely on the waste material that is to be found on the farm.

The condition of our pork products is very satisfactory. A report was brought back by Mr. Arkell to the effect that Canadian bacon now stands very high on the British market. The Britishers apparently did not begin to realize how good our Canadian bacon was until they had been forced to eat the fat bacon that is produced in the United States, and it behooves the Department of Agriculture to use the utmost care to see that this market is developed in every possible way and also that we send over only first-class material so that we can retain the market and build up a splendid outlet for Canadian live stock products in the future.

I think that the stimulation of the use of pure bred sires all over the country is most important. Just as long as we use scrub sires and do not care whether we improve our cattle or not, we shall be moving around in a circle and shall not get anywhere; but if an intelligent system is followed, and pushed to the fullest extent, I am sure we shall get excellent results. I commend the department for the action they are taking. I know they have a number of live officials who are working along these lines and I am sure a great deal can be accomplished by following the course I have outlined.

Mr. ARGUE: I was pleased to hear the minister a few moments ago emphatically lay down the rule that he was not going to make any exceptions. I wish to say a word about agricultural societies. We have two classes of fairs in the West, the A and the B class. Regina, Saskatoon and cities of that size are in the A class, and have been getting $5,000 a year assistance. The Regina fair last year had a surplus of about $22,000 to hand over to the city. In the B class there are some five or six different fairs, and a limit is laid down as to the amount of prize money they must pay out to participate in this grant. If no exceptions are to be made, that is all right; but once you begin to make exceptions the trouble starts. Exceptions have been made in the case of some of the fairs. Some fairs which did not comply with the regulations have been granted assistance, and others that did not comply but applied for the grant were refused assistance, or at all events, we have not been able to get any definite answer yet. I should like the minister to lay down some definite rule as to what he is going to do about these fairs. If he is not going to follow any particular rule, but give the money out indiscriminately, I think Swift Current and one or two other places should participate with the others who have got the grant.

Mr. CRERAR: Under the regulations for grants to fairs the provision was that where $4,000 of their own money was spent in utility prizes for livestock the department would assist to the extent of 75 per cent of $2,500. Prior to 1918 they secured the whole $2,500, but in order to economize and make our funds stretch as far as possible that grant was reduced last year by 25 per cent. There were, of course, a number of fairs that thought they were entitled to this grant and found difficulty in getting it. We appreciate the position the fairs are in at the present time. The hon. member for Swift Current and the hon. member for Battleford have both made strong representation upon the matter, and about a week or ten days ago I instructed the officials of the Branch to carefully survey the field again with a view to reducing the amount of expenditure that was necessary in order to participate in the grant. After careful consideration they have recommended for the present year a reduction of $400. Consequently, any fair that last year spent $3,600 or over in utility prizes will participate in the grant this year.

Mr. ROBB: Has the minister any information as to the increase or decrease in the number of cattle in Canada during the last three or four years?

Mr. CRERAR: The officials advise me there has been a considerable and steady increase in the total number of cattle. The total number of cattle in Canada now is estimated to be over 10,000,000, and the increase during the past four years has been between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000. In some of the western provinces the increase has been very noticeable.

Mr. MOLLOY: Are purebred sires ever sold outright by the Government?

Mr. CRERAR: When the department desires to get rid of a sire on account of age or some other reason he is sold outright, but not to clubs.

Mr. ARGUE: Referring again to fairs, as I stated a moment ago, the Regina fair last year had a surplus of $22,000 over and above their expenses. Now the B class fairs are doing just as much for the building up of the livestock industry as the A class fairs, and the larger cities like Regina do not need this grant of $5,000, but the smaller fairs do need assistance to carry on. I do not care whether the grant is $5 or $500, but I want all the B class fairs to be on the same footing. Yorktown and Prince Albert for instance, which did not comply with the regulations received the grant, while others did not. All I am asking for is a square deal.

Mr. CRERAR. If the fairs which the hon. member speaks for spent $3,600 last year in utility prizes they will participate in the grant this year. We have stretched the limit I think to the utmost. As to the relative merits of A and B class fairs, I dare say there are not a few hon. members in this House who would argue that the A class were more beneficial to the community than the B class. In the A class fairs the prize lists are larger, they have a bigger exhibition of livestock, and a great many more people patronize these fairs because they are held in the larger centres. The Toronto Fair, for instance, which runs for two weeks, undoubtedly attracts a great many more people than a fair in a little town of 2,000 people that runs for only three days. The policy of the Department may be open to criticism, but I am sure that the officials of the Department have studied the matter earnestly and honestly, with a view to getting the maximum of results for the money expended. I can assure the hon. member for Swift Current that it is not in the interest of any person in the department that B class fairs should be discriminated against in favour of A class.

Mr. ARGUE: As regards the reduction of $400, this was not made until after the question had been discussed several times with the minister and we pointed out to him that he had made this grant to other fairs which had not earned it, and that we thought we were entitled to the same privilege.

Mr. CRERAR: The cases to which the hon. member refers have already been alluded to. One was at Prince Albert, where they were $22 short of having spent $4,000. In considering the matter the officials of the department were of the view that this shortage of $22 was not due to their inability to get the money. The other case was Yorktown, where there was a shortage of $46 for the same reason. I have asked the hon. member for Swift Current what amount the Swift Current Board spent last year, but I have not been able to find out.

Mr. ROBB: I am not interested so much in what this contribution is given for fairs in Prince Albert and Yorktown, nor am I opposed to the grant to the Toronto Exhibition. But it is very questionable if the Toronto Exhibition would pay out in prizes to live stock in proportion to the grant received, and the Toronto Exhibition is a very profitable venture for the city of Toronto. I hold in my hand an item from a daily paper dated the 25th of December, which says:—

Toronto Fair Surplus $90,557.

Toronto, December 24.—Santa Claus, in the triple personality of T. A. Russell, president, Johnston G. Kent, manager, and Frank Brentnall, treasurer of the Canadian National Exhibition, slid down the chimney into the City Hall to-day and presented Toronto with a cheque for $90,557.74, the biggest surplus by a good margin that the exhibition has ever paid.

It is quite apparent that such an exhibition which is able to finance itself should be able to concede a little bit to the pioneer districts in Western Canada, and some of the money might profitably go there.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is being done by the department either alone or in conjunction with the Agricultural Departments in the different provinces in organizing these societies? I was very much impressed by the address to-night by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie), and I was thinking that if some hon. gentlemen like himself or some other person equally informed and gifted were travelling through the farming districts and telling the farmers the advantages of pure bred stock very satisfac-

tory results would accrue. I am not aware that any organized or proper effort is being made in the part of the country from which I come either by the local Agricultural Department or by this department to bring this education home to the farmers and to invite them to organize and take advantage of the opportunities which the department offers to them.

I am sure that there are hundreds and thousands of people who are making their living as farmers to whose attention the advantage of having proper stock and the way in which they can get it has now been forcibly brought. If no effort has been made hitherto to have a proper organization along those lines and a campaign of education, I would suggest to the minister that he should have a proper arrangement with the agriculture departments of the different provinces so that this campaign of education may be carried on. There is such a thing, no doubt, as a duplicating and overlapping of effort. We have agricultural societies in Nova Scotia under the supervision and control of the local legislature which do fairly good work, but we must push this work if we are to produce the results necessary to reach the high-water mark in regard to it. I am particularly pleased with the information which the hon. member for Victoria city has given us and I trust the Department of Agriculture will be able to present this matter to the people in such a way as to reach parts of the country that have not so far taken advantage of their opportunities. I am not finding fault with the department, because they seem to be doing good work but I would like to go one step farther and press home upon the farmers the advisability of taking advantages of the opportunities which are made available to them through the department.

To enforce the Seed Act, to test seeds for farmers and seed merchants, to encourage the production and use of superior seeds, and to encourage the production of farm and garden crops, $200,000.

Mr. PEDLOW: I notice that this item is for the purpose of encouraging the production of farm and garden crops. There is another method of encouraging the production of farm and garden crops which is not indicated fully in the description as contained in this item, and that is to find a market for that which has been produced. About a month ago I took the opportunity of asking the then Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) for information regarding some correspondence I had from a citizen living in the constituency that I have the honour to represent. The Acting Prime Minister stated then that the Government had supplied altogether $80,000,000 to help in the marketing of Canadian wheat and that they were arranging, if my memory serves me aright, a credit of $90,000,000 additional for the same purpose. But he failed to explain why it was that any farmer found it difficult to find a market for his wheat and intimated that the wheat was not of proper grade. I have had since then considerable correspondence from a number of farmers in the same section, as well as a number of millers, and they all have the same story to tell, that there is a large quantity of

11 p.m. wheat, fully twenty per cent of last year's crop, still in the hands of farmers. They all say that they cannot find a market for it. It may be difficult for a man like the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) or the Minister of Agriculture to understand that, and yet that is the story that comes to me from the riding of South Renfrew. The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) made an inquiry regarding the same subject a few days ago and the Minister of Finance informed him then that the Government were negotiating with the Greek Government for the disposal of 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 bushels of wheat. Notwithstanding this information, I am still confronted with the proposition that the farmers in South Renfrew have that quantity of wheat on their hands and are not able to dispose of it. Just a couple of days ago I received a letter from the proprietors of the Killaloe Roller Mills Company. This was sent in response to an inquiry made by me, and they informed me that there are at least ten or twelve cars of wheat within hauling distance of their mill but that owing to the fact that they are unable to find a market for their flour they cannot purchase this wheat. The consequence is that this wheat will remain on the farmers' hands. The farmers are anxious because, as I understand, the guaranteed price for wheat will be withdrawn and the farmers with 18,000 or 20,000 bushels of wheat in one little section of South Renfrew will be left with this wheat on their hands. There are other sections in the same position, and they naturally view the situation with considerable anxiety. I rise to discuss this issue on this item because it is my opinion that if the Government and department will find a market for that wheat they will certainly encourage production. These men were induced to in-

crease their acreage during the past two years for war purposes. In the last two years they increased their production by fifty per cent. That is the opinion of the several milling concerns in the riding. A market was held out to them as an inducement and as a result of that inducement there was increased acreage and increased production. If you want farmers to increase production no better method can be adopted than to insure a market for what they produce. Here is the case as I find it not only in that one section of my constituency but in several other sections as well. They have the wheat on hand but no market. They want me to find out what the Government are going to do about this situation. I would like to know the exact attitude of the Government in regard to the disposition of wheat which is in the hands of farmers at the present time, particularly in South Renfrew, in which I am naturally most interested. Will the Government undertake to find a market for that wheat at the guaranteed price? Should not the farmers expect the Government to take action along definite lines? Will the Government undertake to purchase the wheat to fill the contracts referred to a couple of days ago by the Minister of Finance? Will the hon. gentleman say that this wheat will be purchased for that purpose?

Mr. CRERAR: How much wheat has the hon. gentleman's correspondent?

Mr. PEDLOW: One correspondent says there are twelve cars of wheat within hauling distance of his mill; another, two cars; another says that there is twenty-five per cent of the season's crop around his section, and still another tells the same story. I cannot tell what the quantity is, but there will be about 20,000 bushels in that one section of my constituency.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not wish to further interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I know that a ready market is being found for all the surplus wheat in Canada at the present time. If this wheat has not been marketed I fancy it must be due to other causes. The demand undoubtedly exists for it, and I am informed that it is being sold steadily and readily.

Mr. PEDLOW: I must say to the minister that if he entertains any doubt as to the quality of this wheat I can assure him on that score. The quality of the wheat raised in the Bonnechere Valley is equal to what is considered Manitoba No. 1 Hard. That is the reputation of the wheat raised generally in that section. And I am informed by one of the millers that the quality of the wheat sold there is first-class in every particular. I might further state that this miller wrote to the department, and I have the letter which he received in reply. It is certainly not very encouraging. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read it. It is dated April the 24th, and is as follows:

> Dear Sirs,—I have your letter of April 18th, but regret to state that there is very little information I can give you, except that conditions have changed materially during the past year The great shortage of ocean steamships has led to congestion in many parts of the world. An arrangement was entered into some time ago with the British Government by which the Wheat Export Company were to take the exportable surplus of the 1918 crop on the basis of the fixed prices. The British Government, however, has been unable to purchase the quantity at first thought necessary in view of the congestion at British ports and the very large quantity of wheat in the United Kingdom, larger quantities in fact than at any time since the outbreak of war. The whole question of the marketing of the Canadian wheat and flour is now engaging the attention of the Government. It is a difficult problem, however, in view of the present world wide conditions. Apparently matters can only adjust themselves.

It will be seen that this letter suggests no way out of the difficulty, and I would like to know if it is not possible for the Governmen to assist the section of the country referred to in this respect.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know just what form the assistance could take. I am not personally familiar with the circumstances of the case to which the hon. gentleman alludes, and I would suggest that he take it up with the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, in whose department the transportation and marketing of grain lies. I can assure the hon. gentleman, however, that if the grain cannot be marketed, there must be some particular reason affecting it, because grain is being sold almost every day to the United Kingdom, to France, and to neutral countries in Europe just as rapidly as tonnage is available. It may be that there is no person in the district to buy the grain, or no cars available for its shipment, or something of that kind. If the ordinary machinery exists I cannot understand why it cannot find a market. I would suggest to the hon. member that he place all the facts before the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce and let him have inquiry made into the matter by the proper officials in his department.

Mr. PEDLOW: I might add for the information of the minister that the letter is signed by the Deputy Minister of Trade and

Commerce, and again call his attention to the concluding sentence:

Apparently matters can only adjust themselves.

It leaves the matter in a most dubious position—that is to say, the department can render these parties no assistance.

Mr. CRERAR: I would suggest that the hon. gentleman take the matter up with the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. PEDLOW: The letter came from that department.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, but it is written by the deputy.

Item 53, a vote of $25,000 for the administration and carrying out of the provisions of the Agricultural Instruction Act, will stand with the permission of the Committee, and afford opportunity for discussion to other members of the House who are not able to be present this evening.

Pensions, European War and Active Militia—$28,000,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister (Mr. Rowell) not think it is rather late to bring up such an important question, when the attendance is so slim as it is now, a question in which the whole country is interested? I certainly think it is, if the minister is to make a statement of the Government's policy in regard to pensions.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Council): If this were a statement of the Government's policy I would at once concur in my hon. friend's suggestion. But the policy of the Government with regard to pensions, as well as the policy of the Pensions Committee, will come up for consideration when the Pensions Committee's Report is presented, which report I think will be in shape for presentation next week. The Pensions Committee has practically completed its work, and its report will then come up together with a Bill which the committee is drafting for submission to the House. All questions of policy will come up for review when the Bill is being considered. This is simply a vote of the estimated amount required on the basis of the existing pension schedule. If the Pensions Committee recommends some increases, as will likely be the case, that will involve a supplementary estimate being brought down; the whole question will come up for very full consideration when we have the committee's report before us, and the Pensions Bill which will have to be considered section by section. I thought, therefore, I would make simply a very brief statement, giving an outline of the present position of affairs. This item might then be permitted to pass, and we could discuss the whole question of policy when we come to deal with the report of the Pensions Committee.

This is simply an estimate based on a certain number of estimated pensioners—taking the figures for last year, plus the estimated number of pensions for the coming year. The total casualties in the Canadian Expeditionary Force up to 8th of May of the present year, were 212,182. Of that number there were either killed or died of wounds or disease 63,347, and the total number of wounded was 148,835. That gives us the total possible pension claims up to date, and very few could subsequently arise; of course, some further claims may be presented before demobilization is completed. Taking first the killed, that is 63,347, it is estimated that no pension will be applied for in the case of approximately fifteen per cent of that number. That is there will be fifteen per cent with no dependents who would be entitled to claim any pension, and the Pension Board estimates that the total number of pensions which will probably be granted in respect of men killed in action or that have died of wounds will be 53,854—at least that is the total number in respect of which claim might be made to come within the provisions of the pension regulations. Now, so far 22,612 of these cases have come up for consideration by the Pensions Board, which is not quite one-half of the possible pension claimants in the case of those killed. Of the 22,612 claims which have come up for consideration and been dealt with, 16,959 have been allowed, and 5,653 have been refused on the ground that they did not come within the provisions of the pension regulations. That leaves 31,233 yet to be dealt with if claims are presented, and if they are disposed of on the same basis. In other words, if the percentage of claims that should be allowed is the same in the future as in the past, experience has shown it would come to 23,425 more pensions to be allowed in respect of those who have been killed in action or who have died of wounds. With that as a basis the Board of Pension Commissioners is able to estimate the total amount payable to dependents of those killed in action or who have died of wounds, and it is on that basis that that part of the present estimate is made up.

Then, take the case of disabilities. I gave the total number of wounded as 148,835. A number were wounded more than once and

returned to the firing line. It is impossible, of course, until all claims are in, to ascertain accurately how many have been wounded more than once. But for the purpose of this estimate the Board of Pensions Commissioners have put down the number at five per cent of the total, or 7,441, leaving 141,394 as the number of cases or disabilities for which claims might possibly be made. Of these, 71,834, about fifty per cent, have already been dealt with, and of the 71,834, 53,876 have been allowed and 17,958 disallowed, as not coming within the provisions of the pension regulations. If the remaining applications or possible applications are disposed of on the same basis, we would have 52,170 additional pensioners on the ground of disability. This estimate is based on the assumption that we shall have that additional number and that the average amount payable in case of disability will be the same in the new cases as in the cases already allowed. On that basis, the total estimated Pension Bill of the Dominion when all cases are disposed of will be $32,814,391, assuming that no increase is made in our pension schedule and that no change is made in the regulations so as to bring in cases that are now excluded. Of that amount, it is estimated that we shall require this year the amount mentioned in the Estimate. As a number of men have not been discharged from the army and the right to pension has not yet arisen, the full amount will not be required this year; it is estimated that $28,000,000 will cover the pension bill for this year on the basis of the present schedule of disabilities. If the Pension Committee recommends and the House concurs in some increase in the pension schedules, a Supplementary Estimate will be brought down to cover that estimated increase. That, in brief, is the basis of the expenditure under this vote of $28,000,000. If any further information is desired I shall be glad to give it as we proceed.

Mr. BELAND: Are all men wounded in any way expected to make claims for disability?

Mr. ROWELL: Not unless the disability affects the earning capacity of the soldier in the general labour market.

Mr. BELAND: All the wounded are included in the 148,000?

Mr. ROWELL: All who have appeared in the casualty lists.

Mr. BELAND: But many of them may not be claims?

Mr. ROWELL: Many of them may not be claims. I may add that the Pension Committee has made a generous estimate of the number of pension claims. The actual number will certainly not exceed their estimated number of claimants. Probably it will be less, because there are many wounded whose wounds do not entail an impairment of their earning power.

Mr. MANION: I should like to put on record the case of a man who has not been given justice by the Board of Pension Commissioners and to get, if possible, the minister's assurance that he will take an interest in getting the Board to settle the case justly. I refer to the case of a private named John Taylor, whose regimental number was 439,640 and Pension Board Number 32,019. This man was wounded in France. He came home, and on the strength of having an injured arm—an arm that appeared to me to be paralyzed—he was given a pension of $5 a month. I met him quite by accident and I found that his right hand was absolutely paralyzed and his right arm out of use because of this paralysis—and he was receiving the magnificent sum of $5 a month. I took the matter up with the Board of Pensions Commissioners by wire on December 19th last, informing them that this man was getting $5 a month and that I considered it a disgrace to the country that he should be so treated. They wrote to me informing me that this man's hand was not paralyzed. They said:

> On discharge it is found that fingers could be moved passively through all the entire extent of normal movements and that the grasp was lessened. There is no sign of injury to the nerves, and it was the report of the medical examiner at Port Arthur which stated that most of the condition was due to psychic disturbance, and not to any organic injury to nerves or muscles.

Further on they said:

> The spasm of the muscles of the forearm and hand disappearing under an anaesthetic.

I communicated with them again in a letter dated December 27 objecting to their decision on the ground that even if this man's case was one of psychic paralysis, as they called it—that is, more or less imaginary—unless they cured that psychic paralysis the man had every right to a proper pension. I still adhere to that opinion. If a man loses the use of his arm through service at the front he deserves to be treated properly by his country—and this man has not been treated properly by the Board of Pensions Commissioners in

receiving an allowance of $5 a month when his right arm has been put out of business. Whether the disability is psychic or organic is beside the question, to my mind; unless the paralysis is cured the man has a right to a pension. I also informed the Board that the fact that this man's fingers could be moved passively had nothing to do with the case, because to earn one's bread one had to move his fingers actively. I said further that the disappearance of the paralysis under an anaesthetic was also beside the question, as a man under an anaesthetic would find it difficult to earn a living.

I again wrote to the Board about this case and they claimed that Mr. Taylor was under treatment by the Invalided Soldiers' Commission. At the time they said he was being treated by that Commission he was working in Fort William—I admit that they were misinformed, through no fault of theirs. The most treatment the man had during the four months that he was supposed to be under the Invalided Soldiers' Commission was four days, but he received no pension during the (4) months that he was supposed to be under treatment. Later they paid him $20 for the four months. After working three months on this case. after many letters and other correspondence I succeeded in getting him re-boarded somewhere around March 5. He advised me to this effect, and he was then granted a 45 per cent pension, which would mean a pension of about $20 a month, which shows that a mistake was made in the first place when they gave him a pension of $5 a month. They were, however, not satisfied with that, and they sent him to Winnipeg to be boarded again, and the Winnipeg Board also recommended him for a 45 per cent pension, he tells me. He came back to Fort William about the middle of March, and he wrote me he was content to get this pension. But he waited another two months and after hearing no more about it he wrote to me again, and I once more drew their attention to this. They then advised him to go back to Winnipeg again for re-examination, and the man refused, and to my mind quite rightly. He had already been sent to Winnipeg twice and had been examined by neurologists in Winnipeg. Why, then, should it be necessary for this man to be put to the trouble of going to Winnipeg the third time with the possibility of losing his job? He was receiving a pension of only $5 a month and he was earning his living. Besides, this would mean putting the country to the expense of taking him all the way to Winnipeg a third time. It was some time about the middle of May that he advised me he was not going to go to Winnipeg any more, as he had to earn his living. I advised him I thought he was perfectly justified in not going, and I advised the Pension Board to that effect, because I do not think that man has received justice from the board. In reply to my letter, they advised me that they were giving the matter consideration. This is a case which has not yet been settled, although it is almost six months since I first drew the attention of the Pension Board to it, and it is high time that the board woke up to the fact that this man is being treated with absolute injustice. He was recommended for a higher pension, but they have not yet given it. I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the committee, but I wish to get an assurance from the minister that he will see that this man gets justice at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. ROWELL: I, of course, have no personal knowledge of this case. It is the Pensions Board that deals with all these matters, and the Board is the final authority in connection with them under regulations passed by this House. I understand, however, that the Pension Board states that the facts are somewhat as follows: That on 4th October the case came to the attention of the Board of Pension Commissioners and that on the fifth of October Mr. Taylor was examined and recommended for treatment, and he was granted treatment under the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment on the 7th October. For reasons which probably Mr. Taylor considered sufficient but which were not explained, he discontinued the treatment of his own volition within a few days after he was recommended for it. I should point out to the committee that those receiving treatment are on pay and allowance during the whole period of the treatment, and if a man is married his wife gets a sum similar to the separation allowance. It is quite true, as the hon. member has suggested, that there was some mistake in notifying the Pensions Board by the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and his pension was not resumed as it should have been when he discontinued the treatment. According to the regulations while a man is receiving treatment, if he is a pensioner, he draws pay and allowance paid by the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and his pension is discontinued. When he ceases treatment, his pension is resumed, and under the conditions there was a holding over of the pension and the man has in that sense a

grievance and ground for complaint because of the mistake made in reference to notification to the Board of Pension Commissioners. I understand the situation is at present that he has been asked to go to Winnipeg for further examination, and if treatment is recommended, for treatment. Winnipeg is a neurological centre; they have there experts who can provide the treatment. The information which the Board of Pension Commissioners has is that this is a neurological case; and that treatment of that kind is necessary and that, if applied, will restore the man to health and should give him the use of his limbs, and, therefore, that man should, they think, go to Winnipeg to take the treatment. The expense to Winnipeg is paid, and if he takes the treatment he receives pay and allowance. That is the information I have received. I have, of course, no power to give the assurance for which the hon. member asks. The Government has no such power under the regulations adopted which were considered wise at the time in order to prevent any question of politics interfering. The rules adopted, recommended by the Pension Committee, expressly provide that the decision of the Board of Pension Commissioners is final. There is no appeal to the Government and the Government has no right to override their decision. I will, however, personally look into this matter to see if there appears to be a grievance or miscarriage of justice, with a view to urging the board to remedy any injury if one appears to have been inflicted. That is as far as I can go, because this is a case in which the decision of the board is final.

Mr. MANION: There are two or three points the minister makes that I wish to take up. With regard to the mistake made by the board regarding the man's being under treatment by the Invalided Soldiers' Commission I frankly admitted when I spoke that the Pensions Board were not to blame for the misunderstanding. The man says that he was not told to stay in Winnipeg and he left Winnipeg, but that was some misunderstanding. I ran across the man by accident, and it was because I found him a perfectly honest, decent chap who made no fuss, that I took up his case. I informed the Pensions Board that I was a returned medical man and knew something of this case; that I was not speaking as a layman. The minister has just told us that he has been informed that the Pensions Board advised this man to go to Winnipeg for treatment.

Mr. ROWELL: For examination and, if treatment is recommended, for treatment.

Mr. MANION: That is not what the man was informed because I happen to hold in my hand the letter written by the Pensions Board to the man, who sent it to me, and I will read it to the Committee. It is addressed to Mr. John Taylor, at his residence, and reads:

> Dear Sir:—
> Will you kindly make it convenient to call at this office as soon as possible with a view to sending you to Winnipeg for a neurological examination? Transportation and expenses will be supplied to you.

No mention is made of treatment, and as the man had already been sent to Winnipeg for examination on two occasions, I think he was perfectly right in refusing to go a third time after, for a year, getting a pension of $5 a month.

As regards the man's having a grievance, I can assure the minister that I know just as much about these cases as most of the medical boards of this country, and more than some of them, according to this case; and this man has a grievance, and I intend to see that it is rectified.

Mr. ROBB: The complaint made by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), and the reply of the minister, is an indication that it is not fair to put these estimates through to-night, because there may be other complaints. It is now nearly twelve o'clock, and we might very well adjourn.

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend wishes to have the item stand, I thought probably the item would go through and all these things be discussed when the report comes in; but I will not press it at this hour. This is a large sum, and an important matter. I do not know if my hon. friend was in when I stated that I expected that the report of the Pensions Committee of the House would be received next week, when all these matters would come up for review.

Mr. ROBB: Will hon. members have an opportunity of bringing in similar complaints to those presented by the hon. member (Mr. Manion) ?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. It will be understood that we are passing a pension law which revives all questions of the law which is to govern. The action of the board in this case is taken on the basis of existing regulations which make provision for requiring treatment in neurological cases. I do not wish to press the matter, but if my hon.

friend has no objection, I should like the item to pass.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister says that any of these items on page 60 under the headings, "Pensions," on the report of the Committee, or on the Bill which he proposes to introduce, I have no objection to this passing.

Mr. ROWELL: I am willing to give my hon. friend that assurance.

Pension to the sisters of the late Col. Harry Baker, M.P., $700.

Mr. ROWELL: I beg to move to insert the word "unmarried" before the word "sisters."

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell the House adjourned at 11.42 p.m.

Monday, June 2, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report on Export of Electricity from Canada, and Report of the Power Controller; Statistics of the Food and Drug Laboratories of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1919; Final Report of the Fuel Controller, March 31, 1919.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Copy of Order in Council of 29th May, 1919, approving of the general scheme of housing of the province of Quebec.—Hon. Newton W. Rowell.

EFFICIENCY OF THE INSIDE CIVIL SERVICE.

On the motion of Mr. Michael Steele, the second report of the Special Committee appointed to consider the possibility of reducing or re-arranging the staffs of the Inside Civil Service with a view of securing greater efficiency with the minimum number of employees, was concurred in.

RED CROSS SOCIETY INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 130, to amend the Act to incorporate the Canadian Red Cross Society. He said: The purpose of the Bill is merely to give the society the power in time of peace to carry on and assist in work for the improvement of health, the prevention of disease, and the mitigation of suffering, throughout the world. There was a convention of the various Red Cross societies in Geneva during the past winter, when this purpose was declared to be a desirable one, and also, as I recall, a clause has been introduced into the Peace Treaty which commends the purpose that is to be given effect to by this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 127, respecting the Grand River Railway Company.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 128, respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill No. 129, for the relief of Stanley Gordon Eversfield.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

INDUSTRIAL UNREST IN CANADA.

STRIKES IN WINNIPEG AND OTHER CITIES DISCUSSED.

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (North Winnipeg) moved the adjournment of the House, under rule 39, for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, viz.: the strikes in Winnipeg, and other Canadian cities, together with all the circumstances, conditions, and causes, near and remote, having any bearing or connection therewith.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE: I have moved this motion, Mr. Speaker, because of the great industrial unrest which exists in this country to-day. I am somewhat surprised at the great anxiety of the Opposition to precipitate this debate to-day, instead of waiting until Wednesday, as I had planned. Of course, we must appreciate their kindly interest in the strikes in Winnipeg and elsewhere, but I wish to recall the fact that last year, when a much more serious condition, riot and bloodshed existed in Quebec City, not one of the members now so insistent, rose to support the motion of the hon. member from Simcoe to discuss those serious disturbances which existed at that time. I hope, Mr. Speaker, this discussion will be of a moderate nature and in character entirely constructive, which will have a tendency to allay the prevailing unrest and be of some assistance to the Government in its efforts to formulate a policy which will effectively deal with

the situation. I hope the tariff is not unduly blamed for all the high cost of living and unrest, as I am informed that barring probably New Zealand, the cost of living is lower in Canada than it is in any other country in the world. Mackenzie King in his booklet "The Four Parties to Industry," starts out by saying the truth must be arrived at, and the truth shall set us free from fear of the future and shall aid in the enforcement of that social justice which the truth demands.

Canada stands to win more out of this war than any other nation of the world, provided we are fully united in taking the full measure of the opportunities afforded. The eyes of the world are upon Canada. Her sons have done as good fighting, and I think I might safely say the best fighting in this Great War, that has been done on any of the 37 different battle fronts. Industries must needs flock here to a country whose natural resources are so great and opportunities almost unlimited. Canada is confronted with the opportunity of developing more in the next ten years than probably she has in the last fifty years. But, that development cannot be expected to take place unless we have industrial peace.

When we see a patient we must first make a diagnosis and then proceed with the treatment. At the very bottom of this unrest lies misunderstanding and distrust and jealousy. If we define industry as King does in his little book—and I would commend its perusal to hon. members—we get this definition:

> Industry is the means by which the material resources of the world are transformed, through human intelligence and human energy, with the aid of natural powers, tools, and machines, into commodities and services available for human use. It is a vast process of transformation, itself a series of transforming processes so inter-related and numerous as to unite mankind, in this age of world-wide industrial expansion, in an enterprise that encompasses the globe.

The four parties to industry he defines as labour, capital, management and the community. We have heretofore been inclined to regard labour and capital as the two factors of industry, leaving out both management and the community. This is King's definition of the community:

> It is the community which provides the natural resources and powers that underlie all production. Individuals may acquire title by one means or another, but it is from the community, and with the consent of the community, that titles are held. It is the community, organized in various ways, which maintains government and foreign relations, secures law and order, fosters the arts and inventions, aids education, breeds opinion, and promotes, through concession or otherwise, the agencies of transportation, communication, credit, banking, and the like, without which any production, save the most primitive, would be impossible. It is the community which creates the demand for commodities and services, through which labour is provided with remunerative employment, and capital with a return upon its investment. Apart from the community, inventive genius, organizing capacity, managerial or other ability would be of little value. Turn where one may, it is the community that makes possible all the activities of industry, and helps to determine their value and scope.

Labour must fully appreciate its responsibility to capital and the State, and capital must as fully appreciate its responsibility to labour and the State. The tired feeling is abroad in this land. Nobody seems to want to work. In many industries, I am told, only 40 per cent to 60 per cent of efficiency is produced. This is not fully appreciating the responsibility to capital and the State.

The aim and object of many of the workingmen to-day seems to be to get the most possible money for the least possible expenditure of energy. The tramp says the world owes him a living, and he is going to get it. I hope we are not coming as a nation to the same status as the tramp.

One may well wonder that capital takes no more interest in labour than it is now doing. For nearly 100 years workmen and employers have been organizing, and as yet we do not find a full understanding between the four parties interested in industry. We seem to be much in need of reconstruction in our industrial life. Some people have defined reconstruction as restoration; others demolition and reconstruction from the ground up. Between these extremes stands a majority which interprets readjustment as restoration, with more or less modification, the degree of modification varying considerably, but the structure of pre-war days being in its essentials retained.

I have seen both capital and labour abuse their privileges. I had an opportunity of spending two winters in the lumber camps of Northern Ontario. During the first winter 1906-7—lumber was at a premium, prices were good, and labour was in great demand, but the labourers were not producing anything like their maximum. If the foreman said a single word to them of complaint or reprimand they would walk over to another camp of the same firm and get work. The next year there was not much demand for lumber, and one firm which had intended operating a large number of

camps cut them down to three. That winter I saw them bring down labourers from Winnipeg and charge them 3 cents a mile for the trip, and also charge them high prices for their supplies, and when the company were about even with the boys they gave the latter their time and told them to hit the trail. Men who had walked twenty-five miles to lumber camps were told there was no employment for them and they might go. Both parties during those winters abused their privileges and did not show any friendly spirit towards one another.

One of the chief ways that a solution of this difficulty and ill feeling that exists between capital and labour, or rather, misunderstanding, can be blotted out, is by each appreciating more fully the interests of the other. Labour cannot go on without capital, nor capital without labour. A process of education must be entered into, and probably, as charity begins at home, we could well spend a few minutes criticising the Postal Department. As I said on the floor of this House there would have been no strike at Winnipeg had the protests of the men been paid more attention to last year by the Deputy Postmaster General. I am provided by some unknown person with a clipping from the Financial Post of Toronto. It starts off on the loose management of the post office and is a tirade--a great deal of which is justified—against the Deputy Postmaster General, who is probably doing better now, but last year he was not fully appreciating his responsibilities towards the employees. Both employers and employees must be educated as to their responsibilities to the State. Garretson, who is head of the railway conductors, says:

> An army of unemployed is being created that must in the last analysis be reckoned with and unless a remedy is found whereby incentive may be restored and recompense made apparent, society itself must pay the forfeit.

Lord Brassey in his book on Work and Wages refers to certain railway labourers whose wages were raised from 2 shillings to 2 shillings and 6 pence and then to 3 shillings a day, and he states that they produced work more cheaply at the higher wages than at the lower. The same thing occurred on the Metropolitan drainage system, London, while in India when the wages were increased, the employees lay down on the job and would only work enough to give them a living. Some courts must be established to deal with their difficulties.

The Whitley plan in England has been productive of allaying much of the unrest in that country. One of its aims was to make and consider suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and workmen, to recommend means for securing that industrial conditions affecting relations between employers and workmen shall be systematically adjusted by those concerned with a view of improving conditions in the future. The circumstances at the present time are admitted on all sides to offer a great opportunity for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employees, while failure to utilize the opportunity may involve the nation in grave and great industrial difficulties. This should be a move in the right direction to improve the conditions of the working people

Heretofore, as after the South African War, and during the industrial depression say of 1907-1908, people were left to hustle for themselves and make the best of the conditions which existed at that time.

The community seems to be now more alive to its responsibilities, and more care is being taken to alleviate the suffering that is bound to follow after this great crisis. The Whitley report suggests a triple organization starting in the workshops and extending into the districts and the nation. The object is to secure co-operation by granting to working people a greater share in the consideration of matters affecting the industry in which they work. This can be achieved only by keeping employers and working people in constant touch. The report aims to deal with the better utilization of the practical knowledge and experience of the work people, and to establish methods of negotiating issues arising between employers and working people, with a view both to the provisions to discuss them and to the better adjustment of them when they appear. It also aims to deal with industrial research; utilization of inventions; improvements of processes; proposed legislation affecting the industries, but above all—the fullest measure of co-operation between employers and employees. The report is very pronounced on this last, it being mentioned three or four times. It is very insistent in bringing forward the fullest measure of co-operation and in stimulating such between employer and employee. The councils in their work of promoting the interests of their own industries will have regard for the national interest. This is a point that should not

be overlooked in even the smallest industry in the country.

There should be adequate organization on the part of both employers and work people. We hope that representative men in each industry, with pride in their calling and care for its place as a contributor to the national well-being, will come together in the manner here suggested and apply themselves to promoting industrial harmony and in removing the obstacles that have hitherto stood in the way. It is contemplated that agreements reached should carry with them the same application of observances as exists in the case of other agreements between employers' associations and trade unions. That point should be carefully studied. We have fought in this war for what was termed by the Germans as a scrap of paper. We have in Winnipeg an instance where civic employees had gone out on strike, as the Minister of Labour said, almost before the ink on the agreement was dry. Agreements should be binding and that proposition cannot be too emphatically laid down. There will never be a court whose decisions will please every one; yet there must be some tribunal to settle disputes, whose decisions when rendered are final. In this age and generation it should not be found necessary to strike in order to settle disputes. It has always amused me to see people strike, and then arrive at a settlement and go back to work. Probably neither side is completely satisfied. Some tribunal such as a district council or the men's own union should have settled the matter if both parties had played fair. In every particular, from welfare to wages, immediate results will depend upon the temper and degree of enlightenment of employers and employees. The old saying of employers during a depression, when many men lined up at their offices day after day seeking employment—it is our turn now—should be a thing of the past. The majority of employers, in my opinion, have a new outlook and a greater willingness to concede the existence of a viewpoint other than their own and not to regard their business an autocracy and themselves the rulers.

In New Zealand a Board of Trade has been appointed by the Government to investigate and report on conditions, trade prices, cost of living, etc., in that Dominion, and to enforce the Commercial Trusts Act of 1910. If I am correctly informed, this board had a dispute with some merchants; it took over two of the stores and ran them for one year losing one-fifth of a cent per pound on the meat. It was however, able to stabilize prices and arrive at a new basis on which the men could carry along. In dealing with the problem of the cost of living, the Board reported that the fixing of prices was a remedy that could be applied only with the greatest of care, as the supply might greatly diminish, if not cease entirely, so that prices should not be fixed except in the case of commodities of which the whole supply could be controlled from the field of production to the final consumer, the intermediary changes being limited to fair remuneration for services rendered. By such means little could be done to keep down the prices of products imported from abroad. It also recommended that steps should be taken to control the manufacture and sale of goods that might be considered as luxuries as valuable labour was expended on these which should be diverted to the production of essential commodities. In New York State a personnel of Managers' Club has been established whose objects are the methods of promoting good relations and industrial peace. They seem to be standing with reluctant feet at a point of departure from familiar paths—their faces turned in the right direction, but themselves not ready to go confidently forward.

It is a seriously debatable question how long any amount of amelioration in industrial relations with structural changes in the social edifice will suffice to keep the working people or population in a state of reasonable contentment. In Canada we have a Royal Commission investigating industrial conditions and the other day a committee was appointed to inquire into prices. When their reports are brought down, I have no doubt they will form a basis on which the Government may take action.

War has been a ferment, a tremendous power the action of which cannot yet be fully determined. Victorious people have always been a complacent people, but this war seems to have furnished a variation. People are thinking differently. It is estimated in the States there are 800,000 revolutionary union workers. The world is living in fear of a thing called Bolshevism. Force will not destroy it, no ring of armed men can stay the fusion of its subtle poison, where injustice makes misery and misery makes desperation. Employers must prove their case and their intentions to the working people and to the community. We must have justice. The text of justice must rest in its inclusiveness, it must be just to all men. Brain and brawn should each receive the full value of work done. Decent

subsistence means food, shelter, clothing and opportunities for recreation—nothing extravagant, nothing luxurious, nothing lacking.

It is the belief that the employer benefits disproportionately by increased production that causes conflict. I have heard it said that men in the shop say: What do we care whether we produce more? It does not do any benefit to us because we get our pay just the same. All work is not equal in value, and the rewards should not be equal. Justice must take this course by orderly procedure with the utmost rapidity possible.

During the war we considered that co-operation between employers and employees was a national duty and privilege. The war was but a transient affair, and this feeling of national duty and privilege should be the more applied in times of peace. The National Association of Employers in the United States lays down fair dealing as a fundamental and basic principle on which relations between employers and employees should rest. Misunderstandings must be eradicated. The Golden Rule may be hard to apply in business, but it should not be impossible of application. It is quite different from the old saying "Business is business," and that justifies everything that strays from the Golden Rule. The trouble to-day with labour is that it is being misled in the West. The revolutionary and socialistic elements seem to be in the control. In Winnipeg, I am told, that only 8,000 voted for the general strike, which has recently taken place. Many men join the unions to make life more pleasant for themselves in their shop and then pay little attention to the elections and the choice of leaders.

I have here a copy of the Western Labour News, Special Strike Edition No. 5, printed on May 22, which gives a list of 58 unions that are on strike. It says that the partial vote as reported Wednesday morning showed only 8,000 in favour of the general strike and 600 against it. I will lay this paper on the table of the House so that hon. members may see that these contentions are taken from Labour's own paper. Men who are earning $70 per month in wages are out on strike in Winnipeg for men earning $160 and $170. The fact that only 8,000 voted for the general strike, while 35,000 are out on strike, backs up my contention that the labourers are not taking a proper interest in their unions and in the election of their leaders.

The heart of Labour is all right, but many of the leaders are all wrong. The Minister of Labour says he has no doubt that while the strike in Winnipeg arose over a definition of collective bargaining, it was at heart really an attempt at revolution and the establishment of a Soviet government. To use the words of the Winnipeg Citizen "it was not a strike, but plain, ugly revolution". To back up that point I lay on the table of the House the Winnipeg Citizen, which quotes as follows from the Western Labour News of April 25:

> The Russian Soviet System.
>
> Was worked out from the blue print from which this reproduction (the diagram) was made. The western Labour News has, it is believed, the only copy on the American continent. It will pay you to vote for the "One Big Union."

This quotation from the official organ of the Labour party at Winnipeg shows that the Minister of Labour was quite right when he said that this was not a strike but a plain, ugly revolution. Many of the leaders in Winnipeg have openly during the past year declared that they would soon take over the industries and run them themselves. On the second day of the strike, one of the leaders was reported to have proclaimed that Winnipeg was controlled by the Soviet. One alderman is reported to have said to the Mayor in the Council Chamber, "What are you giving us? We can run the city, we're running it now." The labour leaders in Winnipeg are telling the men that if this strike is lost the trade unions' cause will receive a terrible setback, which it will not recover from for many years. They have fears that the capitalistic cause will seize the opportunity of exploiting labour in its weakened condition. Government assurances that legitimate trade unions will not suffer would do much to allay the fears. If we found ourselves individually in the same position that this country is in, what would each and every one of us proceed to do? Work the very hardest we were able to do, cut out extravagances and save. Now, the people as a nation must do the same as individuals would do in the same crisis. What made France a great nation and enabled her to pay all her indemnity to Germany so rapidly after 1870? The whole nation worked and saved. In France during the earlier stages of the war it was found that the men from the Sunny South were not equal in energy and staying powers to the men of the North. To have to buck nature produces a hardy and virile race. Canadians occupying the northern half of this continent have a rigid climate to en-

dure which has undoubtedly produced a virile race which should be second to none in industrial activity.

We come now to another class of the community which has not received very much attention, and which is suffering perhaps more than any other class; I refer to the salaried men, the "silent sufferers" as they have been called. Although the figures show that the cost of living has doubled, the salaries of this class have probably not been raised in proportion to the increases granted to the working men. To solve the difficulty, we must first control the spread between the manufacturer and the consumer. The manufacturer has been blamed almost altogether by the public for the high cost of living, but I think I am safe in saying that the middle man is more to blame than any other. I recall one instance where an article sold wholesale at $3 a box, at a profit of 30 cents, when retailed was sold for nearly three times that price.

Sedition must be stamped out. It is all very well to talk of free speech, but to talk of Bolshevism and riots and overthrowing the Government is a different thing, and I think the Sedition Act might well have been amended four years ago instead of now; but better late than never. Radical Socialist leaders must be interned or deported. As I have already said, the heart of labour is all right, but many of labour's leaders are all wrong. Free speech must be allowed where it deals with plain justice. Leaders who speak of Bolshevism or revolt must be taken in hand. In a full house at the Walker theatre at Winnipeg a few months ago, the meeting which was strongly in favour of Bolshevist rule in Russia, passed a resolution approving of the Soviet system in Russia.

Sympathetic strikes must be abandoned. The community have a great deal to say about that, and the community have shown where they stand in regard to the strike at Winnipeg. The outlook in the morning papers is good. Many of the unions are beginning to realize that they have troubles enough of their own without taking on others. The Toronto Street Railway workers have refused to go out on strike, and the same is true of many other unions.

The Government must deal with the situation with a firm hand The Criminal Code should be amended to prevent civic, provincial and federal employees joining in any sympathetic strike. These employees are employed for their service to the community and not for gain. The community is alive to their interests in industry. They are out for justice. They appreciated their position last year when the civic strike was on at Winnipeg, and they have appreciated it more keenly this year. They are going to be a bigger factor than heretofore to reckon with, both from the standpoint of labour and capital. I hope that they will pursue not only in Winnipeg but in every other large centre an aggressive campaign of education for both capital and labour. They must be reckoned with in any sympathetic strike.

I speak as a neutral. I have not a dollar invested in any industrial enterprise in the country. I work among the poor of Winnipeg. I know their troubles and I have spoken as the truth came to me.

Our men have fought nobly and well, but some of them find it hard to settle down again. They have proved themselves heroes in fighting the battles of the Empire; they are proving themselves greater heroes in fighting the much harder battle of life. The war is a thing of the past, and henceforth they will be judged by the success with which they fight the battle of life. We must not forget, first, our service to our country, our service to our fellow man, and our service to the perpetuation of Canada.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, I think no one on this side of the House feels it necessary to offer apology for any anxiety to discuss this subject to-day. Neither will I answer the rather unkindly remark of my hon. friend at the beginning of his speech with reference to the troubles in Quebec last year—troubles which the Right Hon. the Prime Minister described in England last summer as having been greatly exaggerated by the press both of Canada and of Britain. The good old much-abused, ill-understood, wholly Canadian province of Quebec seems to be remarkably at peace at the present time, and I think I might very well confine my remarks to a discussion of the trouble where the trouble exists.

This debate is certainly of the most extreme urgency. We have been criticised for not having already discussed in the House this alarming situation. I was personally of the opinion that the hands of the Government should not be hampered and that full liberty of action ought to be accorded them in order that they might try to effect a speedy settlement, and I also thought that it was better to afford some time to the Right Hon. the Prime Minister to do something with a view to remedying a condition that is largely the result of negligence, mal-

administration and blunders. But, Sir, the period of blunders does not seem to have ended with the return of the Prime Minister. Indeed, every day brings forth new and terrible mistakes. The troubles are spreading to places and centres which formerly were industrially at peace, and the Government appears to be lamentably impotent and inactive. What has the Government done so far? After waiting until it was too late, it sent two ministers to Winnipeg as mediators and for the purpose of reorganizing the mail service. Later on I shall express my opinion of this mission of our two ministers. The Government has also appointed a Parliamentary Commission to investigate the high cost of living. In this connection is it not appropriate to repeat those famous words of a British statesman, uttered two years ago: "Too late! Again it is too late." Undoubtedly, the cost of living and the war profiteers have a great deal to do with the grave situation with which we are confronted. Consumers cannot readily recognize the fairness of a system or a policy which allows meat trusts, flour trusts, and other dealers in the necessaries of life to pile up their dividends and multiply their millions while the prices of bread, bacon, meat and other commodities are soaring into altitudes heretofore unknown. If my hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) thinks, as he expressed himself in the House the other day, that the Government is owned by Sir Joseph Flavelle, is it any wonder that so many people in Canada regard the administration as being directed and controlled by the profiteers? The workingman is told that his wages have greatly increased. But, Sir, wages are purely nominal when their increase is only made to correspond with a larger advance in the prices of articles. It is immaterial whether a man earns fifty cents an hour or two dollars an hour; the significance of his wages depends altogether on what the fifty cents or the two dollars can purchase and thereby make for proper living in his home.

But, Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the finding of the Parliamentary Commission on the high cost of living, whatever light it may throw upon the subject, the important question is: What will be done in the meantime to end the strikes which paralyse the country? What remedy will be resorted to? We cannot afford to wait. As was said on a memorable occasion: We are not confronted with a theory; we are facing a most terrible condition, and it is useless to try to mystify the public by acting a Bolshevist melodrama to cover administrative and governmental negligence. We cannot allow a chaotic policy of laissez-faire while industrial unrest is growing steadily more acute; and the apparent willingness of Parliament to let matters drift from bad to worse will but breed a dangerous intolerance among the wage-earners. We must have industrial peace in this country. Too long have suspicion and distrust prevailed between capital and labour, those two twin brothers of productive enterprise. Unless capital and labour solve their difficulties by working frankly and whole-heartedly in co-operation, Canada cannot be equipped for the coming war of commerce, and she cannot be able to devote all her energies and all her work to the expansion and betterment of her trade and national life.

A union between employer and employed is necessary to the welfare of the individual, the family, and the country, and for Canada to-day this is a question of life and death. Formerly the labour man knew only his wants, his desires, and, at times, his sufferings. But he has come to know his power, and realizes that he is an indispensable factor in the production of wealth, and he accordingly claims the right to be treated frankly as a partner, with equal rights and equal responsibilities. Unfortunately certain employers look upon their employees as cogwheels in the industrial machine, having a market value but no recognized rights as human beings. It is fortunate that the big nations of the world agreed upon some fundamental principles as to the rights of labour and that such principles are to be embodied in the Peace Treaty. Let me read the first two principles. They are:—

First. The guiding principle above enunciated that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce.

Second. The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers.

When the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) indicated to the House those two clauses as being among the principles to be included in the Peace Treaty, he said that they had been adopted on the motion of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister. I do not know whether he was right in that assertion, because I happened to read in a French newspaper that some other gentleman was the mover of the resolution, and I thought that perhaps it might have been a piece of little propaganda or impropaganda, and that my hon. friend might have received his information from his own information bureau. How-

ever, whether as mover or supporter of the labour resolutions, the hon. the Prime Minister gave his assent to them. This being so, I am at a loss to understand how the principle of collective bargaining can be resisted or objected to if the Government intends to live up to the agreement entered into at the Peace Conference.

The right of association to the employees is worthless and valueless unless it is accompanied by, and means, the right to make association or organization effective. It is apparent that the individual labourer is at a great disadvantage when bargaining with the employer. The employer is often a big corporation, a combination of capital. The labourer is poor and to make his living must rely on working in the property of other people. Having no resources to fall back upon, he cannot wait until he can obtain the best bargain from the employer. It is a case of the necessities of the labourer pitted against the resources of the employer. It is only when the labourer bargains collectively that he has bargaining power approximating equality with that of capital. I do not think there is a better definition of collective bargaining than that which is found in the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations in the United States:

> This term embodies and implies the right of employees to organize and to exercise those functions which are necessary to make organization effective, to make bargains collectively rather than individually and, most important of all, to have a definite, recognized voice, coequal with that of the employer, in determining the wages, hours and working conditions upon which their safety, health and life are dependent.

If collective bargaining is at all desirable, organized labour must be conceded the right to use the methods through which it can be secured or obtained by agreement. On Tuesday last the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) answered a question asked by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) as follows, Hansard page 2956:

> Now one can easily see that what is called the right of collective bargaining, if interpreted in a certain way and carried to an extreme length, might have an unfortunate effect so far as the public interest is concerned. More than that, as is suggested in this public statement, it might have the effect of placing labour men and labour unions themselves in such a situation that they could not make their own bargains except with the approval of some body that might be situated thousands of miles away. Before the phrase "collective bargaining" is insisted upon, we ought to have, and we must have, an exact definition as to precisely what is intended by it and as to precisely what the results might be if that principle, so defined, should be adopted. On that point the Government will probably have suggestions or recommendations in the report of the Industrial Commission, which we hope to receive not later than the fifteenth day of next month. My hon. friend who has asked this question will realize that it would be out of place and, indeed, invidious for the Government to attempt, by way of anticipation, to pronounce upon questions which are properly within the scope of the duty imposed upon that commission.

On the following day I inquired whether some part of collective bargaining was favoured by the Government. Still the Prime Minister answered that we would have to await the report of the Industrial Commission. May I say, in the first place, with all due respect to the Prime Minister, that I was astonished at this answer of his. Surely, if he favoured at the Paris Conference, the right of association, which includes the right of collective bargaining, he

4 p.m. knew what that right meant irrespective of any meaning that the Mathers Commission could give to it. There is another consideration. The right hon. gentleman based his comment on a certain statement of Senator Robertson published in the press and reading as follows:

> The central strike committee interprets the right of collective bargaining to mean that the central body shall have the power to approve or reject any agreement that may be satisfactory to the employer or classes of employers and their employees, which, if granted, would have the result of enabling any central committee entirely outside the industry or craft affected to dictate the acceptance or rejection of any agreement. Instead of giving to the workmen in any individual plant or industry the right of collective bargaining with their employers, the present plan deprives them of the right and places them entirely in the hands of a central body, which principle, the Citizens' Committee of Winnipeg, Provincial and Federal Government, agree cannot be accepted.

Sir, this statement of Senator Robertson has been challenged by the labour leaders of Winnipeg and it is only fair that I should read their version of the case. I take it from the Montreal Star:

> We challenge absolutely this statement of the Minister of Labour. It is entirely beside the facts of the case. The Postal Federation for instance have never submitted either schedules or agreements to the Trades and Labour Council, nor have the railroads, nor have the building trades, nor has any organization at any time. The principle at stake at this time is that all workers should have the same rights of organization as have, say, the railroad workers. Senator Robertson must know this has been denied to the Metal Trades workers and because of this the strike was called.
>
> This is the principle at issue in this strike and the interpretation given by Senator Robert-

son, if he was correctly quoted, is absolutely unjustified.

The workers are on strike for the principle of collective bargaining as understood by the Trades Union Movement. Nothing more and nothing less. For Senator Robertson to misconstrue the issue seems to us absolutely uncalled for. If he is in doubt he can get the fullest information by meeting the strike committee. They have approached him and shown that they are willing to inform him of the correct nature of the struggle.

There is a vast difference between the two interpretations, but this is the interpretation given by the labour men and must be considered as being their own interpretation. They know what they mean better than does Senator Robertson. Is it unfair for the working man to claim the right of bargaining by industry instead of by craft or trade? The various trades of an industry are all links in the one chain. If one fails the others are worthless. For instance, in the metal industry, there are machinists, pattern makers, moulders and various other trades. Each one of them has its own special union. If an agreement is entered into by the employers with the machinists' union and with the patterns' union, but there is no agreement with the moulders, and there is trouble in the industry on account of that fact, the machinists and pattern makers will have to stop work as well as the moulders. It is easy to see that all the trades of the same industry have a similar and common interest in the proper carrying on of that industry. If you concede that, you must accept as fair and equitable the right of collective bargaining by all the trades in one industry.

The organization of capital has been unlimited. Powerful organizations have been formed combining many industrial establishments. It is only natural that there should be a similar evolution on the other side, on the part of labour, and that workmen in the various trades are uniting to protect their common interests.

The trade agreement, or collective bargaining, is one of the most generally accepted principles to-day in the world, and more especially in the United States and in Great Britain. I perhaps will surprise some hon. gentlemen—in view of the wild and stupid accusations of Bolshevism which are preferred against the labour movement at the present time—when I say that the advanced Socialist, such as the Independent Workers of the World, reject the collective bargaining and the trade agreement because they do not want to agree in any manner with what they call the capitalistic interest. Strange situation indeed to see the extreme Socialists, and some employers, reject the same means of settlement which evidently must be considered the fair and middle course.

I said that this principle is now accepted in United States and in Great Britain. Every hon. member can consult the Monthly Labour Review which is published by the Bureau of Labour Statistics in the United States Department of Labour. In its issue of March last you may see a list of the most important industries in the United States which have accepted the principle of collective bargaining. I might quote only two, if you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, which are perhaps better known in this country—I mean the Standard Oil Company and the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. I have here in the issue of the Labour Review of February, 1919, the agreement which was entered into by the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation and the metal trades affiliated with the American Federation of Labour. This agreement, and you will see that it is exactly what is asked for by the labour men of Winnipeg to-day, reads as follows:

Agreement made this 7th day of January 1919, between the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd), a Delaware Shipbuilding Corporation, (hereinafter called the Company), and the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labour, (hereinafter called the Department).

Witnesseth: That, whereas the department is an organization composed of national and international unions, (hereinafter called the unions), affiliated with the American Federation of Labour, many of the members of the said unions being in the employ of the company in its various plants; and

Whereas the company recognizes the said unions collectively as a suitable agency to represent its employees in questions arising as to wages, hours of labour, and general working conditions and;

Whereas the department is authorized, by the express consent of each union which is a member of the department to enter into an agreement with the company providing for the relations of the unions with the company—

And then the agreement follows. To show how many trades are interested in the same industry let me tell you that the organization of the steel industry by the American Federation of Labour included twenty-four different trades.

In Great Britain the principle is admitted and recognized by the employers and by the State. We have first the recommendation of the Whitley Commission which has been accepted by the British Government, and I will read clause 23 of the first report of that Commission which has been published by our own Department of Labour:

It may be desirable to state here our considered opinion that an essential condition of securing a permanent improvement in the

relations between employers and employed is that there should be adequate organization on the part of both employers and work people. The proposals outlined, for joint co-operation throughout the several industries depend for their ultimate success upon their being such organization on both sides, and such organization is necessary also to provide means whereby the arrangements and agreements made for the industry may be effectively carried out.

And in the appendix on page 30, it is said that the councils which are to be formed should be composed only of representatives of trade unions and employers' associations.

At the beginning of the present year, Great Britain was facing a critical industrial situation. The crisis came to a head when the Triple Alliance—the miners' federation, the railwaymen's union, and the transport workers — joined together and threatened a general strike if steps were not taken to meet the demands of organized labour. The Government of Great Britain answered this ultimatum by calling a national conference, composed of eight hundred members representing the employers and the workers interested equally to go into the whole industrial situation and to report upon it immediately. The conference held its first meeting on February 27, and appointed a joint committee which made a report which was unanimously approved by the eight hundred representatives of both the employers and the employees. They agreed on the following things:

(1) A National Industrial Council of 400, half capital and half labour, is to be elected by the employers and the trade unions and to be recognized by the government as the "official consultative authority on industrial relations." (2) Not only are the unions to be free from molestation, but it is ruled that workmen should accept their jurisdiction. (3) Parliament is to enact a national minimum wage law, a 48-hour week and measures raising the legal age of child labour and extending the principles of short-time work to meet the problems of unemployment. All of this programme is now before Mr. Lloyd George's Cabinet.

There was also the Sankey Report—the report of a commission which was instituted to prevent miners' strikes. The Sankey Report has been accepted by the British Government, and it not only grants the right to the miners to unite and bargain collectively but also recognizes their right to co-partnership and to share in the management of the mine.

All this shows that there is nothing very new or very revolutionary in the demands set forth by the Canadian labour men. It also shows conclusively that had our own Government acted as other governments have in the face of a situation infinitely more serious than our industrial situation, difficulties and troubles might have been avoided. While the other governments were taking speedy and effective action the Canadian Government seemed unable to read the writing on the wall, and merely buried its head, ostrich-like, in the sand of its numberless and powerless Orders in Council. Various religious bodies in America and Great Britain have endorsed and recommended the adoption of the demand of the labourer, including the right of collective bargaining.

Among the number are the National Catholic War Council, and the Federal Council of Churches in the United States, and in England the archbishops' committee on Christianity and industrial problems.

May I read to the House the following extract from the New York Nation, which appeared in its issue of March 8th?

Archbishop Patrick J. Hayes, lately appointed to succeed Cardinal Farley as head of the Archdiocese of New York, is one of the four men who formulated the striking programme of social reconstruction that has recently been made public by the National Catholic War Council and, as spiritual leader of 1,325,000 Catholics, he will play an important part in its further development. Without piety of mysticism, and with remarkable tough-mindedness, the War Council has recognized the industrial struggle as the most serious menace to the future peace of every nation. As immediate remedies, it advocates a national system of labor exchanges; the retention of the National War Labor Board; no lowering of the wages attained during the war, "even when the cost of living recedes," for, says the pamphlet, "after all, a living wage is not necessarily a full measure of justice"; the legal minimum wage; recognition of the right of labor to organize for collective bargaining; adequate housing; the establishment of co-operative stores; vocational training; abolition of child labor; heavy taxation of incomes, excess profits, and inheritances; and prevention of monopolistic control of commodities. In its more fundamental suggestions, the programme approaches syndicalism, rather than socialism—the abolition of the wage system, though not the abolition of private ownership. "Full possibilities of increased production will not be realized so long as the majority of the workers remain mere wage-earners. The majority must somehow become owners, or at least in part, of the instruments of production." The capitalist, in the meantime, "needs to learn the long forgotten truth that wealth is stewardship..... that the laborer is a human being, not merely an instrument of production; and that the laborer's right to a decent livelihood is the first moral charge upon industry." "This," concludes this remarkable programme, "is the human and Christian, in contrast to the purely commercial and pagan, ethics of industry."

I hope I have convinced you, Mr. Speaker, that, after all, there is nothing revolutionary or Bolshevistic in the demands of the workmen for collective bargaining.

I will now refer briefly to those charges of Bolshevism against those who are parties to the present labour difficulties. I do not think that any advance will be made towards a settlement of our labour troubles by the slanderous attacks which are made by the Government press against the leaders of the working men. It is not true that the labour leaders at Winnipeg or at Toronto are foreigners or Bolshevists. In both places the committees are composed almost exclusively of British-born citizens. They belong to that sturdy class of immigrants which I have often heard described in this House as being the one class needed in this country. Why, Mr. Speaker, do you think if the Winnipeg strikers were foreigners or Bolshevists that they would have succeeded in enlisting the sympathy of the returned soldiers? The employers—I beg pardon, the newspapers say—and the employers, too—that the returned soldiers are neutral. I read only yesterday that thousands of them after parading the streets of Winnipeg on Saturday, marched to the Parliament Buildings and intimated to Premier Norris that he should exercise his influence for the recognition of the principle of collective bargaining. If they were neutral, I would like to know what they would do.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: Is it not a fact that the Great War veterans of Winnipeg repudiated such action?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Quite true, the officers of the Great War veterans proclaimed their neutrality. But it is also true that the returned soldiers by thousands have evinced their sympathy with the strikers of Winnipeg. In order to try to show that the strikers are animated by Bolshevistic ideals, much is said of their having issued their famous licenses with the words, "By leave of the strike committee." The strikers had no right to do this, Mr. Speaker. Such a usurpation of power cannot be tolerated in any constitutional country. They made a mistake, and they seem to have realized it, because they have discontinued that course of action. But is that a sign of Bolshevism and disloyalty? The first city in any British country which gave such an example was the city of Belfast. A few months ago when the gas and electricity workers joined the strike, Belfast went without light except so far as the strike committee gave leave to relax their prohibition in that regard. Yet nobody will gainsay that Belfast is a loyal city. It is the loyal city par excellence—it is the capital of loyalism. Belfast is so deeply and profoundly British that the mere prospect of self government being given to Ireland kindled the flames of rebellion four years ago. The strikers at Belfast were wrong when they arrogated that right to themselves; so were the strikers at Winnipeg; but the latter are not more anti-British or disloyal than the former.

With regard to the action of the Government in trying to effect a settlement of the strike, it has been rather unfortunate. Senator Robertson seems to have sided with one party to the struggle, and obviously his usefulness as a mediator is gone, and I do not wonder that he is on his way back to Ottawa. His last performance in sending an appeal to Mr. Gompers, the head of the American Federation of Labour, is a most extraordinary one. Here is that despatch as I find it in the Montreal Star:

Samuel Gompers,
President of the American
Federation of Labour,
Washington.

May 29.—A general sympathetic strike involving some ninety-five unions was called in the City of Winnipeg for May 15, resulting in a complete tie up of all business and declaration by Strike Committee of control over civic affairs as well as interference with provincial and federal employees.

As is the case in all general strikes of this nature it has already defeated itself, but I feel it proper to say to you after being on the ground for several days that in my opinion the prestige and authority of international unions whose endeavouring to embroil their members in other cities in sympathetic strikes in support of the lost cause here, should receive the earnest and serious consideration of the executives of the various organizations concerned, particularly of what is know as the metal trades.

The underlying motive in calling the strike is undoubtedly in support of what is known as the "One Big Union," movement and which has for its purpose the destruction of the international trades unions if possible. Will you give this matter your personal attention and communicate with the executives of the various internationals as you may deem desirable.

This is an appeal, clamouring for help, by a Canadian minister of the Crown to a foreign labour leader.

More humiliating action on the part of a responsible minister in a British country has never before been witnessed, and I hope may never be witnessed again. It stands as a monument to the statesmanship and national ideals of that combine of the best brains of the country which was once gathered together in Canada by some sort of collective bargaining under the name of Union Government.

I have no hesitation in saying that the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen)

was the last man in the world who should have been selected to act as conciliator or mediator. Nobody has more admiration than I have for the ability and talent of the minister, but his temperament, mentality and training disqualify him altogether for the difficult task of mediator. He stands in Canada as the Apostle of arbitrary enactments and despotic legislation. He is the father of the closure in this House. His Italian hand may be discerned in the War-time Elections Act, that nefarious piece of legislation which is still a blot on the statute books of Canada. If there exists in some quarters of the country a feeling of distrust of Parliament and Parliamentary institutions, I believe the Acting Minister of Justice is one of those who are largely responsible for it. Be that as it may, he is so considered by quite a number of people in the country, and he will not be welcomed and trusted by those people as a fair mediator. When, a few weeks ago, I moved in this House that labour should be given representation on the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways, it was the Acting Minister of Justice who said in reply that I was favouring a very unsound principle. He was unable to understand that employees of a railway have an interest in the system different from and larger than the interest of the rest of the community. Yet the principle of allowing labour a share in the management of industry is accepted to-day and advocated by both employers and employees in Great Britain and the United States as the best way to enlist the whole soul and energy of the workingman in the thing he is doing. Individual employers in that respect have been ahead of legislation and universal practice. They have set an example which has, in all cases, been most successful. Why does not the Government of Canada set an example in this country? Why refuse a reasonable concession now and be forced to grant it afterwards? The Government may yet grant it so that such concession of a fair demand shall not take on the appearance of a surrender on the one side and a triumph on the other. I do not wonder that the labour men of Winnipeg could not consider my hon. friend as being able to enter into their minds sympathetically, in order to discover their ideals, aims and desires.

But the situation is becoming more serious every day, in spite of ministerial optimistic announcements we have daily at the opening of the House and the interested denials in the newspapers. Still I ask: What shall we do? What shall the Government do? The Mathers' Commission does not possess the authority or prestige that would give its report or its finding a large degree of influence. It is by no means representative. As was stated in the last issue of Maclean's Magazine by a member of the Press Gallery, it could hardly be considered as a satisfactory camouflage, and that was all it was intended to be. The commission was told in all the cities: "There is something rotten in the state of Denmark." We all knew that. Why does not the Government issue a call for a large national conference of employers and employees, as was done in England? If labour in Canada acts as labour acts in England, why should not Canadian statesmanship be able to follow the example of British statesmanship? Let such a conference be called and let labour select its own representative. When a man is selected by the Government to represent labour on a committee, or commission, or conference of some kind, that man does not properly represent labour; he represents the Government. I have the fullest confidence that the Canadian employers and employees could find a common ground and agree together as British employers and employees have succeeded in doing. In the meantime, as a token of goodwill, could not Parliament and the Government agree to have a labour representative on the Board of Directors of the Canadian National railways?

The Government states that it has no power to enact eight-hour day legislation. I admit there is grave doubt as to that, but there is no doubt that the Government can enact eight-hour day legislation as to its own public works, and such legislation would go a long way towards securing the general adoption of that reform. Something must be done quickly to endeavour to convert class struggle into class harmony, to convert retaliation into reciprocity. But Mr. Speaker, I believe the Government has already delayed too long. Something must be done now, and these are my concluding words to the Government: Do something and do it now.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be allowed to contribute a little something to what I consider in my humble way as the basis of this industrial unrest. I do not purpose indulging in personalities, nor in blaming any body for not having unearthed some solution of a problem that confronts the entire world, nor do I purpose discussing various theories which have been advanced from time to time as solutions of the problem. But I will go to what I

consider the very root of the matter, namely, the ability of the workingman to maintain himself at the present rate of wages. I firmly believe that if he had the wages which would enable him to live properly and comfortably, he would be satisfied, and if he were satisfied, you could not possibly stir him into any form of unrest.

Some few days ago I asked the Acting Minister of Labour (Mr. A. K. Maclean) if he would be kind enough to answer a question regarding this. After several days he very kindly answered the question and put the answer into printed form which was served upon me to-day. It is headed: "The high cost of living and minimum wages," and it reads:

Re Mr. Burnham's Inquiry of May 28, Hansard for May 28 shows the following statement:

Mr. J. H. Burnham (Peterborough West): I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Labour (Hon. A. K. Maclean) what is the weekly budget for the average Canadian family as found by the latest report of the Department of Labour; and what is the minimum weekly wage to correspond with that weekly minimum budget?

This was the reply:

Regarding the point raised by Mr. Burnham it may be stated that the weekly family budget printed in the "Labour Gazette" is given as a typical family budget, not as a minimum family budget. The figures as printed do not vary from month to month or from year to year. The object aimed at in printing the budget is not to indicate in any way what commodities should be purchased but to facilitate an effective comparison of prices at different periods so that the relative purchasing power of money may be shown. The weekly budget printed in the "Labour Gazette" was framed by the Dominion Statistician some years ago and the foods enumerated and the quantities specified go to make up the number of calories estimated as necessary for a family of five,—husband, wife and three children; save that so far as the workman is concerned the budget is intended rather to meet the case of a man engaged in somewhat severe manual labour, the food allowance being therefore slightly larger than would be necessary if the man were engaged in clerical or other light employment. The figures printed from month to month in the "Labour Gazette" show the cost of the same quantities of the same class of commodity, the prices ranging over a number of years. The budget includes prices as to foods, fuel and rent and does not include clothing. Clothing is of course an essential part of the cost of living but the subject is one which cannot be easily reflected by statistics, the articles covering so wide a range and the conditions varying so greatly as between different families, different localities and different periods. In considering the family budget as printed in the "Labour Gazette" an addition of from twenty-five to forty per cent must be made for clothes and miscellaneous articles.

Regarding the latter part of Mr. Burnham's question re minimum weekly wage, it may be stated that just as there is no minimum budget known to the Department of Labour neither is there any weekly minimum wage known to the department, save that during the past year or two different provinces have enacted minimum wage laws as to some classes of labour. Wages are, as a rule, fixed for each calling and the minimum wage varies greatly as between one calling and another and as between one city and another. The family budget as printed in the "Labour Gazette" is, it may be added, much used by employers and employees in measuring the fluctuations of living and is therefore of material value in effecting wage agreements in different trades. Attached is a copy of the family budget as printed in the May, 1919, issue of the "Labour Gazette." Attached is memorandum showing food prices for Great Britain, United States and Canada, respectively, for the month of February.

The copy of the family budget attached for staple foods, fuel, light and rent, in terms of the average prices in 66 Canadian cities, shows the cost per week to be $21.34. That budget does not include anything for clothing, for which I have allowed only the moderate sum of $2 per week. It includes nothing for medicine and medical attendance, for which I have allowed $1 per week. It includes nothing for boots and shoes, for which I have allowed 50 cents per week; nothing for headgear, for which I have allowed 10 cents per week; nothing for religion, for which I have allowed the modest sum of 25 cents per week; nothing for amusements, for which I have allowed 25 cents a week; nothing for education, for which I have allowed 25 cents a week, (because although education is free in some provinces there are incidental expenses); nothing for insurance for which I have allowed 50 cents per week; making a total of $4.80 not allowed for. This added to the $21.34 makes a total of $26.14, or an average of $4.35 per day for six days in the week which the man engaged in severe toil must earn or he cannot meet this necessary budget. Even then nothing is allowed for the instruments of labour, the tools which the workman must have, and nothing is provided for old age. When we consider the wage the workingman is receiving at the present time, he is away behind this budget. The Government has worked very hard investigating these prices, and its figures, which are given in the most candid manner, show that $4.50 per day—$5 per day including provision for old age and tools—is the minimum wage which the labouring man in Canada should receive to-day. But he receives nothing like that, and it naturally follows that there is very great unrest. He does not know, very few of us did, that this was what the budget amounted to; but there are the figures given by the Government, in answer to my question, after

several days' delay, and they show that the workingman is away behind. He is going down lower and lower in the scale, and his weekly and yearly deficit is becoming most alarming. Restlessness must follow as a matter of course. I do not think for one moment that the employer can pay more than he is paying at the present time and make things go. I do not claim that there is any inequality whatever in the scale of prices relative to each other. I am simply accounting for the unrest among the masses of the people of this country. To urge that free trade or anything of that description will remedy matters is not to argue by the book.

Mr. M. CLARK: Give it a trial.

Mr. BURNHAM: It was on trial several years ago, and the verdict was "Guilty," and free trade was thrown out. I do not purpose to try it again, because it is a well-known principle in law that when a thing has once been tried, it cannot be tried again.

I have no suggestion to make. I know the workingman says if he was getting only a dollar a day and prices were the same as when that was the current wage, he would be content. It is not that he wants fabulous wages. He simply wants to meet his obligations. Therefore, I maintain that if you can so arrange things that the workingman can live decently and meet his obligations you will allay the unrest in this country, and in no other way can you allay it.

Mr. F. J. PELLETIER (Matane): I am pleased that the Government has finally allowed the question of the present industrial unrest to come before the House for a fair discussion and a frank expression of opinion from hon. gentlemen. It is one of the most important questions with which we have to deal.

With the suspension of hostilities in Europe, with the dawn of peace bringing contentment and solace to all hearts, how is it that the country to-day is actually in a worse situation than when we were at war? How is it that the merry ringing of bells announcing the coming of peace in Europe announces at the same time a state of industrial war in Canada?

What is the cause of this industrial unrest and of the universal unsatisfactory feeling that prevails throughout the country? It is not necessary to go through a long and dreary inquiry to ascertain the cause of this trouble. It is apparent and every one realizes it at sight. It is the unbearably high cost of living and the necessity for the working classes to have better conditions, better wages, lower prices for foodstuffs, clothing, and all the necessaries of life. But it is not sufficient to find out the cause of a social evil to remedy the situation. One must see who is responsible for such conditions. Then it will be possible, if there is goodwill on the part of those responsible, to find a solution of the serious problems which must be settled if Canada is to live. The fundamental cause of all the trouble we are actually going through lies in the lack of sincerity, wisdom, foresight and Canadian patriotism on the part of the present Government. The hon. gentleman to your right, Mr. Speaker, may think that such a statement is a slander against the present Government, and it would be such if I did not have absolute proofs to substantiate the indictment. The time has come when we must look the situation boldly in the face, examine our national conscience, and set aside the rubbish of electoral parley to consider if the governing influence of Canada has really worked for the general good, or simply for the benefit of the privileged class. The time has come to put a soft pedal on the patriotic camouflage which has been the only means of putting through this House and the country all sorts of measures and thousands of Orders in Council; and to scrutinize the real motives which prompted the Government to place Canada on the verge of bankruptcy and on the threshold of revolution. Not only does serious industrial unrest manifest itself, but there are innumerable strikes in large cities And there is also a supreme contempt of the Government of the land, and an evident relish for revolutionary ideas and principles, so much so that in the city of Winnipeg there was a tentative Soviet against which the Government did not dare to take stringent measures. Had it been an ordinary industrial crisis, had the Government not been responsible for the situation, and had the people at large had the least confidence in the ministers of the Crown, the settlement would have been an easy matter because the Government would have been the high court to which the grievances would have been brought. But such is not the case. The labouring class is dissatisfied, and does not care to have the Government's assistance, believing the Government to be a party committed to the opposing forces. I do not need further proofs than the fact of the reception given in Winnipeg to the ministers just returned from the West, and the result of their peace-making mission. Let us consider

for a moment how we have been brought to the unenviable position in which Canada finds itself to-day.

At the outbreak of the war, without any consultation with Parliament, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister pledged the country to England for 500,000 men. This offer was accepted, and to compel the people to accept it as granted, numbers of orators, journalists and canvassers sounded from one end of Canada to the other the note of devotion to the Motherland, to the cause of liberty and civilization, and devotion to the cause of the small countries. They declaimed upon the phantom of German tyranny as if Canada had been threatened with immediate invasion. This was done with the deliberate object in view to cover the extremely dangerous consequences, for a country as small and as poor as Canada, of assuming responsibilities beyond our means. During the long years of struggle, whilst the final victory was uncertain, and as long as the united efforts of the allied nations were necessary to keep up the morale of our soldiers, nothing was said. But now that the war is over and the Allies have been victorious, it can be said to the Government that its action was nothing short of national suicide, and we are beginning to realize the fact. For the four years of the war, we drained the country of our best young men, we crippled our industries by the multiplication of shell factories, we allowed speculators to increase the price of every necessity of life to such an extent that it became necessary to maintain the output of munitions, to increase the salaries of munition workers tenfold, while the other classes of working men were in a sorry plight. To-day they ask that these conditions be made bearable, and they are not to blame. The responsibility for these conditions lies at the door of those who have allowed them to be created. But the Government has not only been extravagant in its promises to Great Britain; it has been totally inefficient in preparing for the necessary transition from war to peace. Notwithstanding the advices given privately and publicly, the Government did not see fit even to try to do anything in that direction, all its efforts having been bent upon the prosecution of military service defaulters and the contriving of means whereby to remain in power. Instead of taking measures to fix prices, to protect the labouring men against the greed and heartlessness of speculators, the Government has simply marked time waiting for events to pass on at will, seeming unfit to foresee the crisis we are facing to-day. If this is not correct, let the hon. gentlemen to your right, Mr. Speaker, point out one single measure prompted by wisdom and a desire to assist the poor. Let them show in what direction the country was prepared to switch its energies and activities from war-time industry to peace. What did the Government do when inquiries disclosed the fact that products, foodstuffs of all kinds, were rotting in warehouses and thrown away in order to maintain famine prices? What is the Government doing to-day when prices are even higher than they ever were before? What reasons are given for such conditions? Is it admissible that a Government, appreciating the importance of its duty, would allow food to be exported to such an extent that its own people would suffer and be on the verge of starvation? Is there a country in the world that would bear with such a Government? Is there a country under the sun afflicted with such a ruling power? What is the result of such apathy, such inefficiency on the part of the Government? As long as the war lasted, as long as contracts and profitable orders were distributed, and there were men to be conscripted, this Government showed more autocracy than did the late Tzar. The whole Administration was run by Orders in Council adopted and enforced even when Parliament was sitting.

Now that the war is over, and since conscription has ceased, now that no more munition contracts can be given to heartless profiteers, the only activity displayed by the Government is as I have said before utter severity in the prosecution of defaulters who have suffered heavy fines and imprisonment.

Such a condition of affairs does not conduce to confidence in the Government, on the part of the working class, and a striking proof of this was given by the manner in which the ministers of the Crown were received by the union men in the West. We also have other striking examples of the energetic attitude of the Government in time of crisis, in the manner in which the strike activities were managed. We were sitting here discussing the abolition of titles when the city of Winnipeg was in the pangs of Bolshevism. We are here discussing minor questions when the whole country is suffering, when the entire industrial structure is shaking—we are discussing, while the soul of the Canadian people want action and not words.

The Government has suffered from want of discretion in determining Canada's share

in the war; it has suffered from lack of sincerity in allowing prices of necessities of life to soar as they did; it has suffered from lack of foresight in not preparing for the after-war period.

It has suffered from lack of Canadian patriotism in sacrificing the future of the country; it has suffered from lack of wisdom in passing laws that spread discontent and distrust in all ranks of society; it has suffered from lack of ability as shown by the fact that it remained idle when it was time to act.

We are passing through a very critical period and no one knows what the results may be. Whatever the endeavours of this Government may be now I feel that it can accomplish very little, having lost the confidence and support of the people. The only wise and practical thing for the Government to do in the interest of the people, in my opinion, is to dissolve Parliament and allow the people to elect honestly representatives who have at heart the welfare of the country.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, when the election was on, a year and a half ago, it was my privilege to address an audience of Winnipeg workingmen on the subject of winning the war. The issue at that time was quite clear cut. I told them I was a candidate for the Union Government and as such stood for the conscription of men. I pointed out that this meant the particular men I was talking to. I also told them that I stood for the conscription of money, which meant their money, and for the conscription of the last dollar and the last man in Canada, if need be, to win this war. That was pretty straight talking. When I got through one of the men got up and said: "Well, we understand exactly what you mean now." I told them I would not think of going over the top with men who were not prepared to go all the way. When the 17th December came they knew exactly what it meant for the men who were going to the war. When the election was over, in spite of the fact that my opponent was the secretary of the labour union, it was found that they had voted for me in the proportion of three to one.

These are the men who, to-day, are on strike. There is certainly something wrong somewhere. In addition to those men, as good and as loyal citizens as Canada ever had, there are many of my own comrades who stood in the trenches in France; they are on strike. I say, standing in my place here, that in my opinion eighty per cent of the returned men of Winnipeg are in sympathy with the strikers and the object of this strike.

On the first of May the men of the metal trades went on strike, partly because the masters refused an eight-hour day and a larger hour wage but chiefly because of their employers' refusal to recognize their union. The building trade employees presented their schedule to the masters who frankly admitted its fairness and reasonableness, but declared their inability to meet the demand. Here we have the two vital causes of the strike (1) a living wage, and (2) the right to organize. This is the cause of the strike in my opinion after the most careful consideration and
5 p.m. after using every means in my power to find out the facts. When the ironmasters let it become known that they were going to make it a trial of endurance, the trades and labour council called for a sympathetic strike of all organized labour in the city. A vote was taken and all unions, including public utilities, came out.

As to the blame, I accuse no one, I judge no man, but the fact remains that the men are on strike and that is a fact that we must not forget. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the labour unions in Winnipeg in all good faith, in the month of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, were forced to strike for a living wage and for the right to organize. So far as the living wage is concerned, I think hon. members will agree that if ever a strike is justifiable it is for a living wage for the striker and his family. With regard to the right to organize, there was a time when a combination of employees was accounted conspiracy and treated as such, but to-day it cannot be denied to those whose saleable commodity is labour, the free right to say what terms they will sell their labour at; how much of it they will sell, and whether they will sell it for six or for twelve hours a day. The days of serfdom in Canada have passed. Nor can their right be denied to agree together as to the price at which they will sell their labour and the quantity of labour they have to sell, so long as this right is granted to any other class in the community.

The single workman is helpless against the great corporation; the individual union or craft is equally so. Collective bargaining is the logical outcome of organization and it is now too late in the day for any corporation to refuse it—that principle is embodied as one of the provisions of the

charter of labour formed by the League of Nations.

The sympathetic strike is the natural and logical sequence of organization. What more natural than that men who have interests in common should stand together in an emergency? A particular union or craft in striking may be striking for a principle that is absolutely vital to every man in the industry and just as the employers can down one single man so they can down a single union unless all stand together. This is co-operation; it is brotherhood, and it is absolutely the same principle of sticking together that was employed in France. Twenty-seven allied nations had a sympathetic strike, and they won. That sympathetic strike brings one naturally to the "One Big Union," and here again I believe is an entirely logical and absolute sequence of organization. If you once permit men to organize, and by their organization to deliberately make the boss "come through" with something with which he does not agree, that is force, and there is no other word for it; and the "One Big Union" is a logical way of fighting. It took us a long time to fight it out in France, but we did fight it out eventually, and once we got "the One Big Union" and "the One Big Foch" we won the war; and in the case of labour unions that is a logical conclusion once you begin to strike. I do not believe in strikes, but we have them in Canada. Having got them, there is need for the application of intelligence in their settlement. Once you have got labour lined up on one side you find there will also line up the Bankers' Association, the Manufacturers' Association, and all the other representatives of employers, and there is likely to be a first-rate fight. A little fight has been started already, and it will be "a real proper one" if we do not have a change soon. There are only two ways of settling disputes, as far as I know, one by arbitration and the other by force; and there is no more reason for the strike that is going on in Winnipeg to-day than there is for myself and any hon. member of this House who had a difference of opinion, going out on the lawn in front of this building and settling that difference with bombs; we should both of us be regarded as criminal lunatics if we did that. I have heard some criminal lunatics advance suggestions in connection with the settlement of this strike, and the sooner those persons are in the "jug" the better it will be.

In speaking along these lines it has been my experience that in military matters you will find in every platoon, every company, every battalion, and every regiment, men that are termed "roughnecks"—fellows that if you do not run them they will run you; and it appears to me that we have some of this class at large in Canada to-day. There is no question that if we do not do something to curb them they will run this Government and the country as well. We have got farmers' organizations, soldiers' organizations, and God knows what other bodies, all lining up for a fight, and I think it is about time that the members of Parliament, the representatives of all the people in Canada, had something to say in the matter. Let us have a little constitutional government; I have heard too much about organization and that sort of thing to please me. When a man begins to organize he is preparing to fight. I stand for arbitration and not for war in industrial relations as well as international relations. The Prime Minister the other day declared that if we could not settle this little business of our own it boded ill for a League of Nations. I think it does. I would suggest, if I may, that a national industrial conference should be called at once. In the meantime this striking has got to be stopped; if it does not stop one side or the other will win. I do not know which side will be the winner, I am playing no favourites, but I do know that the work people in Winnipeg are determined to win if they can. If they do not win they will starve, they will go back to their work with a bitter feeling. There are men on strike to-day that were repulsed by the Germans three years ago, but that did not end the war. The principle at stake is one of absolute force, as far as I see it, and I would like to see that changed. It can be changed, it is being done every day. If we cannot settle the problem I think it is time we got out and let somebody else have a go. In that respect I agree with an hon. gentleman who has spoken this afternoon.

There is another point I want to touch upon for a moment or two. Twice this afternoon I have heard the term "Bolsheviks" applied to the strike leaders in Winnipeg. Gentlemen, if you apply the term to those men you apply it to me, because they are my friends. There is a man called James Winning, a good level-headed Scotchman, who has spent practically all his life working for his fellowmen. The only erratic thing he has done in this agitation has been closing down the press and participating in the strike. As to the press, I had the misfortune to hear an hon. gentleman, one of the oldest members in the chamber, state

his opinion that the press was corrupt, and he was not called a " Bolshevik " for saying that. If ever a strike by workingmen in newspaper offices was justified it was in this case if the newspapers were not playing the game. There is another man called Russell in Winnipeg. Russell is a Socialist and not a man who advocates force. I know these men, and for them force would be absolutely the last resource. Russell wants a change. So does Robinson, so does Simpson, and so does Rigg. They want a change because they are not satisfied with present conditions. How many hon. gentlemen in this House are satisfied? I venture to say many of them would welcome a change of government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ANDREWS: I feel a little that way myself, but I would like to see some further action by the Union Government first. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a time that we should get together and all take hold of one rope and pull in harmony, it is now. We talk about working six hours a day. In my opinion the time has come when we should work eighteen hours a day, and I think the fellows would do it too as long as they did not fear they would work that length of time to enable one or two men to make millions out of it. They will not do that but they are ready to work and work well, when they deem the cause is a legitimate one. As an old farmer I cannot help but realize that it does not take any more bushels of barley to feed a hog to-day than it did five years ago. Yet the hog is worth five times as much to-day, it is a good time to sell hogs when the same amount of grain would yield five times the value. It is about time that we got off our coats and worked together. I would like to see some very strong action taken with regard to the present situation. I do not like compulsion nor conscription; but I cannot help thinking that we ought to be able to establish courts of arbitration in this country that will give a just award on a dispute that is referred to them. If that is done I think there would be enough public opinion behind the award to enforce it, and in that case our troubles would be over.

It is far better than letting this strike work itself out to the bitter end, which means another fight. There are times when on principle I have as little theoretical regard for conscription as my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). I do not believe in conscription, I never did; but, unlike my hon. friend, there are times when I think it is justifiable. During a prairie fire if you come across a deaf man you do not stop to argue with him, but you grab him and take him along, and when he finds you did it to save his life, he is very glad that you did not stand upon ceremony. Conscription, I think, is sometimes justifiable, and in my closing words I strongly recommend that in this instance the Government adopt it forthwith.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): I would like to venture into this debate, Mr. Speaker, as an employer of labour as well as a member of this House who has attempted to keep in close touch with the aspirations of organized labour. We are discussing industrial unrest largely because of the developments in Winnipeg during the last few weeks; but, to my mind there has been unrest amongst organized labour for some months past. I have attempted to ascertain the reasons for that unrest, and I would enumerate them not in the order of their importance but as I have noted them down.

First of all, I think one of the paramount reasons for the present unrest among the working classes is the high cost of living; second, I would say that what we have been calling " profiteering " since the commencement of the war is another very important reason; third, the failure to fulfil some of the promises that were given to the labouring classes during the war, that out of this war would come a new world, and that they would live under new conditions; then there is a demand, of course —and I would classify this as a fourth reason—for better living conditions; there is a universal demand for the recognition of the eight-hour day; there is also a universal demand for the recognition of unions, and, again, there is the feeling that there should be more equitable sharing by the working classes in the profits of business.

Having enumerated the reasons for the unrest which exists, I will try to point out some of the remedies that we, as the Parliament of Canada, should provide. In regard to the high cost of living, I would say that it is our duty to adopt legislation to reduce that high cost. When the Budget comes down this week it seems to me that we should deal with the tariff in such a way that the cost of living will be reduced. It is argued that if you attempt to deal with the tariff you are going to injure the industries of this country. Are not those industries being injured now on account of the unrest that

is being caused by the high cost of living? If we can remove some of that unrest we are to that extent going to stabilize our industries. So I believe it is in the interest of the country as a whole that we should without any further delay remove the duties from foodstuffs and the real necessaries of life.

It has been argued that it is impossible to deal with the high cost of living; that it is too intricate a subject. I find that in New Zealand in the year 1915 the Government passed what is termed a "Cost of Living Act," in which they attempted to reduce the cost of many of the necessaries of life. I saw an article the other day dealing with the price of footwear, and stating that in New Zealand the Government regulated the cost of the leather supplied to the manufacturers, and instructed them to manufacture only certain classes of boots in order that there should be a standardization of footwear, with a view to reducing the cost to the lowest possible point. We might very well keep in mind that it is possible to introduce legislation—preceded, of course, by proper investigation—that will attempt to relieve the unrest that is due to the high cost of living.

Now, as to profiteering. I feel that one of the greatest reasons for the present unrest is the extravagant display of luxuries by people who have amassed wealth, because such display arouses dissatisfaction among those who have not the same means, and these feel that the men of wealth are getting too much profit out of the industries of this country compared with what the workers themselves are obtaining in the way of wages. That is one of the reasons for the demand by the working classes for co-operation or a share in the profits of industry. To remove the feeling against profiteering, I hope that very advanced steps will be taken this year in connection with our income taxation so that the real wealth of the country will be made to bear its share of the cost of government, and that wealthy people will be made to feel the burden as they have not felt it in the past.

The promises made during the war undoubtedly were featured by the assurance that following the war, there would be greater democracy throughout the world, and I think labour feels that that greater democracy should be realized without delay. If we are to have a new world we must have different living conditions. We must not have the housing conditions that have existed in the past; and we must attempt to look after the old and the infirm by legislation rather than leaving them to be taken care of by fraternal societies and other organizations.

As to the eight-hour day, I may say that in the business I conduct we have had the eight-hour day for some years, and as a result of that experience I am an advocate of the adoption of the eight-hour day in every line of business in this country.

Mr. NESBITT: How much does my hon. friend think that the cost of living will be reduced by adopting the eight-hour day for farming?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I am speaking of the industries of this country. I do not think that it is practicable to adopt the eight-hour day for farmers. In the summer they may be working twelve hours or more a day, and in the winter they may not work for more than four or five hours a day.

Mr. NESBITT: So far as the farmers of Ontario are concerned, they work twelve and fifteen hours a day winter and summer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I would like very much to be able to continue the discussion with the hon. member for North Oxford, but it is impossible under the circumstances. As to the eight-hour day, I would like to quote the views expressed by Lord Leverhulme, a member of the British House of Lords, and one of the best known business men in Great Britain. He is not only advocating a reduction in the hours of labour to eight, but he is bringing the period down to six hours. I am not going to argue in favour of the six-hour day, but I would point this out, that in a book written by him he made the statement, that in the munitions industry in Great Britain at the commencement of the war, working hours at first were about twelve hours a day, and gradually they were reduced to eight and a half hours, and that this reduction of hours resulted in a greater production of munitions per day and per week. If that was the case, there cannot be very much objection to the adoption of the eight-hour day throughout this country. Lord Leverhulme in this volume from which I am quoting made this statement:

> Government reports repeat over and over again, from definite experiments, that in a reasonable number of hours the human being turns out its maximum output. Fatigue the human being one day, let the man or woman come fatigued to work the following day, and so on, and after two or three days the output goes down, down, down, and is continually falling.

I think that is the case. I am satisfied that in my own business the production is just as good as when we had a nine-hour day.

In 1886 the output of a certain class of worker in the United Kingdom was 312 units;—

I am quoting these figures to exemplify an argument used by Lord Leverhulme to show that in the United States where they were more advanced in their legislation as regards working hours than they were in Great Britain, the production was greater.

In 1886 the output of a certain class of worker in the United Kingdom was 312 units. In 1906 it had dropped to 275; in 1912, the last recorded year before the war, it had fallen to 244—a drop of 68 units in twenty-six years. In the United States the output per worker in 1886 was 400 units; in 1906 it was 596; in 191 it was 600—a rise of 200 units. The output also rose during the same period in Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, so that Lord Leverhulme is forced to the conclusion that, of the English-speaking races all over the world.

And Lord Leverhulme reaches the conclusion that by the reduction of hours of labour, production in Great Britain will not be interfered with, but rather it will be helped.

Since industrial troubles have arisen in this country, many views have been advanced as to proper co-operation between labour and capital. Only yesterday, I read in a Canadian paper an article explaining the system adopted by the Sears-Roebuck Company of Chicago. I am going to place the two systems that I have before me on record because I think they are of considerable value in this discussion:

The Sears-Roebuck Company, a great mail-order house which employs about 20,000 men and women, have had in operation for about three years a plan of profit sharing.

In 18 months of its operation, the plan discovered the following facts:

Ninety-one per cent of the eligible employees contributed to the fund.

The employees in 18 months paid into the savings fund about $439,500. The company contributed in the same period $1,318,712, that being 5 per cent of its net profits without deduction of dividends to stockholders.

Julius Rosenwald, president of Sears-Roebuck, made the following statement:

An employee earning $25 a week would, on the basis of the past two years' record, have accumulated in 20 years' service, approximately $20,000. An employee earning $50 a week would in the same period of service have accumulated $40,000. It is estimated that this is a minimum!

I quote this merely as an instance of the possibility of developing co-operation between working classes and employers in order to bring about greater contentment and a better opportunity for living well in this world. The other view that I have here was expressed by a manufacturer from Brantford, Ontario, merely giving his idea of a scheme that might be adopted to encourage better relations between employers and employees:

1.—The payment of a fair living wage. The happiness of the workingman will not depend on whether he has an eight or nine-hour day—

That may be considered a contradiction of the argument I have advanced in relation to the eight-hour day, but I am giving it simply as the view of this gentleman.

but on ensuring him a wage sufficient to keep his family comfortably and permit them to enjoy the good things of life.

(2) The organization of sick benefit associations in connection with factories, similar to the Massey-Harris plan, the benefit to amount to say, $8 per week.

(3) Every manufacturer should insure his employees, so that in case of bereavement the family will have something to carry on with.

(4) Provision for old and faithful employees in the way of pensions when they retire.

(5) The taking of the employee into partnership to the extent of each man's earnings. If he earns $1,000 he should be paid the same dividend on that amount as is paid the shareholder. It would encourage men to be faithful and to look after the interests of the business, because in so doing they would also benefit.

Having expressed these views as regards what capital should do to remove some of the grievances of labour, I would say this in regard to the position that organized labour should take. One grievance that the employer has and, I think, has justly, is that when he engages what might be termed a union man, he is not always guaranteed that the man is efficient for the work he is engaged to do. Labour should see that every man who is provided with a union card is efficient, and is entitled to earn the wage that is paid to him. It should also see that when an agreement is made with an industrial concern, that agreement is kept, not only by the union but by the employer. If we could bring about a proper understanding between labour and industry, I am satisfied that all agreements would be observed and that we could have a guarantee of efficiency.

I may be a little advanced in expressing the view that we should encourage labour representation in the House of Commons. I believe many of the problems we have to deal with to-day would be solved a good deal more easily if we had in the House a few men who represented the views of labour, and we do not have them here at the present time and we should encourage them. That would be an advantage not

only to the Government, but to Parliament and the country. Probably one way in which we could bring about a proper representation of labour would be by the adoption of proportional representation in Canada.

I have listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews), and I am inclined to think that while at the beginning the difficulty in Winnipeg may have originated with reasonable labour men, it got into the hands of unreasonable labour men and I believe the One Big Union is at the back of the movement there. I have no sympathy whatever with the One Big Union, because no organization in Canada that expresses sympathy with Bolshevism and the Spartacans in Germany could have my sympathy, and as I understand it, the One Big Union, when created in Calgary, expressed sympathy with those movements. What I want to see is a development in Canada along constitutional lines, and we should keep as much as possible in advance, but I do not think the reasonable labour people of Canada have any sympathy whatever with the movements in Russia and Germany along revolutionary lines.

I have no disagreement with the principle of collective bargaining, as I understand it in my business and as I know it exists at the present time in the Canadian Pacific. If I might be personal and explain the method adopted in dealing with the International Typographical Union, collective bargaining is simply this: The International Typographical Union, in the city of Lethbridge, represents the employees in all the printing and job offices. And when we come to negotiate an agreement with the union we negotiate it with the employees of all the offices, and representatives of the employers meet representatives of the employees. That, in my judgment, is collective bargaining; but if collective bargaining goes beyond that and means that men in the baking, or milling, or moulding business are going to decide whether an agreement in another line of business is to be accepted or not, then I disagree with collective bargaining along that line. But if it is to be bargaining between men and employers in a certain line of business, then I am quite satisfied to have it generally adopted throughout Canada.

It would be in the interest of Canada that we should remove a good deal of the suspicion that exists between employers and employees and between employees and employers. I know the employer is under the difficulty that he is suspicious of the motives of his employees, and on the other hand the employee has the same suspicion when dealing with the employer. I do not say that is always the case, but it is the case to a very great extent.

If we can get the heads of the industries of the country to trust and co-operate with the men in their employ to a greater extent than they have done in the past, I believe we shall remove a great many of the difficulties that have arisen. If I may make another reference to that book of Lord Leverhulme, one of his principles was this: "Trust labour whole-heartedly and wisely, and all will be well." Lord Leverhulme, one of the greatest employers of labour in the Mother Country, has been able to get along well with labour by co-operating with and trusting the men, and I feel that if we develop that feeling of trust in this country we shall alleviate many of the difficulties that have existed.

In conclusion, I would urge the Government to consider the organization of a permanent commission—I am not going to try and foist on the Government another commission, but I think it would be in the interest of labour and capital in this country if we had a commission somewhat of the same type as the Railway Commission to move about the country and consider difficulties that might arise, and try and solve them before they develop into a strike, when sometimes the difficulties are almost impossible of solution. There are many little differences and difficulties that occur in industries that, with a proper presentation of the case to an impartial tribunal could, I am satisfied, be solved before they had reached the stage where they are beyond solution and where a strike develops. It might be difficult to form in Canada a commission that could cover the whole country, and it might be necessary to have it divided so as to deal with East and West, because the commission would undoubtedly be kept busy meeting individuals from the Atlantic to the Pacific who had representations to make. I feel that it is our duty at this really critical period in the history of industry in Canada to get together, not only those who sit on the Opposition side but those who sit on the Government side as well, and do all that is possible to bring about a solution of these problems, in order that we may have peace and become the Canada that the men who fought and died for us in France aimed to possess when they came back to this country.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): I do not know whether I can usefully add anything to this discussion, as when I came to the House this afternoon I had not the slightest intention of seconding the resolution of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake), but when he wanted a seconder I was very glad to lend my name so that the matter might be discussed.

In the discussion that has taken place it seems to me that we are to an extent not appreciating the changed conditions that have taken place, particularly in Winnipeg. Like the hon. member for North Winnipeg and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan), I have endeavoured to secure as best I could a correct appreciation of the development of the facts in reference to the Winnipeg strike. I agree with what the hon. member for North Winnipeg says in this respect, that the strike was originally precipitated probably because the ironmasters were unwilling to recognize collective bargaining, that term being accepted in the ordinary sense. It means the ironmasters were not prepared to recognize the organizations within their own shops as having the right to speak and bargain for those whom they represent. There was also the question of hours and wages, but the crucial issue over which the cleavage occurred was whether or not collective bargaining should be recognized by the ironmasters, and this, as I understand it, was refused by them. But when the break took place a change came o'er the spirit of the dream. The Central Strike Committee came into existence, and as the strike continued that committee became more aggressive in the demonstration and assertion of its point of view. Collective bargaining in the narrow sense of the word gave way to a different collective bargaining as being demanded. The collective bargaining, as I understand it, that is demanded to-day is not the collective bargaining that was refused by the ironmasters, and which, I may say in passing, I think they would have been wise in granting, but it is a new collective bargaining. It is a collective bargaining that recognizes the right of a central strike committee to determine and bargain for the rate of wages and other conditions, not in respect of any particular employment, but in respect of any employment where there may be a difference. That changes the entire situation. It takes the bargaining away from the employees of a factory or craft and turns it over to a recognized outside committee, who shall have power to determine what the rate of wages and conditions shall be in any particular industry or craft. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) was keen in directing attention to this point. It seems to me he overlooked another fundamental point when he laid emphasis on the fact that the extreme socialistic view as represented by the Independent Workers of the World refused to recognize collective bargaining in any sense. To be consistent, the Independent Workers of the World and those who hold their views must be unwilling to accept collective bargaining in any of its phases, because they are unwilling to recognize the position of capital in industry. They are unwilling to recognize bargaining at all because, they say, there should be no such thing as capital in industry, that labour and the community are the only two parties interested in industry. In other words, that industry should not either directly or indirectly be affected by capital, but that labour, as the operators of industry, and the community that purchases the goods are the only two parties concerned, and that therefore there should be no collective bargaining because it is impossible for one party to bargain with himself. Labour is to take control of industry, and therefore labour could not bargain with itself in control. But to a very great extent that is theoretical.

Coming now to the practical, we are face to face to-day in Canada and throughout the world with conditions that have confronted belligerent nations at the conclusion of all great wars, namely, unrest and high prices of foods, but there never was a time in the history of the world when a war produced such world-wide conditions, and the problem that confronts us to-day really is this: The immensity of the task that we have just completed has practically put all the world at one, in that high prices prevail not only in the countries which took part in the war but in other countries throughout the world. If hon. members interested in this discussion will turn to the last copy of the Labour Gazette which we secured in our boxes a day or so ago they will see that the cost of staple foods in the family budget has risen from $7.34 in 1913 to $13.35 to-day, and that the grand total of the budget, as mentioned by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), has risen from $14.02 to $21.34. But, Sir, these conditions are not confined to Canada. They are world-wide, and as I shall not be here to-night, and have but a few moments at the present time, I shall but roughly direct the attention of the House to some of the conditions one finds

throughout the world. In the United States, for instance, prices have tremendously increased. The Canada Labour Gazette says:

> The index number of the retail prices of foods in the United States calculated by the Bureau of Labour Statistics showed a considerable decrease for February, being down to 172, as compared with 185 for January, 187 for December, 1918, and 183 for November, 1918, and 160 for January, 1918, and 100 for the year 1913.
>
> The normal price is taken as 100.
>
> In the United Kingdom the Minister of Labour reported the retail prices of food to be 113 per cent higher on April 1st than in July 1914, as compared with a level 120 per cent the month before.....
>
> In Norway the statistical officer reported the cost of living for a family in November, 1918, to be 155 per cent higher than in July, 1914.... In retail food prices at Rome an advance of 1.8 per cent was reported in January, the level being 159 per cent higher than before the war. In Milan the cost of living for a family in February was calculated to be 253 per cent higher than before the war, food being up 298 per cent, clothing 274 per cent, heat and light 115 per cent, while rent was unchanged.

In South Africa the increase was about 40 per cent. And thus it is throughout the whole world. The question naturally is, why is this so? And the difficulty is in obtaining the facts. If we could get all the facts, then probably we should be able to apply economic theories to them and more easily find a solution. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) said something which I was sorry to hear him say, because I think it only adds fuel to the fire that exists throughout the country. He directed the attention of the House and of the country to what he stated as a fact: That the food trusts, as he termed them, and the milling trusts, were responsible for the very large increase in the cost of living. He very briefly called attention to the immense profits made by these industries, and, by his speech, gave the House and the country to understand that if these tremendous profits had been swept away the result would have been a very substantial decrease in the cost of commodities supplied by these industries. Now, Sir, I read with great care the report of Mr. O'Connor when it was published, and I also read the report of the cold storage inquiry as conducted in Toronto and elsewhere; and I gave considerable attention to the report of the milling industry as prepared by Miss McKenna. If I understand the purport and finding of these reports, it was to the effect that while these industries, through the immensity of their overturn, made very large profits, yet if the profits in respect of each item of overturn were reduced to nothing it would practically have amounted to this, that the cost of foodstuffs would have been decreased by a negligible quantity. Not for a moment do I argue that these industries should be left with such large profits, but at a time like this, and such as we have experienced during the past four years, it is absolutely essential that production should be driven to the extreme, and you cannot expect men, while human nature is human nature, to conduct an industry unless it can be made profitable. Price must always be in excess of cost, if an industry is to be maintained; and if this Government had been unwise enough to put the margin of profit so low that the industries could not have been successfully operated, then the industries would have closed. But I do think that the Government should take, as it did take—and probably should continue to take by way of taxes—a very large proportion of the unusual profits earned by these companies, because it is not difficult for me to understand the unrest that pervades the labour classes of the country when they see such stock as that of the Maple Leaf Milling Company growing from below par to within 160, and stock of the Dominion Textile Company which a short time ago was 98, standing to-day somewhere in the neighbourhood of 120. What the working people of the country are asking is: Are we, after having contributed liberally of our flesh and blood to the cause of the country, to be called on at the present time to bear an unequal burden in relation to present day conditions? The hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) asked what was the cause of the unrest to-day; why were people willing to make sacrifices during the war and to-day were restive? It seems to me that the reason is this—and it is a fundamental reason—that, unless human nature changes, we will bear a great loss or suffer much in respect of a great gain that we anticipate, but will not bear the irritation of small things when we think we are being unjustly dealt with. And if I can gather the spirit of the labouring people to-day—and I may say that I have had in my riding three strikes within a year—the dissatisfaction that pervades their ranks is due to the fact that they know that increased wages have not brought them any greater comfort, and they are imbued with the idea that unusual and improper profits are being made by certain people. Now, Sir, when you consider the philosophy

that underlies wages, you have to realize that money is only a medium of exchange. Price is only the declaration of value in money, and value is the ratio of exchange of goods. What happened in Canada after the war broke out? We have not forgotten that within a few months following the outbreak of war there was great depression in the country and men were willing to work for anything, for the question resolved itself into the alternatives of work or starvation. Then munitions contracts began, and the cry was "Full steam ahead, because the Allies want munitions." Competition was eliminated because the need for munitions and war supplies was so great that the cost was immaterial. They had to be had, otherwise the war could not be successfully carried on; and none of us have forgotten those days in 1915 when we thought we had almost lost because we had not the shells and other necessary impedimenta of war, and as the demand for munitions became greater the cost of living increased. There was an inflation in currency, and you may have an inflation in currency in two ways: First, because there is more money in the country than there should be, and, for a second reason, money may be circulating more rapidly. You may have a direct and an indirect inflation, and we had both in Canada. Vast amounts of money were being poured out in Canada, and money was circulating with great rapidity from the manufacturer down through to the workman and into the bank; fresh loans were made and the money went round again. Men received higher wages than they had got before, and prices rose correspondingly. We had in Canada a condition that has been experienced by every country at war. Prices were enhanced, but so long as times were good people did not complain. Wages rose, perhaps always somewhat behind prices, but there was a steady increase in wages in ratio to the increase in prices. But then peace came and the workmen were confronted with changed conditions. In all economic papers throughout the world, and in our own newspapers, articles appeared which directed the attention of the workman to the fact that in the future he must look to a reduction of wages, because it was impossible, if Britain was to carry on her export trade and if Canada expected to conduct her business and secure trade, and to undertake the payment of her debts, for wages to remain as they were. Wages must come down, it was pointed out, because, in international trade, goods would be bought from the country which could most cheaply supply them. The workmen began to look around and to consider what their condition would be. One most thoroughly conversant with labour economics and world-wide conditions and a man of extensive knowledge in my riding, said to me: "I have worked and slaved during the war and never had such wages before. But the day after the war was over I found myself no better off than before the war, and all I have earned is gone, having been swallowed up in the cost of living." As a panacea for this evil—because the high cost of living is an evil—some gentlemen in this House advocate the control of prices. It is a popular policy to shout that profiteering shall be stopped, but it all depends on how you define your term. What is profiteering? Is profiteering to be defined as a reasonable effort by a man to produce his goods at the minimum of cost and sell them at the highest reasonable price? Or is profiteering to be regarded as the securing of monopolistic control, and by that control the lessening of supplies and the securing of prices out of proportion to the value of the goods? The first is quite justifiable, and if my views are worth anything in this House today, what I would urge is increased production. But if profiteering means, according to the second definition, the controlling of supplies and the creation of a monopoly, and the taking advantage of the conditions so created to secure more than the article is worth, then profiteering should be condemned. But, Sir, the control of prices, is not as simple a matter as it appears to be. During the war France tried it and failed. According to a statement contained in Bulletin No. 27 of the Department of History and Political and Economic Science, Queen's University:

> The Food Controller of France compares himself to a game keeper surrounded by poachers and laments "that the tradespeople and middle men have invented no end of tricks to evade his prescriptions, and this he blames for his embarrassments."

The control of prices was also tried in Germany—a country whose people had been accustomed to control, who were used to paternal government and to submit without complaint to governmental regulations.

The food controller of Germany said that he had utterly failed because ways were found by which the wealthy secured supplies from those who produced them, with the result that the condition of the poorer

people was worse with the control of prices than without. Mr. Hoover frankly admitted to the people of his country that price control could not be successfully operated.

In Canada conditions were such that the fishermen on the Pacific coast laid up their vessels because they were not able to make a living at the prices that were to be paid for fish. I only direct attention to this because I should be sorry to see the Government adopt a scheme that failed in other countries, and because I am satisfied that the last condition in this country would be worse than the first. The moment you adopt a food price that places the value, or the price, of a given article at less than the cost of production—because as I said at the beginning, no man will produce unless he can sell for more than it costs to produce—just so soon will the production fall off.

From the information I have been able to obtain from those who should know, and with whom I have discussed the question, it is evident that the great want in Canada to-day is agricultural production. We are an agricultural people. A great many of our young men went overseas. We have made a contribution to the war that I shall never regret. I do not agree with the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) when he says that we impaired our national usefulness by the magnificent contribution that we made to the winning of the war. That is a contribution that our people will always be proud of and one which has placed Canada in a most enviable position in the eyes of the world. But, we would be blind to facts if we forgot that taking 450,000 or 500,000 of our men from the ordinary channels of industry has lessened the output of our industries. We would be blind to facts if we forgot that the destruction of war has robbed the world of a large part of the raw materials used by the industries of Canada and other countries in their operations. We would be blind if we overlooked the fact that for the past four or five years a great majority of the young men of the world have been engaged in destruction rather than construction. Keeping all these points in view, I suggest that the Government should be careful not to make a move in the wrong direction, because if they start out wrongly, conditions will be worse than they are to-day.

I realize that discontent exists among the working people. I realize that they are not satisfied with their status. I do not know whether or not a solution of the difficulty will be found in the Whitley report or not. It seems to me that the principle embodied in that document has reference to conditions as they are in England more particularly than to the conditions as they are in Canada. In Great Britain the various crafts and trades are more closely co-ordinated than they are in Canada. We are a more scattered people and I doubt very much if the principles of the Whitley report could apply to Canada. But I say that the status of the working people has to be improved in this country. I do feel that the time has come when the demand of the working people for an eight hour day should be recognized—eight hours for five days a week, four hours on Saturday, Saturday afternoon for recreation and Sabbath for worship. I quite realize that it is impossible for this Government, within our constitutional limitations, to prepare and pass an eight hour day law but I do believe that the legislatures ought to give serious consideration to it.

Although I seconded the motion of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) this afternoon, I would not want to be understood as agreeing with every contention that he put forward. He stated two propositions at least this afternoon in which I think he is radically wrong. One is, if I understood him correctly, that he seemed to stand for the curtailment of free speech. I believe that is a mistake. I have always been impressed with the fact that there is safety in free speech. When in London and Glasgow in 1916 I heard it on the street corners and in public places. While in Glasgow I heard things said that were much more radical than anything I had ever heard in Canada. While in Hyde Park I heard views expressed such as we are not accustomed to hear in this country. I have always felt that the free speech enjoyed in Glasgow and London was the safety valve of the people. If you give men an opportunity of voicing their views, while you may not agree with them you have an opportunity of refuting them. It is better to have views expressed in the open than in the byways and secret places.

Nor would I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg that sympathetic strikes should be prevented by legislation. I do not believe that would get you anywhere. If you are going to recognize the right of collective bargaining as usually understood, if you are going to recognize the right of men to strike if they are not satisfied with the conditions of their employment, then you must recognize the right of those who are not satisfied with the recognition

being obtained by others of their craft to strike in sympathy and legislation against sympathetic strikes would not get you anywhere. It would make confusion worse confounded. It would make the unrest greater in Canada in the future than it is to-day. The parts in respect of which the Lemieux Act has failed are not the positive portions of the Act but those parts which say "Thou shalt not." Positive legislation is what is required and while I sympathize with some of the views advanced by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan), I want to urge the Government to be careful not to do something that will make conditions worse than they are to-day, but to do something that will bring employees and employers together, that will recognize the desire of labour for an improved status and that will bring at least harmony out of the discord that prevails in Canada. It is useless to say that this discord is mainly fomented by the foreigner. Vancouver, Victoria, and Calgary, are the homes of the strongest English-speaking groups that you have in any place in Canada and there is no place where the voice of discontent is more loudly heard than in these three cities.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CHARLES GAVIN POWER (Quebec South): For the past two weeks we of His Majesty's loyal Opposition have been content to keep silent while serious events were transpiring throughout the country. This silence of ours has been variously construed. We have been told, and have heard, that we feared to handle the situation. We have been told, too, that our silence may be attributed to our desire to allow the Government to remain embedded in the mire to which its own actions have brought it. But I think I can safely say, and in doing so I am speaking for everybody on this side, that we considered the situation too serious to attempt to inflame the minds of the public whose patience has already been stretched almost to the breaking point, and that we considered it was well to allow the Government ample time and opportunity to propose a solution and to come to a satisfactory settlement of the present unrest. We considered that it was possible for the Government to bring about, by legislation, by arbitration, or by some means, economic and industrial peace in Canada. We have waited, as I have said, two whole weeks, and what has happened? We have the spectre of revolution, which first became apparent two weeks ago, appearing like a hydra-headed monster in dozens of Canadian cities. We have in cities everywhere, from Halifax to Vancouver, with the possible exception of those in the province of Quebec, which I am glad to say are as yet untouched by the prevailing malady, industrial unrest; we have an upheaval such as this Dominion has never seen. And, if we are to believe the reports of the press, anarchy is being openly advocated, revolt is being encouraged, and grim revolution stalks unmolested through the cities of our country.

The time therefore has come for us to face the situation, and I am convinced that we will do so, not in a cowardly, vacillating fashion, but in the manner in which we have for four years faced the issue of war—as men, conscious of our duty, proud of our common heritage and steadfast in our purpose to maintain justice and advance the common welfare.

In order to come to a proper understanding of our situation, it is perhaps well to go back to those first principles which should be the mainspring of any action in the relations between man and man. These relations have become more and more complex as our civilization has advanced, and in modern times we are occasionally at a loss in our endeavours to establish a code for their proper determination; but the principles themselves are as immutable as the laws of nature, as old as the human race, as true to-day as they were when the tablets were delivered to Moses, or when the Saviour of the world delivered his sermon on the Mount.

Applying these principles to the relation of capital and labour, it is possible to enunciate certain truths which are generally admitted. These truths have found their best expression in modern days in an encyclical of His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII, from which I expect to quote at great length. These truths can be summed up somewhat as follows: The condition of the worker is primarily of the utmost concern to the State: He should not be allowed to be exploited by capital as a mere instrument for the making of money; hence it is unjust that the fruits of man's sweat and labour should not belong to him: As a rule it is quite legitimate for the worker and the capitalist to bargain; but there comes a time when, driven by fear, necessity, or otherwise, the labourer finds it im-

possible to make a bargain which will give him sufficient to gain a frugal, honest and honourable living: When that time comes it is the duty of the State to see that the labourer is not oppressed by the capitalist —to enable the employee to make a fair bargain with his employer: Further, the standard of living should not be the minimum at which the worker can keep body and soul together; there should be given to him a wage sufficient to provide him with comfort and recreation, to enable him to educate his family, and to provide against accident, sickness, and old age: To establish this standard, it is essential that the workers unite, for experience teaches us that man is naturally greedy, and the rich and powerful will rarely concede anything to the poor unless coercion is applied: It is the duty of the State, therefore, to foster and encourage such unions when the poor have not the same facilities for protecting themselves as the rich: It is also the duty of the State as much as possible to remove all causes of complaint between employer and employee, to prevent by remedial measures, taken beforehand, any recourse to the strike, which is invariably a great economic loss, in many cases most seriously affecting those not intimately concerned in the struggle, and always leaving rancour and bitterness in its train. It is neither justice nor humanity to grind men down and stunt their minds with labour of their bodies: Daily labour must be regulated so that it is not protracted beyond the strength of the workers. In all agreements between master and workman it is implied that proper leisure be left to the workman for rest, recuperation and recreation.

Now, having laid down these principles, let us examine the present situation. The demands of the men on strike, if I understand them rightly, are somewhat as follows: first, recognition of their unions; second, an eight hour day; third, collective bargaining.

With regard to the first, recognition of the unions, it is so generally admitted that the necessity for argument is scarcely apparent. Besides, I have an Order in Council of July, 1918, in which it is stated:

> That all employees have the right to organize in trade unions, and this right shall not be denied or interfered with in any manner whatsoever, and through their chosen representatives should be permitted and encouraged to negotiate with employers concerning working conditions, rates of pay, or other grievances.

So there is no doubt that the Government acknowledges that the unions are to be recognized.

The second point, the eight-hour day, presents, perhaps, more difficulty. But bearing in mind that the sweating of employees is a most inhuman and immoral act, we have to come to the conclusion that under the strain of modern industrial conditions a man cannot work very much more than one-third of the twenty-four hours. This fact had been scientifically proved before the war; but it became more generally admitted when a commission of the British Government on the health of munition workers found that the efficiency of the labourers was augmented and that their health was better under an eight-hour working day than under a nine-hour or ten-hour working day. Ten hours work was found over-fatiguing and incompatible with the highest efficiency. Further, since the labourer is entitled to a certain time for rest and recreation, we must at least take that time from the ordinary ten hours of work. The members of the American National War Board on July 20, 1918, issued a memorandum on the eight-hour working day, and their conclusion was as follows:

> The way to crime and chaos lies plainly in the exploitation of our men and our women as if they were coal or oil. In our free America there is to be industrial and social freedom. Out of the ferment of unrest there has already begun to come a truer sense of the human values; a better adjustment of law to those values; a keener conscience as to the treatment of those values and the conservation which shall not stop with saving water or wood, but will make its greatest and more fruitful task the conserving of our people themselves.

So that we find it generally admitted in Europe and in America that an eight-hour day increases efficiency, promotes health, and helps towards the happiness of the labourer.

Now I come to what is, perhaps, the most difficult of the demands made by the workmen—that is, collective bargaining. It is generally admitted that unions of any particular craft or trade should be recognized, and should be allowed to bargain with their employers.

But it is not generally admitted that, for instance, the employer of a metal worker can be asked to bargain with regard to the wages of that worker with a typesetter or a carpenter. This is the objection which, I understand, has been voiced by the Winnipeg Citizens' Committee, and also by the

Minister of Labour. If we admit that a worker may bargain collectively in a given trade, I hardly see how we can deny him the right to bargain as a class. We have already granted different classes in this country the right to bargain as a class. Lawyers, for instance, in every province in Canada, have their bar associations or societies, and they not only bargain, but have their bargains, arrangements and fees consecrated by Acts of Parliament. The farmers—and all farmers are not the same kind of farmers, because there are different classes of farmers—are now endeavouring to bargain with the Government with regard to the tariff, although I do not know with how much success. The manufacturers —and there are many different classes of manufacturers—are also endeavouring to bargain collectively with the Government. Therefore, if one class, the farmer class, or barrister class, or manufacturing class, is allowed to bargain as a class collectively, I cannot understand why the labourer should not be allowed to do the same.

As I have already said, capital is invariably greedy of its privileges, it invariably seeks to obtain further privileges; and it can hardly obtain these further privileges except at the expense of the man who produces the capital. Therefore, if we are to remain in the present state; that is to say where one trade bargains with its employer, we might be in such a situation as this. We might find a strike of metal workers, such as we have, in which the employers would win. The strikers would be obliged to return to their work and the increase in wages and the better conditions of labour which they demanded would not be granted. I have no doubt that other capitalists, encouraged by this victory and using the military tactic of destroying one enemy after another, would be very pleased to emulate the victory of the metal men, and, one by one, our trade unions would be destroyed or rendered impotent. I, therefore, hardly think it is possible for us to admit the right of one trade, one craft to strike and not admit the right of all other labourers in the same locality or even in the same country to bargain collectively with regard to their own conditions, providing they have a common interest, and in the class which we have before us there is a common interest. There is a general demand in Canada for an eight-hour day. There is very little more to be said as regards the sympathetic strike. If we admit the principle of collective bargaining, there is absolutely no reason why we should not admit the principle of a sympathetic strike. The same arguments apply in both cases, and if we admit recognition of the unions and collective bargaining, we should admit the principle of sympathetic strikes.

There is a question whether or not we should admit the advisability and the possibility of a strike amongst the servants of the State. By servants of the State, I mean those who serve a Government, whether federal, provincial or municipal. The condition of the worker under the State is somewhat different from that of the worker under the private capitalist. The former is assured, first of all of a permanent position; he receives his wages, and he knows that through political action he may be able to obtain higher wages. I do not think anybody can reasonably object to his striking, but we can all reasonably object to his joining a sympathetic strike. He, after all, is the servant of the people of Canada; he, after all, is administering or operating utilities for the whole of the people of Canada. The postal clerk is delivering the mail; the fireman is putting out fires; the policeman is the bulwark of law and order. The same reasons which apply in favour of allowing a sympathetic strike in other trades apply in favour of prohibiting a strike amongst the servants of the State, because the latter can, by direct political action, increase their salaries, improve their conditions and establish a condition whereby their wishes may be met. The civil servant has not been sweated by the ordinary profiteer; he is the servant of the State, and should things not satisfy him, he has a good weapon in his hand—the ballot. Therefore, we should admit recognition of the union, the eight-hour day, collective bargaining, the right of civil servants to strike, but not the right of civil servants to join a sympathetic strike.

It would, perhaps, be well to examine a little into the causes of the present unrest. There is, I admit, a general world-wide cause. We have just been through the greatest war in history; commerce has been dislocated, and if I may say so, our population has, to a certain extent, been brutalized. We have found that might and force have been the only means whereby justice and humanity have been able to conquer, so that in spite of ourselves we have come to the conclusion that if we are right, we must fight. Therefore, amongst the people of Canada, as amongst other people throughout the world, the feeling has

arisen that we should have no patience; that we should proceed at once to obtain what is ours. This feeling is general, and it is probably brought about by the conditions of the last four years. But we cannot altogether blame on the world-wide war the state of unrest into which our country has been brought. There is no doubt that some time before the war the labouring classes were in a state of ferment. We had strikes; we had threatened strikes; we had unemployment; the conditions of labour were by no means normal.

However, we have found that in the four years of the war the world has advanced probably two or three generations, and that which satisfied the people before the war will satisfy them no longer. We have also found that there has been something wrong with our economic system. To quote a newspaper which I read recently:

> The traditions of law show more respect for property than for the person—more for Capital than for the Labour that makes wealth. This is all wrong. And labour does well to try by every honourable means in its power to procure for itself equal justice. Labour has as good a right as Capital to collective bargaining. Capital is doing it all the time in spite of laws to the contrary. As well might the Kaiser have attempted to dispute the right of the Allies to make Foch their generalissimo, as for capital to dispute allied labourers right to unity of action and collective bargaining.

The world has changed, and we cannot judge men and affairs by the standards which we would have used four or five years ago. To come down to the more particular causes of the strike, we have found, to quote again the same paper, which in turn quotes from one of the Winnipeg papers, I think the Labor News:

> The Government was indifferent to it all. It appointed food controllers who did not control. It recommended titles for profiteers. It muzzled criticism, suppressed free speech, strangled independent newspapers, censored the truth and imprisoned the protesters. It let contracts to its patrons, and so by sharing in the plunder rendered itself impervious to protest and indifferent to need.

We find that the Government of this country, in disregard of our constitution and our traditions issued during some eight or nine months decrees as tyrannical and ukases as evil as ever were issued by the Bolshevik government of Russia or by its predecessor the Czar himself. Order in Council after Order in Council was issued until at last the people decided that they would no longer have any respect for them. The Government considered Parliament useless, Parliament was not summoned in any crisis whatsoever, but an Order in Council was passed; and, whether right or wrong, the result was always the same—to bring into still greater disrepute the law and constitution of our country.

The policy of the Government with regard to the labour situation has been weak and vacillating. It reminds me of nothing so much as the policy of the last king of France before the Revolution, who, when the revolutionists were crying at the gates of his palace, was one moment for granting them a National Assembly and the next, for sending the ring-leaders to the Bastille. It might be likened also to the policy of the Czar just before the revolution, when one moment he was for summoning the Duma, and the next for letting loose the most reactionary elements in that country. And so with the Government of this country. In July, 1918, a set of pious ejaculations were issued by the late lamented Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). We were told what the relations of capital and labour ought to be. The capitalist was told to be good, the labour man was told to be good, we were all told to be good; but no solution was found for the difficulty. Still later, after a trip West of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) an Order in Council was issued on October 11, 1918, in which it was decreed:

> Any male person, employer or employee, of military age, as defined by the Military Service Act, who violates any of the regulations abovementioned shall be subject to the military law for the duration of the present war and demobilization thereafter, and shall forfeit any exemption granted him and any right to obtain exemption under the Military Service Act.

As hon. gentlemen will remember, that raised a storm of protest throughout the country, and on the 2nd of November the Order in Council was amended. Later on, when we were still in the period of demobilization, an Order in Council was issued on November 19, 1919, repealing the previous Orders in Council and providing:

> That the Government is informed that concerted movements are now under way on the part of employers and workmen respectively which aim at improved relations as between employers and workmen, and looking to the elimination, so far as may be practicable, of lockouts and strikes in connection with industrial disputes.

I am very glad the Government was informed of that, and I would have been still more glad had their hopes been well founded. Unfortunately, shortly after this pronouncement from the Government, the unrest became acute, culminating in the present strikes at Winnipeg, Vancouver and elsewhere.

We have, therefore, as one of the proximate causes of the present unrest the diffi-

culty which the Government has found in demobilization. I do not intend to go into this question at any great length. Many theories have been advanced as to whether demobilization should proceed more rapidly or more slowly, but we have found this: The Government, despite all its agencies—its employment agencies, its land settlement scheme, its war-service gratuity scheme, and even its pension scheme—has been unable to find work for the returned soldier, and unable to provide for the dislocation of industry consequent on the armistice. The Government have been unable in any way to prevent or forestall the unrest which it was patent to any one of us would follow the conclusion of the war.

The cost of living has been going up by leaps and bounds, and there has been no attempt to prevent or control it on the part of the Government. I do not wish to tire the House by quoting the figures of the percentage of rise for all the countries in the world, but I might mention the increase that has taken place since 1914 in the following countries: United Kingdom, 120 per cent; France, 137 per cent; Sweden, 220 per cent; Canada, 84 per cent; United States, 75 per cent. One hon. gentleman stated today that in New Zealand the cost of living had gone up higher than my figures show, but if my figures are correct, and I have reason for thinking so, the cost of living in New Zealand in October, 1918, had increased only 42 per cent. So it will be seen that the increase in the cost of living in Canada has been exceeded only in European countries subject to blockade conditions. Compared with all other countries except these the increase in the cost of living in Canada is by far the highest.

It has increased considerably more than in the United States. There is twice the increase suffered by New Zealand and nearly two and-a-half times that in Australia. In one paper it is stated:

> For four years our Government has permitted and even fostered one of the most nefarious following now to become organized into a band of middlemen, which is as great a curse upon the country as the cold storage octopus. It has an army of agents running wild through the country buying up everything in and out of sight upon the farms, giving the farmers such fabulous prices that it not only unsettles and sometimes prevents them from taking advantage of the normal rise in prices, but they themselves are admitting that the produce is not worth the prices that they are being sold for in the city of Quebec.

The excuse is that there is a shortage of food in Europe. If there is a shortage of food in Europe, where there is revolution and strife, is that any reason why we should export more of our surplus and create the same labour unrest at home? Would it not be better to take the bull by the horns and bring down the high cost of living by spending millions immediately in building cold storage houses and controlling the farmers' produce, so that there may be normal prices, only charging sufficient commission to pay the working expenses of the cold storage plants? Then, again, can we not make a law to imprison the dishonest promoter and speculator by making it an offence punishable by imprisonment for middlemen to engage in speculation?

There is another reason for this general unrest. I think the Government is, to some extent at least, responsible for it. The wealthy people of Canada have not been judicious in the manner in which they have enjoyed their wealth. It is said:

> The wage-earner is measuring his income against the evidences of luxury, advertisements of ladies' dresses at prices that have to support a family for a year, and not too much of them at that. Gentlemen's neckties at from five to fifteen dollars, and all else in proportion—goods whose commendation evidently is their dearness. Daily appear such appeals to fashion luxury in the newspapers as might well be called immoral in their encouragement to ungainly waste. Meantime, the wage-earner reads with rage of millions made out of war necessities, and of one claim upon the government, that he has to support, for eighteen million dollars, which a contractor would have made had his product not been rejected. He stands aghast at such figures, and, in his corporate capacity of trades unionist, he rebels against it. Here is the way the Winnipeg worker sees it: "During all these fearful years the rich became richer and the poor poorer, and with the increase of wealth the arrogance of the wealthy increased. Their wealth did not make them more beneficent. It made them mad for still more wealth. They became more and more callous and indifferent to the needs of the masses."

I charge the Government with responsibility, even though indirect, for this condition of things, in that they allowed this profiteering. They allowed great wealth to be made in munitions and in the sale of supplies to our Allies, and people made wealthy through the instrumentality of the Government used their wealth most injudiciously. We have been told that we have in this country a very undesirable element—the Bolsheviki—and that in Winnipeg this element is in control. I am not fully apprised of all the circumstances of the strike in Winnipeg, but so far as I can see there is little on the part of the labour men except a just and legitimate claim of labour to enjoy the fruits of its labour and to enjoy better conditions. But it is be-

coming the habit in this country to designate every one a Bolshevist with whom we cannot agree. This is a very old failing of the Tory party. For centuries any one who opposed the Tory party was always hailed as the Bolshevist of that day. I remember having read in my history of England of Lord Russell and Sydney having been called Whigs. They were hanged for saying and, indeed, for believing, that the King was not King by divine right. They were the Bolshevists of those days. And the Roundheads, the Puritans, were the Bolshevists of the day of Charles I and Charles II, because they dared to insinuate that the immorality and the bestiality of the courts of England of that time were not conducive to the proper government of the people of England. Later on people were condemned to the dungeons for being Liberals. Then it became a byword of reproach to call a man a Radical. We have learned a lot from the early Radicals, and we have learned a lot even from our own Radicals. Had it not been for the Liberals and the Radicals of this country we should not at the present time be enjoying responsible government. Men of the Family Compact in Ontario, I presume, called William Lyon Mackenzie a Radical; and yet, were it not for William Lyon Mackenzie, I doubt whether we would be sitting here in this Parliament to-day. Again, men in Quebec who denied responsible government to the people of Quebec and Lower Canada, called Louis Joseph Papineau a Radical and drove him into exile. But had Louis Joseph Papineau and those associated with him not taken the stand which they took, I am very doubtful whether there would be responsible government in that province and whether we would be sitting here to-day. Later on still, the same attitude was held in regard to those whose views were different from the policies of the party in power, particularly the Tory party, and such persons were called Socialists. Yet we have taken a great deal from the Socialists. The present Government, Tory and all as it is, has adopted the naturalization of railways, something which thirty, forty or fifty years ago would have been considered extreme socialism. To come to our own day and to the present moment, any one who seems to oppose the Government is promptly described as a Bolshevist. Well, Mr. Speaker, if opposition to the Government, and if a desire to establish the rights of labour, and a wish to have it understood once for all that we in this country are opposed to anything which will rob labour of its dignity and nobility, is Bolshevism, then Sir, I am willing to be called a Bolshevist. But if Bolshevism means the subversion of all authority; if it means anarchy; and if it means the government of the country by one class alone; lastly, if it means, as we have been told it does in Russia, the nationalization of women and the murder of all those who are opposed to the theories held by certain sections of the people, then undoubtedly I am opposed to it. And I think you will find that in expressing this opinion I am voicing the views of most of those who have seen service at the front. The ordinary returned soldier has been a labourer, and was such before the war and during the war. I should say, without having the exact figures at my disposal, that before the war fully 20 per cent of the army consisted of wage earners; and further that 60 to 75 per cent were those who worked with their hands as day labourers. These men cannot be expected to become strike breakers. You cannot expect them to lose sympathy with their fellow workers. You cannot expect them to enter into competition with the men at present engaged in manual labour. You cannot expect them in any way to help the capitalist, whom to a large extent they blame for the late war. You cannot expect them to give up their own comrades and to put their services at the disposal of any person who has in view the victory of capital over labour.

He also knows what the promises of the Government are. He has been promised a great deal and given very little. He has his own troubles with them in connection with demobilization, pensions and gratuities and I consider that he is more apt to side with the worker than with the capitalist.

Having said all this, I think the least I should do is to suggest a remedy. A remedy would be to grant the demands of the strikers in so far as an eight-hour day and collective bargaining are concerned. In regard to the civil servants, if they do not want to go back to work, put somebody else in their places. In regard to the undesirable elements which we have in the country, or which I am told we have, if they are undesirable, if their theories and actions are such that we find that the free air of Canada does not suit them, let us deport them. Let us deport them whether they come from the slums of Warsaw, from the ghettos of Rome, or whether they be the cockney off-scourings of Whitechapel or the dock rats of Liverpool. It matters not who they are, if they are undesirable citizens; I do not care where they come from; they are not fit to remain in

our country. We had been led to believe until to-day that this undesirable element in Western Canada was the foreign element. We find now that the leaders of the Winnipeg strike are not of the foreign element but are British born—the British born that we heard so much about a few years ago. If these men are not satisfied with the laws of our country as they are at present administered; if they are not satisfied with our manners and customs, deport them. I would like to quote from a little pamphlet entitled "Social Reconstruction —A General Review of the Problems and Survey of Remedies." It is signed by such a conservative body the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States. They say:

> The labourer must come to realize that he owes his employer and society an honest day's work in return for a fair wage, and that conditions cannot be substantially improved until he roots out the desire to get a maximum of return for a minimum of service. The capitalist must likewise get a new viewpoint. He needs to learn the long-forgotten truth that wealth is stewardship, that profit-making is not the basic justification of business enterprise, and that there are such things as fair profits, fair interest and fair prices. Above and before all, he must cultivate and strengthen within his mind the truth which many of his class have begun to grasp for the first time during the present war; namely, that the labourer is a human being, not merely an instrument of production; and that the labourer's right to a decent livelihood is the first moral charge upon industry. The employer has a right to get a reasonable living out of his business, but he has no right to interest on his investment until his employees have obtained at least living wages. This is the human and Christian, in contrast to the purely commercial and pagan, ethics of industry.

In conclusion, I have confidence in the Canadian workman. I have seen the Canadian workman in more difficult circumstances than those of to-day. I remember well the circumstances under which I saw the Canadian workman two years ago to-day when our trenches from Hooge to Mount Sorrel had been completely wiped out. I saw the Canadian workmen counter-attack in broad daylight and in the face of numerous machine guns they never faltered. They carried on until there was hardly a man of them left and although they did not take the position on the first day they tried again and again and within two weeks every inch of the trench lost on the 2nd of June, every gun and every trench instrument that had been taken, were once more in the hands of the Canadian workman. Bearing that in mind I have no doubt that the man who was able to do that under those circumstances will be able to make arrangements whereby he will see to it that he works for the greater prosperity and greater benefit of this country.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, the subject of debate does not concern directly any of the departments of the Administration for which I am just now responsible, but inasmuch as for the moment the seat of chief disturbance is in the province from which I come, and inasmuch as I had something to do with the study of the situation on the ground, I venture to intervene in the debate. The motion of my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) will have served a good end if it succeeds in throwing some light upon the age-long problem of the relations between capital and labour —and it can do no more than throw some light upon it—or if it succeeds in bringing into relief, and enabling us to study at close range, the difficult and concrete conditions under which that problem has taken acute form in Winnipeg and various cities of the country. It is wholly beyond hope that by any consideration this Parliament can give to it in any single debate, we can make any substantial progress towards a solution of the world-wide problem of labour and capital. But perhaps it is not impossible that some ideas and principles may more clearly emerge whether merely precautionary, as were those with which the excellent speech delivered by the
9 p.m. hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) was replete, or whether of constructive positive policy, of which, I fear, so far every speech has been barren. In the struggle between labour and capital the history of the past has been the advance of the cause of labour, and the history of the future will be the same. No one can read the progress of the past or the signs of the times aright who is not prepared to admit that to the labourer belongs a larger, and ever larger, share of the product of his labour. Whenever legislation interferes it must be on behalf of the man behind. But merely stating a general principle like that does not lead us far in the consideration of any specific administrative acts that we can apply to the conditions that exist in this country.

The first thing necessary is to know the conditions that do exist and the causes that brought them about—what they are, and how far any general principle can be applied thereto. A general strike was declared in the city of Winnipeg on the 15th day of last month. Previous to that on the 10th day of the same month a strike had been

declared on the part of the employees of three concerns—the Dominion Bridge Company, the Manitoba Bridge and Iron Company, and the Vulcan Iron Works—of the city of Winnipeg.

The dispute between the employees of those companies and the companies was a dispute as to what part, if any, should be taken by a body of men elected by certain branches of labour known as the Metal Trades Council in the determination of the conditions of labour in the shops of those three concerns. It is commonly said in Winnipeg, and has often been repeated here, that the principle of collective bargaining was the principle upon which the two sides to that initial dispute split. In one sense that may possibly be correct, but a mere statement like that leads us nowhere, because collective bargaining in the form described by many members has never been denied, and is not claimed to have been denied, by any of the three companies who are taking part in this dispute.

Collective bargaining on the part of all three had been their practice for some time; so much so that one at all events, and I think all of them, had adopted the habit of each week consulting with shop committees of their men as to conditions in the factory, as to improvements that might be made, as to hours of labour and wages. That is to say the principle of collective bargaining had been applied, insofar as collective bargaining was constituted by the negotiations between any single concern and the employees of that concern as a body. That fact admits of no dispute.

On the other hand, however, it was contended on the part of the Metal Trades Council, which is affiliated with, or indeed a constituent part of the Trades and Labour Council of the city of Winnipeg, that a bargain made between the collective employees of a concern and that concern, should not stand as a bargain until it was ratified by the Metal Trades Council. To that the employers in each case objected. They placed their objections on the ground that the Metal Trades Council was constituted by men elected by bodies and by crafts who in large degree had no part in and had no relation to any craft engaged by them; on the further grounds that the Metal Trades Council as constituted was composed very largely of men elected by the Metal Trades of the railway companies, and that conditions that might obtain in the shops of the railway companies could not possibly apply to conditions in the competitive shops of the other companies, inasmuch as the one had to compete in the markets and the other had not. However, it will be realized at a glance that there was a margin between the two sides to the controversy. There was a "No Man's Land" between. Collective bargaining by the employees in a single concern was not accepted as collective bargaining by the Metal Trades Council, nor by the Trades and Labour Council of the city. The employers, on the other hand, refused to extend, temporarily at all events, the principle of collective bargaining. They did, however, later agree that upon the establishment of anything in the nature of an organization between the employers themselves they would then be prepared to deal collectively with the united employees of the three concerns, or with a body of craftsmen of the description of those engaged by the three concerns, though there might be included outside parties not actually engaged by those concerns themselves.

It is only fair to those who went on strike to say that at the time the strike had been declared there was, so far as I know, no concession made of the willingness of the employers to negotiate otherwise than collectively with the employees of the three concerns respectively. Now in this relation it should be known at this stage, that in the opinion of the Minister of Labour the conception of collective employment, as entertained by the employers in that case was somewhat too narrow. It was equally and very decidedly his opinion that the conception of collective employment, as contended for on the part of the Metal Trades Council, was so wide as to be impracticable and dangerous to the cause of labour itself. It is the opinion of the Minister of Labour that where there is an organization of employers, then it is the duty of that organization to deal collectively, not only with the united body of their own employees, but with at least single crafts and unions of employees, consisting not merely of their workmen but of men in the same trade or craft though employed by others.

The point at issue mainly is this, and the reason I will explain as I pass along: The employees contended that the Metal Trades Council should be supreme, that they should have the right of imprimatur and ratification of all engagements entered into by the employees of any concern with the management of that concern and the Metal Trades Council as constituted undoubtedly held within its personnel representatives of crafts that have nothing to do with the crafts engaged by the three concerns affected.

Now there are other elements in the controversy of which it is well that Parliament should have full knowledge. The Government of the province, chiefly through the spokesmanship of the Premier, had made strenuous endeavours to effect a reconciliation. In the course of its endeavours meetings were held and a proposal was made that everything in dispute, and the main thing was the principle of collective bargaining, because on the part of one at all events arrangements had really been arrived at between the employers and the employed, but had been refused ratification by the Metal Trades Council—a proposal was made that all the matters in dispute be referred to a board of arbitration, the personnel of which should be five, and all selected by the Prime Minister of the province. That was not concurred in on the part of the strikers. Then later on, and before the general strike—before the 15th day of May, when the general strike was declared—the Premier requested from the Trades and Labour Council, or the Metal Trades Council, I am not sure which and it does not make any difference—yes, he requested of the Trades and Labour Council, to know whether or not, if the principle of collective bargaining on the part of the Metal Trades Council were conceded by the employers the general strike would still take place, and to that request he received a negative reply. As to that there is no dispute, there can be no dispute. The general strike took place in the face of the denial of the president of the Trades and Labour Council—in the face rather of his assertion that it would take place whether or not collective bargaining on the part of the Metal Trades Council was acknowledged as a sound principle by the employers. Whether or not it would have been so acknowledged I cannot say, but at all events the contingency of its being acknowledged was refused on the part of the president of the Trades and Labour Council as sufficient to ward off the general strike. As a result the general strike took place. The industry of the city of Winnipeg was for the time being paralyzed; public services were placed in a state of tie-up, and Winnipeg was virtually in a condition of isolation and siege.

Now, in discussing the inner principle of a general strike, and the rightness and the soundness of the action of a sympathetic strike, it is well to consider where action of that kind is bound to lead. It led in Winnipeg, as I say, to a general paralysis of the whole industrial structure of the city. It led to a denial of the necessities of life to the people of that city, even to the strikers themselves.

And as a consequence inevitably it led to the establishment of a separate Government—or better, assertion of governmental functions on the part of those in charge of the strike itself. And why? Because it could not lead anywhere else. A general strike ties up all industries and all activities, and denies to all parts and elements of the community the service of the necessities of life, not only public service but each and every ministration, the delivery of bread, the distribution of milk, the circulation of water—indeed all things that are necessary for the protection and preservation of life. As a consequence, and in order that the strikers might themselves exist, they had to exercise control over the distribution of the necessities of life; they had to appropriate to themselves public services to which all the people had contributed; they had to declare that the public services were their property for the time being and could be used for their benefit alone. And they did so declare, and upon that declaration they acted. They had to declare, furthermore, that there should be such a distribution of water by which they themselves should be served, but by which many others should not be served at all; that there should be a distribution of the milk of the city, that whom they nominated should be provided but that the general public should be denied; they were further bound to declare that the very bread of life should be distributed to such as were named by them, but that it should be refused to all others within the compass of the city of Winnipeg.

Those pretensions are an assertion of governmental authority. But the strike leaders were driven to make them if they were to continue effectively anything in the nature of a general strike. Consequently I say it is proved by the example of Winnipeg, and indeed follows inevitably from the very logic of the situation, that a general strike to succeed or, indeed, to continue, must result in the usurpation of governmental authority on the part of those controlling the strike. It did so result in Winnipeg; it must ever so result.

When that stage was reached, when that object lesson confronted the citizenship of Winnipeg, that citizenship was aroused and became organized, and as a consequence of that organization and of the united front it presented there was a rapid retirement on the part of those controlling the strike from the position of governmental authority

that they had assumed, and consequently and inevitably there was a reduction in the general strike itself, because the leaders could not continue the strike as an effective general strike without the maintenance at the same time of the exercise of the functions of Government. That is why in the last ten days the strike has not assumed the proportions and has not involved the hardship that it did in the early days of the struggle.

A sympathetic strike is, of course, essential if a general strike is to take place. A sympathetic strike is a strike on the part of a class of labour, based not upon any grievance of its own, but founded entirely upon sympathy for those involved in another quarrel. Hon. gentlemen opposite and also, I think, some hon. gentlemen on this side, have approved the principle of the sympathetic strike. Now, I do not want it to be assumed from what I shall say that there is any statutory office this Parliament can fill with regard to sympathetic strikes—at all events, any useful statutory office; there is, however, a function that any Government can exercise in this Dominion, and that is by making known where it stands on this question, and why it stands where it stands, and let that have its influence by way of conciliation, or by way of moral constraint.

Now, what I am arguing is that the sympathetic strike almost necessarily involves the violation of contracts. A union itself is based upon the principle of collective bargaining. A union cannot effect its purpose unless it can bargain as a union, and make its engagement with an employer or combination of employers. In a word, one of the principal functions of a union is to make an engagement on behalf of its constituents with the employer concerned. If, having made any such engagement it is to be free to break it by reason of the quarrels of others, then of what value is the engagement? As a result we found in the city of Winnipeg the remarkable spectacle of men in the city by the hundred, yes, I believe by the thousand, who were on strike, as they claimed, for the principle of collective bargaining, and who at the same moment were declaring that any bargain on their part had no validity at all. In one breath they were saying: A collective bargain must be acknowledged on the part of the employers in this city. In the next breath they were saying: No bargain, collective or otherwise, has any force with us at all. Indeed they themselves were violating a collective bargain which they had made in one case only some few weeks before.

Now, it must be clear to hon. members that if the principle of the sympathetic strike, resulting in a general strike, is to be sound, then there can be no such thing as the sacredness of contracts—there can be no attribute of a bargain that would make a collective bargain of any value whatsoever. Therefore, I say that the Minister of Labour is sound and right when he declares that while a strike may be just when the balance of merit is on the side of the strikers, there is nothing that can justify a sympathetic strike in breach of a bargain; and there is nothing at any time that can justify a general strike involving upon the whole innocent community, the paralysis of industry, and the denial of the necessities of life.

In that condition of affairs we found Winnipeg when we visited it last week. We found at the same time a tremendous volume of public opinion well aroused and determined that assertion of government authority on the part of the strike leaders —or on the part of any one else—as opposed to the constituted authority of the country, should be at no time acknowledged by the people of Winnipeg. And the citizens of Winnipeg in taking that position have rendered a service not only to their own city and province, but to this entire Dominion. They have shown an example to the citizens of this country that the body of sensible opinion in Canada can and will set its face decidedly and effectively against anything in the nature of a general strike—anything in the nature of a soviet or any other form of government inconsistent with constituted authority.

I do not think it is necessary for me to bring written evidence of the assumption of soviet or other irresponsible authority further than the facts that I have adduced as to the declaration of right, and indeed, the acting upon that declaration of right to control the distribution of the necessities of life. But if further evidence were needed all one has to do is to look up the columns of the Labour News of that city and read the statements of the strike leaders themselves, who openly declared that they were in control and intended to continue in control, although they said they intended to do so without bloodshed and without force. Just as if the whole principle of government of this country could be overturned without bloodshed and without force! But

it is apparent from a perusal of that paper that the strike leaders for a time believed themselves to be in possession of governmental power and were determined to exercise it, but were faced by an overpowering concentration of public opinion against which they could not avail.

Furthermore, the opinion had taken permanent root in that city that the issue that had given rise to the strike on the part of the employees of the three concerns was no longer the main or the present issue to be decided; that it had been swallowed up in a far greater issue, just as if a man or a class of men, in determining that they should assert a privilege of their own, had burned a city in reaching out for that privilege. Therefore, they said: Those who are fighting here for some form of collective bargaining have, to ensure the success of their claim, taken steps that are inconsistent with constituted Government, and they have raised an issue that entirely overshadows the first issue on which they went out on strike, an issue that must be decided once and for all before we return to weighing and determining the merits of the first cause of quarrel. In that position, I submit the citizens of Winnipeg were right.

It was essential that the greater issue raised by the assumption of Soviet authority—and it was nothing less on the part of those in control of the strike in the city of Winnipeg—should be once and for all decided and be decisively beaten down before they should concern themselves with the smaller and much less important issue upon which certain men had originally gone on strike. That is the stand the citizens of Winnipeg took. That is the stand the Minister of Labour took, and I leave it to the House whether or not he acted in the interests of this country in taking that stand as determinedly as he did. In that position the matter rests to-day.

We found as well that about 450 employees of the city post office about 180 of whom were letter-carriers and the rest postal clerks, had joined in the sympathetic strike, and in violation, as we claimed and I think rightly, of their oaths of office, had deserted their posts, and as a result the postal service, a necessary public service, was out of existence. What action should have been taken under those circumstances? Inasmuch as the strike on their part was on a sympathetic footing and nothing more; inasmuch as within only a few weeks before representatives of those men had, in writing, assured the Government of the satisfactory treatment of their grievances; inasmuch as they had gone out without notice and without cause, we decided that some time should be given to them to return and that with the approval of the Government on the expiration of that time their positions should be vacant if they failed to return and they should be no longer employed in the public service. As a result of the announcement of that decision which appeared in the issue of the Morning Press of Saturday, the 24th May, there returned on the morning of the 26th, I think, 70 of those employees. On the morning of the 26th May returning employees were harangued by the Rev. Mr. Ivens on the one hand and Mr. Winning, President of the Trades and Labour Council on the other, who standing respectively in the rear and in the front of the office tried to persuade the returning men that they should hold back; that the decision of the Government was nothing more than a hoax or a bluff, and with all the force of their oratory—and it has some quality—they endeavoured to make the men hold fast against constituted authority and stand in full allegiance to the strike leaders instead of to the public of this country. Had it not been for that, I doubt not that more would have returned. The business, however, of this Government was to see to it that all desiring should have free access to the office; that no physical impediment and no threats should deter them, and that duty was fully carried out on the part of the officers of the Government. No man was deterred, no man was intimidated; all had free and full privilege of returning to work, and not doing so, the promise of the Government was implemented, and at twelve o'clock on the 26th May all who did not return, about 380 in number, lost their positions in the service of Canada and shall not be further employed.

Concurrently with the action of the Dominion Government in this regard, the Provincial Government took precisely similar action with regard to the telephone employees and their decision took effect also at exactly the same hour. The city of Winnipeg has since taken similar, although not wholly similar, action with regard to its employees. As a consequence, it is only the truth to say that the force of the general strike in the city of Winnipeg has been very largely broken; business has been restored, not to normal, but to something approaching normal level. At all events, the conditions of life are tolerable, but the attitude of mind of the citizens remains still, in my belief, adamant that nothing

but defeat and complete defeat shall attend the efforts of men who dare to assert the authority of Government and who in doing so bring hardship on the whole community in order that they might win in a quarrel between certain employees and certain employers. The strike about that time and since has extended to some other cities in Canada, strikes not altogether related to that in Winnipeg, although in many cases related. Wherever in those strikes, the public service has been demoralized, the attitude taken by the Government and the policy adopted has been the same as it was in the city of Winnipeg. We have notified all concerned that if they engage in those strikes on a sympathetic basis—and there is no other—they thereby resign their posts in the public service and they are not further to be employed. That has taken effect in Calgary, and in the city of Winnipeg some 109 railway mail clerks went out on strike after I left, but all returned within the twenty-four hours' time given to them by the Minister of Labour for that purpose. They had not been warned in the same way as postal clerks in other cities, and that being the case, it was deemed fair that a reasonable time should be given to them, so they were allowed 24 hours, and all returned within the 24 hours.

We felt it necessary that the Government of the country should be well advised as to the exact facts connected with the extraordinary circumstances obtaining in that city. The telegraph was more or less denied; communication with the city was very limited; it was impossible at this distance to gauge not only what were the exact facts in dispute and the merits of the various classes that went out on strike, but the state of public opinion in that city in order to enable us to know whether or not we could supply voluntary effort to take the place of the strikers; whether or not public opinion was sufficiently aroused and seized of all the facts to back up the Government and enable it to carry out a policy of replacing those strikers by voluntary workers for the time and by permanent substitutes at the expiration of a fixed period. Consequently, it was visited by members of the Government and a survey was made of the whole situation. Men representing the strikers were taken into conference fully and at length. All they had to say, everything they had to urge, was heard sympathetically on the part of the representatives of the Government. For, let me say here: If there stands in Canada to-day a man who represents in fullest sympathy the cause of labour and labour organizations and labour unions, it is the Minister of Labour; a man who has undoubtedly the confidence of labour and labour organizations in this Dominion, and a man who, in my judgment, having had some opportunity to study closely the circumstances has to-day the confidence even of most of the strikers in the city of Winnipeg.

I have argued that the sympathetic strike cannot at all events become general, and in the main cannot take place, unless we concede the right to the violation of solemn contracts. I have argued further that the general strike cannot take place unless it is to be followed by an assumption of governmental power on the part of the leaders of the strike, who have no constituted responsible authority.

Let me carry that argument a little further, because what I want to impress upon the House is this: There is not in this dispute any question at all about the recognition of the right to labour unions; none whatsoever. No man can give a moment's thought to the circumstances and pretend to argue that the question of the recognition of labour unions is an issue in any degree at all; it is not an issue. The question as to the form of collective bargaining is in part an issue, and there may be merit on one side and merit on the other. In the opinion of the Minister of Labour there is demerit on the part of both, and some merit on the part of each, but no one can argue that the right to labour unions was involved in this strike. What shall be the form of collective bargaining was in the first place an issue. It was superseded after by a far greater, and a far graver issue that is now being fought out and decided; but for the time being it was an issue. What I want to impress upon the House is this: If collective bargaining is to be granted as a principle—and it is granted as a principle, as hon. gentlemen say, in other countries as well as in this—then there must be some unit to which the principle of collective bargaining is to apply, and beyond which it cannot go. It cannot for one moment be argued merely because collective bargaining is to be acknowledged that there shall be an unlimited and heterogeneous collection of all classes of labour that may get together ad infinitum and then say to employers or to any class of employers "You must bargain with us and cannot come to a decision unless with us." If that is to take place then not only

the Metal Trades Council of the city of Winnipeg, composed of crafts that are in no way concerned or employed by the employers in the dispute, can itself bargain as to conditions and wages with many of its members, even the majority of its members, have nothing at all to do therewith, but the Trades and Labour Council of the city of Winnipeg may also do the same, and you might extend it right on and on until you would have every organization of labour in the Dominion united and all exerting their united influence in every dispute that might occur. Can any one contemplate such an event? Can anyone contemplate that such an event could possible exist concurrently with responsible government by the people? Are we to have on the one hand a concentration of employers, and on the other hand a concentration of all the labour interests of the Dominion, fighting it out for supremacy? Collective bargaining, unless you bring it down to some unit, is bound to reach that end. If you are going to have a combination of all organizations of labour in the Dominion taking part in and determining the event of every dispute as to labour conditions and wages here, there, and at any other point, why then you have the perfection of Bolshevism. It would be nothing less. You would have an organization that could hold aloft the weapon of the strike or any other weapon—could hold that weapon aloft in majesty and dictate and read out to the rest of this country the conditions of life itself. Can any one find fault with the reasoning that leads to that conclusion?

All I say in this: Collective bargaining is sound, but a unit must be found towards which the principle of collective bargaining is to apply and beyond which it must not go. Otherwise, you lead inevitably to a concentration of labour on the one hand, and of capital on the other, to a condition of dictation on the one hand and subordination on the other, whichever it may be, and to the complete elimination of governmental authority, because under those conditions it could not subsist. A general strike would then mean a paralysis of the activities of the entire Dominion, and indeed it might extend beyond the nation itself. Therefore, let me repeat, you must come to some unit, whatever it may be when you apply the principle of collective bargaining.

What should the Government have done that it has not done? I remarked early in my address that we had had nothing in the way of constructive suggestion. It is true that the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) prefaced his speech by the assertion, in language of which he is a master, that by our long career of errors and blunders and disasters this Government had brought about the terrible condition of affairs that he says now presents itself, but, no doubt out of affection for the Administration, he mercifully refrained from even mentioning any of these blunders or errors.

Mr. JACOBS: It would take too long.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would not take too long to mention one, and I am not in such a hurry that I would not give the honourable gentleman a chance to mention one just now.

Mr. JACOBS: I will in a few moments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the safer course I will give the honourable gentleman a chance to name them all in a few moments, and I hope he will support what he says. It is true that the honourable member from Kamouraska ended by a pitiful appeal to the Government to do something—something— he knew not what. The honourable member for South Quebec (Mr. Power) also seemed to think we could in some way reduce the high cost of living by taking the bull by the horns. Outside of these two admirable suggestions, I am afraid the afternoon has passed without any recommendation being offered, except indeed a word of practical caution on the part of the mover and of the honourable member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle).

The Government of this country is peculiarly responsible for the administration of the public service to the best advantage of the people of this country. Is there any step we could have taken with relation to the public service that we did not take? It is argued on the part of some that there was a failure to implement promises made last summer to the post office employees. There was no failure at all. I had something to do with the settlement of that strike last summer. With all my limitations, and I know they are many, I ventured to act as a conciliator, and some way or other I had some success. Every promise I made was carried out to fulfilment. I said that if they should return to work I would recommend pay while out, that all should be accepted back, and that immediately the Civil Service Commission should sit upon the determination of their grievances, but that I could not recommend an increase by

way of bonus or otherwise without the authority of the Civil Service Commission. Not only were all these promises implemented, but under the special circumstances which were revealed here, a bonus was granted. Consequently, no fault can be brought home to the Administration that has the remotest relation to the strike on the part of the members of the public service that has taken place in the city of Winnipeg. Furthermore, whatever one might argue in that regard the strikers themselves by their action put any such argument by the board because they openly and frankly declared that they struck out of sympathy with the metal workers of that city, and in order, as they thought, to establish the principle of collective bargaining.

Now I am not here to argue as to what should be the change, if any, in the law with regard to strikes. That should first be considered collectively by the Administration, if any change indeed can be suggested. But I do wish to impress this upon the House: that the authority under our Federal constitution of the Dominion Government or of the Dominion Parliament with relation to the settlement of strikes is limited—very limited indeed.

Whether or not it is best that the precise division of responsibility that now constitutionally exists should have existed, or should continue to exist, I do not say. But the fact is that it does exist. It is fixed by the law and constitution of this country, and it is well that all should understand where that division is. The determination of civil rights in this Dominion is in the hands of provincial legislatures and those alone. The relations between employers and employed as to hours of labour, conditions of toil, and so forth, are relations of civil rights, and as such are beyond the jurisdiction of the Parliament of this Dominion. The habit has grown of following a plain assertion of truth of this kind by the comment that it is passing the buck to another; but the buck can never lie at the feet of those who are constitutionally incompetent to move it. Truth lies on one side or the other. Why should we not face it? I am making no complaint as to failure of any provincial authority to intervene or establish different relationships between employers and employed. That is another question altogether. On authority of the officers of the Crown, that power is not ours, and consequently we cannot exercise it, and should not be complained of for not indulging in the exercise of an authority which we have no power to make effective. We could, it is true, by constituting the employment of labour, say, beyond a certain number of hours per day, a criminal offense, assert and assume jurisdiction. But it is going pretty far to ask the Parliament of Canada, especially as respects employers and employees in private concerns, to say that a certain act on the part of these concerns is a crime, before any provincial legislature has decided that the prevention of it is a civil obligation. Laws regarding hours of labour in certain classes of workers have been passed by some, I think by all, provincial legislatures of the Dominion. Laws upon that subject generally, upon conditions of labour, child labour, women labour, hours of labour in general, have been passed by provincial legislatures almost times without number and are clearly within their jurisdiction and competency. Laws of that nature are not within our jurisdiction unless we choose to make a certain deed, which is not perhaps at all an offence against civil law, and which is not denied as a matter of civil right, a criminal offense. It would scarcely be suggested that we should take that course. Therefore, let it be clear that as respects a general law for the reduction of the hours of labour in this Dominion the problem, for the present at all events, is one for the provincial legislatures. Furthermore as to a general law setting up and enforcing the principle of collective bargaining, that itself is also a matter in regard to which the function of the Dominion Government can not be directory but conciliatory and advisory alone. We could not by specific legislation declare and make it an obligation of an employer or set of employers to adopt the principle of collective bargaining. All we can do in that regard is to say where we stand on the subject—where the Department of Labour stands and what is its advice and to press that advice by way of conciliation whereever it can do good. Having done that, our powers are exhausted so far as these subjects are concerned.

Now, in a general study of the whole problem, while I think all hon. members will agree that the whole tendency has been and will be an addition to labour of its share in the product of industry, the part that any single country can play at any one time in the solution of that problem is very limited indeed. No single nation, no single industrial national unit, can advance appreciably beyond the general line of the industry of the

world. The industrial units of the single nation must compete in world trade with the industrial units of others, and handicaps cannot be put upon them which will unduly or disastrously militate against them in that competition. If such is done all will suffer—employers and employed. Subject to that consideration, it seems to me the duty of Parliament and of Governments, provincial and federal, is to see to it that labour conditions are ameliorated and that labour hours are reduced, because unquestionably with the multiplication and increased efficiency of machinery all the wants of mankind can be supplied without anything in the nature of oppressive toil. Unquestionably, by a much shorter day than has obtained in times gone by we can get along in this world and have all the legitimate wants of mankind supplied; and I say that it is the duty of legislatures and of Governments to make it possible, and indeed to make it imperative so far as lies in their and our constitutional powers, that the hours of labour be shortened and the conditions of labour be improved, so long as we do not go more rapidly than is consistent with the reasonable necessities of our industry in competition with the industry of other nations. That is the way in which I view the duty of the Parliament of Canada, and the duty of the provincial legislatures of this Dominion as a matter of general principle.

The problem is, indeed, a difficult one. These particular employers in Winnipeg have said already, " We are quite ready to go down to nine hours and we believe we can do that and compete with our competitors in Ontario and other provinces, but we say we cannot go to eight hours until they do the same." And they have said—at all events the Manitoba Bridge and Iron Works have said clearly, that just as soon as their competitors in Eastern Canada went to eight hours they were prepared to do the same and to bind themselves in writing accordingly upon that proviso. That is an illustration of the condition and the difficulties that present themselves in one province as compared to another. Consequently it might have been well—I am not arguing whether it would or not; there are difficulties the other way also—if the constitution had been framed so as to make this question a federal instead of a provincial one. But it is not worth arguing. The fact is that it is not a federal question.

The tendency is, and I hope it may be more rapid in the future than it has been in the past, to a reduction in the hours of toil, particularly on the part of the manual labourer, whose title to such reduction is sounder and more just than that of any other class of labour in the world. The tendency, I repeat, is to a reduction in the hours of labour and toward an increase in the remuneration of toil, both in the absolute and relatively, to other occupations. My only object has been to set out as clearly as I could what concrete facts present themselves in the face of the dispute that exists in the city of Winnipeg, and its reflection in many other cities in the country, to submit that those concrete facts comprised the issue in the first place were overshadowed by a subsequent larger issue, and that such larger issue must be rightly decided before the offices of this Government, or, indeed, of the provincial government can be usefully exercised towards a settlement of the initial dispute. That view I believe the provincial government share. I have also ventured to outline the general principle along which I think legislation should move in the treatment of the great struggle that has for ages long subsisted between capital anl labour and that can at best be ameliorated and not, at all events for many years, wholly removed or solved.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) this afternoon deplored the fact that when the Government decided to send delegates to Winnipeg to endeavour to settle the unfortunate disturbances which exist there now they should have selected the hon. Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen))for that purpose. Those of us in the House who may have thought that the hon. member for Kamouraska was using language perhaps a little too harsh in regard to the hon. Acting Minister of Justice, will, I think, come to the conclusion, after having listened to the address with which he has just regaled the House, that he was quite right in his statement that it was a mistake of prime importance to send a gentleman with the cast of mind, and constituted with such a temperament as his, to endeavour to settle a strike of the magnitude we have on our hands now. One would have imagined, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman thought that he was in a court of justice and that he was pleading the case of the metal employers as against the employees. I do not know that I ever heard a finer piece of forensic special pleading in my life than that which we heard from the hon. Acting Minister of Justice to-night. Incidentally he told us

that his sympathies were with labour, that at some time in the future labour would probably achieve what it had set out to achieve; in other words, that "man never is, but always to be blest."

We have a situation confronting us in Winnipeg that concerns the whole Dominion, and yet the hon. gentleman talks to us about provincial and federal rights and the encroachment of one upon the other. That is, I consider, something quite beneath the hon. gentleman. When we have our house on fire we endeavour to extinguish the flames in the best way we can with the means at hand, and in our efforts we take the best means at hand. The attitude of the hon. gentleman towards this question reminds me of the story of Mr. Squeers, of Dotheboy's Hall, in Nicholas Nickleby. He was such a kind man and his wife was such a kind woman that when the poor orphan child was dying they got out the best dictionary in the house and laid it under his head for a pillow. That is what the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to do now. He has treated us to fine words, he has given us a magnificent address; he has told us the position of the manufacturers, and he has told us that the strikers have actually been so bold as to violate a contract. He says that in going on this sympathetic strike they violated a contract. I admit they violated a contract. The Allies went to war with Germany and contracts were violated as soon as war was declared. Does not the hon. gentleman know a strike is war, that war is negation of all law and that when you are at war you do not stop to consider contracts or who is right or who is wrong while the war lasts? The discussion does not turn on the question of the contract or who is right and who is wrong, but you ask yourself the question: Why is it that the Government allowed this trouble to go so far without taking any action in the matter? We have sat here for the last four weeks talking on the legislation which has been presented by the Government. For the last four weeks we have had rumours of these strikes in the West, and particularly in Winnipeg. What has been done by the Government in the way of an attempt to see that this strike did not come about? Absolutely nothing. We have a Minister of Labour in Canada. Have any of us ever seen the Minister of Labour? We have certainly never seen him in this Chamber for the good and sufficient reason that he can not constitutionally enter this representative Chamber of the people. We have to seek for him in the rarer atmosphere of the Senate chamber. Last year we complained about the masterly inactivity of the then Minister of Labour; we charged him with being asleep when he should have been awake, but we never accused him of being awake when he should have been asleep. Now, they have changed the situation and given us a Minister of Labour who does not sit in this House. Last year we were chastised with whips, this year we are chastised with scorpions. For three weeks past questions have been asked almost daily of the Government as to what was being done about the strike, and their maid of all work, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who speaks for the Minister of Labour, would get up, and in his bland manner, tell us that "the Government has the situation well in hand." They have it well in hand? They have it well on their hands now and it is for them to get rid of it. Nothing was done towards seeing if some solution of the difficulty could not be found. The Department of Labour leaves these two interests to settle their differences amongst themselves. The place for the Minister of Labour during the last four weeks was in Winnipeg attempting to bring the parties together. He did nothing of the kind, and it was only when public feeling was worked up throughout the whole Dominion that he, accompanied by the Acting Minister of Justice, went to Winnipeg. What did they do when they arrived? We find by the press that the mayor of Winnipeg, who naturally would know something about the conditions which prevailed there at the time, complained that for forty-eight hours after they arrived they never even called upon him officially or unofficially; that they never saw the mayor, in so far as I know, during the entire time they were there. The complaint was made publicly by the mayor that these gentlemen representing the Government, and particularly the Minister of Labour, never considered it worth while to go into immediate conference with the mayor and try to settle the strike.

10 p.m.

The question of collective bargaining seems to be the difficulty between the two parties to the dispute, or it was at the beginning. As I understand it, when the strike trouble first started, the employees of certain industries demanded the right to collectively discuss with the employers matters affecting every branch of trade of that particular industry. What difficulty was there about that which the minister could

not settle? There might have been some difficulty between the two contending parties, but it was the duty of the Minister of Labour to have located himself in the city of Winnipeg at that time and had he done so it would not have taken very long for him to have brought the parties together. He could have brought the parties together if he had been there but he was recreant in his duty. He never faced the situation and now the Government are trying to stand from under when they find the situation is such that they cannot handle it.

In regard to collective bargaining, it is generally recognized in the United States, it is recognized in England and it is recognized in every country where they have discussed the matter up to the present time. But judging from the remarks of the Acting Minister of Justice one would imagine that if this were to be accorded to the strikers it would mean the overturning of our constitution and the rebellion of the people of the whole country. These people were perfectly right in their demand for collective bargaining because it is only by banding together that they can obtain rights in a way corresponding to that in which the manufacturers band together for their own purposes.

When this conflagration started in Winnipeg what were we doing in this House? We were discussing soothing syrup. You will remember that we went into a very long and learned discussion upon the question of soothing syrup, not for the strikers in Winnipeg but for the infants under one year of age. The hon. member who speaks for the Minister of Labour waxed quite eloquent upon the deleterious ingredients of soothing syrup. A day or two was devoted to this question in Committee and we finally sent it to a Select Committee for further consideration. Then we discussed the question of titles. I am disposed to agree that the question of titles is one of importance and that it was right that it should have been discussed at that particular time.

The Right Hon. the Prime Minister was away at the time, and it was necessary that we should get that Bill through before he returned, or the same thing would have happened here which happened last year. I do not begrudge the fact that we did spend a day and get this matter cleared out of the way before the Prime Minister arrived. "When the cat is away, the mice will have their say." I think the last time I saw the Prime Minister it was a day or two before he left for England last year, and prior to his arrival on the other side we found that the net result of his having held up the question of titles was that his brother secured one, his private secretary secured one, and the apologist for titles in this House, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, also secured one. Perhaps if I had known titles were so easy to secure, I might myself have said a word or two in their behalf and been rewarded in the same way. I merely mention this to point out that it was necessary that titles should have been discussed before the Prime Minister's return this year.

Then we had the Sexual Offences Bill, the Fisheries Inspection Bill, and matters of that kind, and this important question, which should have been discussed three weeks ago, and ventilated in the House so that the country could know something about it, was stood aside until now, when it has got almost beyond our power. The Minister of Labour finally found his way to Winnipeg, where evidently several conferences were held with the strikers and with others. And what do you think happened afterwards, Mr. Speaker? An S.O.S. call was sent to Mr. Samuel Gompers. Just think of it. A call was sent to Mr. Samuel Gompers, advising him that the strikers had already defeated themselves, a congratulatory message, I fancy, but inasmuch as there was reason to think that possibly the intervention of Mr. Gompers might help to a certain extent, it would be advisable for him to take some action in the matter. Well, as I understand it, Mr. Gompers is not in any way connected with this movement, which started in Winnipeg, three or four weeks ago. It has got beyond the power of Mr. Gompers, and I cannot see why the Minister of Labour should have seen fit to call upon that gentleman unless it be that he wanted to return a compliment which had been paid to us some years ago when a serious strike was on in Colorado and Mr. John D. Rockefeller wired to Mr. Mackenzie King to come down and settle that strike, and inasmuch as the strike was satisfactorily settled I suppose the Minister of Labour considered it would be exceedingly courteous on his part if he were to invite Mr. Gompers to come to Canada for a similar purpose. As my hon. friend the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) stated, it was a most humiliating thing on the part of the Minister of Labour, implicating, as he did, the Government to invite an outside gentleman to take a hand in the settlement and discussion of this matter. Had it succeeded it might have amounted to some-

thing; nothing has been heard of the summons, and, as far as I know, Mr. Gompers has not even answered the wire.

The Prime Minister is being given a great deal of credit, and rightly so, for the work which he has done in the matter of the Peace Conference at Paris. He is a past-master in the art of peacemaking; that would seem to be his métier. We have it heralded in all the government organs of the country that as a peacemaker he stands pre-eminent. Might I suggest that while he has this divine afflatus about him he find his way out to Winnipeg and see whether he cannot use some of the methods which he has so successfully tried in Paris and bring about the settlement of this strike. We know he is—at least the newspapers have told us so—one of the most intimate friends of Mr. Lloyd George, and probably, having sat at the feet of that estimable gentleman, he must have learned something of the art of peacemaking. Mr. Lloyd George undoubtedly knows something about peacemaking. Whenever a strike of any proportions whatever looms up on the horizon in England Mr. Lloyd George is on the spot and the strike is settled forthwith. Why is it, therefore, that having had the tutelage of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Prime Minister of Canada does not see his way to bring about a successful termination of the Winnipeg strike? He has the opportunity of his life now, and I hope he will take advantage of it as soon as possible. We have been getting along very well without the Prime Minister. I do not mean to say as well as if he were here, but we have been pottering along fairly well for the last six months, and I think that the House would be quite willing to lend his services to the city of Winnipeg for a short time to see to it that this strike is brought to a conclusion.

In connection with this matter of collective bargaining, I would like to give the House an illustration of how it is working in the city of Montreal. Hon. gentlemen are aware that some time ago credits aggregating something like $25,000,000 were granted to the kingdom of Rumania, and orders were given for the manufacture of clothing and woollen goods to different merchants in Canada. Those merchants met here and parcelled out the orders among themselves. What did they do as soon as they got those orders? They at once sent for the President of the Garment Makers' Union of America, who controls all the garment workers of this country, and they asked him to supply them with a certain number of garment workers in order to do this work. They asked for pressers, and stitchers and tailors, and so on, and made a bargain collectively with the Garment Workers of America in order to supply the necessary workmen to do this work. That is the way astute commercial men do their business. If that thing can be done in the case of Government contracts, and other Government work, why cannot it be done in the case of the strike in the city of Winnipeg? I think, Mr. Speaker, it will generally be conceded by the House and the country that the Government has woefully fallen down in its endeavour to settle this strike; that it will have to admit its bankruptcy, so far as settling matters of this kind is concerned, and it will only be a very short time when the necessary petition to force them into the bankruptcy courts will be filed by the people of this country.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) moved the adjournment of the House in order that he might discuss the strikes in Winnipeg, and other Canadian cities, together with all the circumstances, conditions, and causes, near and remote, having any bearing upon them or any connection therewith. I thought it might be quite fitting that I should read the motion that the hon. gentleman made this afternoon so as to remind my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) who has just taken his seat that he has entirely forgotten that motion, and has not directed any of his remarks to it. This is regrettable because the hon. gentleman is exceedingly able, and I am sure that the House would have welcomed any remarks which he could offer upon the very interesting subject which has been debated this afternoon—a subject which is not only interesting, but a serious one for the country. The hon. gentleman was disposed to criticise the Minister of Labour because he had not visited Winnipeg earlier. My hon. friend is apparently under the impression that the Minister of Labour had not intervened in this matter until his arrival in Winnipeg some time last week. I wish to assure him that this particular industrial strike in that city had had the personal attention of the Minister of Labour long before he visited Winnipeg, as all strikes throughout Canada from time to time have had his personal attention.

My hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) also expressed surprise that the Minister of Labour should place himself in telegraphic com-

munication with one of the greatest and most distinguished labour leaders of the world, Mr. Samuel Gompers. This criticism was not quite apt, because Mr. Gompers is much interested in this particular strike, many of the trades unions in the city of Winnipeg being affiliated with the international organization of which he is the head.

My hon. friend complains very bitterly and persistently that the Minister of Labour was unable to be present in this House, for reasons which he gave, and thereby was unable to inform hon. members as to the progress which was being made in the settlement of this particular strike, and as to industrial conditions generally throughout Canada. A statement appeared this morning in the press from the Minister of Labour, which was made public just prior to his departure from Winnipeg for Ottawa, and I am disposed to ask the House to listen to me for a moment while I read two or three paragraphs of that statement. I think it proper that I should do so because the minister is not here to express his views himself, His statement is as follows:

> The promoters of the general strike in Winnipeg now sit in the ashes of their folly. Something like 30,000 men and women were called out, professedly for the purpose of enforcing the recognition of the right of collective bargaining. In responding to the call, the majority violated and repudiated their obligations to their own trade union and their contract with their employers. Individually and collectively they wilfully discarded their agreements indicating that the possession of what they are contending for is of little value.
>
> Labor organizations which require that contracts made be fulfilled, merit and command the respect of employers, of the public and of governments. Labor leaders who advocate that only might is right, who hold that law, justice and honor should be discarded at will, merit and receive the condemnation of all good citizens.
>
> If an employer or a number of employers in a given industry deny to their workmen the right to bargain collectively for the sale of their service, the entire force of the workmen may properly be directed against the offender and the public will approve and sympathize. In a general sympathetic strike the force is directed against the whole community who are innocent of any responsibility for the offence and public indignation is immediately aroused because of the inconvenience, loss and suffering imposed upon innocent people. Therefore sympathetic strikes must always fail.
>
> In March last at Calgary the play was written. "The Winnipeg strike". Was its first rehearsal with the main performance promised for a later date? The Winnipeg rehearsal has cost approximately two million dollars in wages lost in Western Canada and has proven the play to have been badly written and unpopular with both the public and most of the performers.
>
> Employers must not mistake the outcome of the general sympathetic strike as a defeat to organized labor, on the contrary, labor will emerge from the conflict strengthened with the wisdom gained from its experience. Numerous strong labor organizations have by their voice and actions largely contributed to the outcome because they believe the general sympathetic strike is wrong, vicious and demoralizing, Employers should rather seek to deal justly and at this period liberally, with their workmen and assist the bona fide labour unions in their legitimate efforts to obtain a reasonable wage for all who are willing to help.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the judgment of a man who is a friend of labour, and there is none greater in this country. I cannot for one moment make myself believe that there can ever be any serious difference of opinion in this country as to the action of the Minister of Labour in connection with the Winnipeg strike. Originally there may have been some merit in the demands of the strikers, as the Minister of the Interior has already stated. That issue, however, soon passed away, and the issue became this: shall constituted authority prevail in this country, or shall a certain section of the community usurp it? That is the issue to-day, and it should end in only one way. It would be an unfortunate thing for this country if the principle asserted by the strikers were to prevail, and I am surprized that their action has received the volume of commendation that it has in this House and outside.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the unrest which prevails throughout the world to-day, what we are most interested in is to know, in the first place, what are its causes; and, secondly, what can be done to abate it. Can any remedy be prescribed? There is to-day without doubt some political, social and industrial unrest in Canada. That is true of every other country in the world, and history shows that it is a characteristic condition following all wars. I assume that every intelligent and reflective man anticipated political, social and industrial unrest following the war. And it is not at all wonderful, Sir, that these conditions are found in this country, certainly no far-seeing man could expect this country to participate in one of the greatest wars in history for a period of four and a half years and at its end find stable conditions politically, industrially and socially. We shall have more of such unrest, and it is well that our people should recognize that fact. It would be the part of folly to expect that we shall be entirely free of further industrial unrest. Other countries do not expect such to be the case. In the first place, the war is not over, and while the world cries for peace there cannot be peace until the treaty is signed, the armies are demobilized

and the economic processes which prevailed in pre-war days restored. As an actual fact, the combat still goes on in Russia and in Hungary. Before 1914 the war now being waged in Russia alone would, I imagine, have been regarded as one of the greatest in history. Even if the war were over, we could not immediately grasp the results of that terrible catastrophe. Unemployment will, I fear, prevail in many countries of the world for quite a time to come, and worse than that, famine will make its appearance in many countries. I would imagine, although I do not presume to speak with accuracy, that up to the present time probably famine has reaped as great a harvest as have the contending armies. The most serious and solemn spectacle which presents itself to the world at the present moment is the fear of famine, decimating the peoples of many countries by the thousands and by the millions. So serious is the outlook that I cannot but take quite seriously the industrial situation in this and in other countries.

Our problems in Canada are largely manifested in the form of unemployment and industrial unrest. Is this a surprise? Should it not have been anticipated? Let me ask hon. gentlemen if it would be fair to expect that any Government or that organized society, could provide absolutely to meet this unemployment and this industrial unrest? The war built up large war industries; existing business expanded; the warring nations were contending for the immediate delivery of war materials and prices which would have been called insane in peace times were offered for war material. This resulted in increased prices of materials and increased wages for workers; and wholesalers and retailers, demanding some of these increased wages, raised their price to the public. Positions sought men and not men positions. Then a sudden reversion to peace necessitated the disestablishment of all the industrial works that had been established during the war, and unemployment necessarily followed. Then men were looking for positions and not positions for men. This could not be avoided in Canada nor anywhere else. These conditions prevail in every country in the world to-day, and it should be a matter of pride for Canadians at this moment that our conditions in this respect are not at all comparable with the conditions which prevail in Great Britain, in all other European countries and even in the United States.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

No Whitley scheme could meet the case fully and completely. Conditions of trade are always intimately associated with industrial problems. Trade is but the exchange of goods, and if opportunities to carry on an exchange of goods are prevented or minimized by any factors, whatever they may be, then trade is hampered, and there must be industrial unrest and some unemployment. We cannot anticipate, and nobody could rationally hope for, an immediate resumption of trade conditions as they prevailed in pre-war days. In the first place, as I have already stated, peace has not yet been signed; armies have not yet been fully demobilized; capital is timid, and trade channels have been disrupted. It will be many months, I fear, before a very large part of this world will be able to resume its economic processes. Until international trade is resumed, we shall have industrial problems. We may minimize them by the granting of credits to countries which wish to become purchasers of our products but which are unable to buy the same unless we furnish the credits. This has been done to some extent. The granting of credits has been criticized, but nevertheless unless this had been done conditions in this country would have been far worse than they are at the present moment.

I refer to these conditions merely to emphasize this fact that employers and employees should recognize them. It should be conceded generally that we are confronted with conditions which we did not create and which are unavoidable, conditions which are difficult of solution, which are capable of a great deal of harm to this country and its citizens. The inevitable conclusion is that the duty devolves upon everybody, employer, employee and citizen, to contribute his part in the solution of a problem unprecedented in our history and one which unfortunately confronts almost every nation in the world. If we in Canada exhibit the spirit of patriotism and co-operation which our people exhibited during the long four and a half years of the war, we shall in the end overcome all these domestic, industrial and political difficulties which to-day confront us.

This war means a social reconstruction of this country, and, I imagine, of all countries. Representatives of all strata of society have fought, bled and died together in the same trenches to maintain a common purpose. I believe that this democratic spirit and this comradeship of the

trenches will not soon perish from the earth, and that is generally conceded by men in this and other countries. The conditions of those engaged in labour prior to the war, especially in some countries, were not creditable to our civilization. That is not as true of Canada as of Great Britain and some other European countries. The war has clearly left the impression upon all thoughtful men that the amelioration of conditions of labour and improvement in the status of people engaged in labour must receive the early and sympathetic attention of all countries, and it is the duty, not merely of governments, but of members of parliament and of citizens to recognize this and to play their part in achieving this end.

The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) this afternoon made many assertions which were, after all, pure assumptions on his part and which, as a matter of fact, are not correct.

For instance, he talked as if there was a tendency on the part of somebody to deny to labour the right of organization. That statement was unnecessary because it is quite incorrect and unfounded. Nobody in this country worth thinking about denies to labour the right of organization. It is a piece of folly on the part of any industrial head to deny to his employees the right of organization. He should welcome it, and I am sure that in saying that I am reflecting the personal judgment and wishes of every member of the Government.

There is no disposition on the part of the Government to deny the statement that the hours of labour should be shortened. Personally, I should like to see an eight-hour day in this country, and I have felt that way for a good number of years. As a matter of fact the eight-hour day prevails very largely in Canada to-day. It is being adopted gradually, and I trust that it will become common even without legislative intervention. My hon. friend from Kamouraska seemed to argue that there was a tendency on the part of the Government, or Parliament, to oppose the eight-hour day, and he also argued as if there was a tendency on the part of the employers and the Government to oppose collective bargaining. In both these respects he is in error. I know of collective bargaining taking place in my native county many years ago. Collective bargaining may have different meanings in different places; one person may ascribe to it one meaning, and another person a different meaning. But collective bargaining has obtained in this country for many, many years. I remember reading of it and hearing of it when I was quite a boy. We have instances every day of collective bargaining. We have it in four different ways: First, we have it expressed in the form of an agreement between an employer and a committee representing his employees, whether unionist or non-unionist. That form of bargaining has obtained for many years in Canada. Second, we have the agreement negotiated between an employer and a trades union acting on behalf of the members of such trade in his employ. The hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) expressed this afternoon his approval of that form of collective bargaining. Third, we have the agreement negotiated between an employer and a union comprising all the different trades in his employ; we have that in Canada to-day. Then, lately there has been urged the new definition of collective bargaining in the form of an agreement between an employer and a confederation of trades unions such as the building or the metal trades. Even before the Winnipeg strike we had an agreement of that kind negotiated in the city of Toronto in the building trades, on the principle of the Whitley scheme. That agreement did not succeed in averting a strike, but at least there was one instance of collective bargaining in accordance with the Whitley Joint Industrial Council recommendations.

The honourable member for Kamouraska spoke as if the Whitley scheme so-called was exactly the mode of collective bargaining suggested at Winnipeg. I say it is not. The Whitley plan involves collective bargaining, but it is more conformable to the form of collective bargaining to which we have been accustomed in Canada for many years past. I should like to read two or three extracts from the report of the Whitley Committee made to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. In the final report I find this:

> Taking our first and second reports together they constitute a scheme designed to cover all the chief industries of the country and to equip each of them with a representative joint body capable of dealing with matters affecting the welfare of the industry in which employers and employed are concerned, and of caring for the progressive improvement of the industry as an integral part of the national prosperity.

On the 31st of December, 1918, in accordance with the recommendations of the Whitley Committee many joint industrial councils had been established, in the following trades, for instance:

Bobbin and shuttle making; bread baking and flour confectionery; building; china clay; furniture; gold, silver, horological and allied trade; heavy chemicals; hosiery; made-up leather goods; match manufacture; metallic bedsteads; paint, colour and varnish; pottery; rubber manufacture; saw milling; silk; vehicle building; wool textile and woollen and worsted.

Separate joint industrial councils were established in all these trades. The whole purpose of the Whitley scheme, as I understand it, is to set up a joint industrial council in which are represented the employers on the one hand, and the employees of some particular industry, and perhaps some closely allied industry, on the other. It is quite possible this scheme may have good results in Great Britain, and perhaps in other countries. I trust it will be successful wherever it is tried. Obviously, it is more capable of experimentation in Great Britain, on account of the size of the country and the ease with which the district councils may be organized. In Great Britain a few of the great trades might be organized in one industrial council covering the whole country.

I do not think I need say anything about the Winnipeg strike itself or the circumstances leading up to it, because that has been fully and ably covered by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) who had personal acquaintance with the whole issues.

I should like to say a few words as to one of the causes which is assigned for high prices of foodstuffs, which in turn is assigned as one of the primary causes of industrial unrest in this country. High prices, being world-wide, cannot afford a complete answer for the conditions which prevail in Canada to-day and which have been the subject of criticism in this debate. In almost every other country of the world prices are just as high as in Canada. Roughly speaking, you will find upon investigation that prices are exactly or very nearly one hundred per cent higher in 1919 than in 1914 in practically every country in the world. Our prices are lower on the average than they are in the United States or in Great Britain; and they are immensely lower than in many of the European countries. Now what is the cause of it? Mere criticism of the fact provides no help in the solution of the problem; and if it is capable of solution only by slow degrees and processes, it is better that we should realize the fact and frankly express that as our view of the matter; because if existing high prices are altogether attributable to governments, then we are disguising the real issue. It has been stated by some hon. member, and it is not necessary that I should elaborate the point, that the chief reasons for the high prices prevailing in the world to-day are, first, an inflation of currency, and, secondly, a lack in the supply of commodities. These, I think, are fundamentally the two reasons for the present high prices. The same causes contributed to high prices following other wars; and students of the problem have given these two reasons as fundamental factors in the case. Now, if that be true, the situation can be met only in two ways: first, by greater production, and second by a deflation of our currency, and this latter can only be accomplished by a reduction of our war debt as rapidly as our country sees fit. If these be the primary causes, still I do not wish to be understood as saying that we cannot provide some palliative, something that might minimize these higher prices. At least it is the duty of the Government and of all who hold positions of responsibility to explore, so far as they can and as constantly as they can, any avenues which might provide any solution or partial solution of the problem. Somebody has suggested a fixation of prices. I am disposed to agree with the injunction tendered us this afternoon by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) in this regard. It may be tried; possibly it should. As a matter of fact, the fixation of prices when tried in other countries during the war has not been entirely successful, and except as regards wheat and newsprint we did not directly attempt to fix prices in this country.

So far as foodstuffs and many other commodities were concerned, the Food Board attempted to control the profits of the wholesaler and retailer, and I believe this had some good effect; and I would venture it as my opinion that that would be a better method than the direct fixation of prices. There are many difficulties in connection with an attempt to fix prices in Canada. England tried it, and with some success. But their circumstances were very different from ours. In the first place, England is an importing country; what she produced in foodstuffs was quite negligible. Every industry and establishment in England was given over to the manufacture of war material, and she was obliged to import practically all her foodstuffs, at least. More than that, she was compelled to purchase these importations of foodstuffs for her people; and thus, being obliged to import, it was not a very difficult matter to control prices as she did. In

many cases the Government of Great Britain assumed part of the loss. This is particularly true as regards flour and bacon, and one or two other commodities. The portion of the cost of flour assumed by the Government of Great Britain amounted to about $5 a barrel. I do not know what it was in respect of other commodities. And in the case of New Zealand and Australia it was easier to attempt fixing prices than it would be in Canada. There, export was rendered almost impossible by lack of shipping, and it was possible, perhaps very much in the interest of producers in those dominions, to assume control of productions which could not be exported. But in Canada there are many difficulties. Some person suggested this afternoon that exportation should be prohibited or limited. I think that that would hardly be a hopeful experiment in this country unless it were carried on in a small way. This country must export foodstuffs particularly and raw material, otherwise we would be unable to carry on trade with other countries. Again, in a country of the magnitude of Canada, it would be impossible, in most cases I would say, to fix a price that would suit all sections of the country. Further, when prices are fixed they must be changed every week or every fortnight or month, and possibly every day, and this would cause endless irritation to consumers and producers. I submit, therefore, that on the whole it will be found a most difficult method of dealing with the matter of prices. During the whole period of the war, as I have already stated, the Food Board attempted to curtail the profits of the wholesaler and retailer. The Cost of Living Commission, which was a bureau of the Labour Department, throughout the war co-operated with the Food Board and other war organizations in the way of obtaining information as to production cost, and selling cost, and in this way was in a position to afford a great deal of publicity which was of considerable use. However, in connection with the high prices prevailing in this country, which I admit are regrettable and impose very great hardships upon our people, we must realize that we are in no worse position than the people of other countries. And while this is not much of consolation to those who must submit to burdensome prices to-day, yet it does indicate that the condition is one which is not local but has a world-wide application and is one of the incidents of the war, due to an inflation of money and a lack of supply to meet the demand, and which we can overcome only gradually and by a resumption of the efforts enjoined in the slogans so popular and acceptable to the people during the war, namely, more production and more thrift. Only in this way can we escape altogether from the conditions now prevailing in respect to prices which undoubtedly account very largely, or at least to some extent, for the present high prices.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the question which has been brought to the notice of the House this afternoon by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) is one of the greatest possible importance. It has been very fully discussed from both sides of the House. So far I do not think it can be said that it has been approached as a party question by any person who has spoken. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Maclean), who is speaking to-night for the Minister of Labour has made one of his usual plausible, well worded speeches but I do not think it can be said that he has given us anything definite, anything constructive or anything that will tend to alleviate the present situation the solution of which is dearest to the heart of every well-wisher of the Canadian people and of Canadian institutions. One would expect from the representative of the Minister of Labour some constructive policy on this very important question. I take it, Sir, that the hon. Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) who was at the scene of the trouble, having spoken and having given nothing in the way of a remedy for the difficulties with which we are confronted; that the hon. the representative of the Minister of Labour having also spoken, having gone very fully over the ground, and having sat down without saying anything that would encourage the hope that there is anything forthcoming from the Government to relieve the situation and to direct us along proper paths looking to the betterment of conditions, both of these gentlemen having spoken and other representatives of the Government, men of importance and standing with the Government and the country, having spoken and having said nothing to answer the substance of the motion;—we on this side of the House have the right to suppose that this is the last word in so far as the Government is concerned and that the Government has nothing at all to offer.

I may say that if I had any function more than that of a private member to

discharge in this House that function, under present conditions, would be brought, and should be brought, to the assistance of the Government if there was anything offered, or if they had anything to offer, to better the conditions with which we are now confronted. I am sure that whether or not we could take any party advantage from the situation, nothing would be further from my own thoughts or from the thoughts of any person who has spoken on this side of the House. I recognize, with hon. members who have spoken as representing the Government, that we must maintain Government in this country and that law and order and government must be respected. I recognize that this Government as constituted to-day represents the voice of the people, and that while they are the Government, and while they are occupying the seats of power that they do occupy, it is my duty, and the duty of every member of this House, to respect their position and to assist them when it comes to a crucial question such as this.

But the question is: Have they on this occasion, and on all occasions since they assumed power, done themselves justice; have they retained within themselves that power which they should have held, or have they been coquetting with and courting powers outside of the Government, powers which are supposed to be largely at the back of the Government? Have they coquetted and flirted with such bodies to such an extent that they have lost the confidence of other large bodies in this country? I fear that whether that is justified by the facts or not, we have large bodies of men in this country, representing the ordinary common people, if I might so speak, who believe—and it is just as bad to believe as if it were absolutely true—that this Government have no more will of their own, but that there are certain factions, combinations and powers which just carry them along, and that they do exactly as they are dictated to by these higher powers. That, Sir, to a great extent, is what has caused unrest. It is believed the Government have forfeited their birthright for the mess of pottage that they have received from these parties. Whether that is true or not, it is just as bad as if it were true to say that it is true. It is the old saying—a saying that is perhaps not a classic—that you might as well hang a dog as give it a bad name. If you give a government a bad name whether it deserves it or not, its usefulness, to a great extent, is gone. From the expressions of opinion which came to us from Winnipeg, Calgary and other cities in the West where strikes have been instituted, and from the men who are at the head of these unfortunate movements, it would appear that the Government had really lost that hold which the Government should have on the country.

There is nothing better understood than the responsibilities of Government in performing its own share of the contract. We talk about the sacredness of contracts and no person can have greater respect for the responsibilities of men who are parties to contracts than myself. The Government has a contract. The people of this country agree that they shall support a certain party in power, support a certain Government, or support the King if you want to go that far. They give fealty and support to the King upon the definite understanding that the King and the Government in return will give protection and service to the country. Give proper laws and see that they are enforced. There is such a thing as kings and governments losing the right which they hold under the contract by not performing their functions and doing what they should do under the contract. It is being contended now that this Government is not so much alive to its responsibilities to the people as it should be.

11 p.m.

I think I am bound to say—I think I must say, Sir—that toryism exists to-day as it existed a thousand years ago. Men die but principles never. The principles of toryism have been handed down from generation to generation. The good, honest men who sit on the treasury benches tonight are not responsible for the heritage of toryism which has been handed down to them; they are simply carrying forward a principle for the origin of which they have nothing to do. They are merely flies on the wheel carrying forward the principles of the party to which they belong.

Can anybody find anything in Toryism, from Adam down, but adversity to labour, adversity to the poor man, adversity to democracy? And it is impossible to think that we are going to get the coloured gentleman in the fence to change his sentiments or the leopard his spots. It is the same old thing. We had eighteen years of Toryism in this country. I would ask the most genuine and orthodox Tory sitting in this House what, during those eighteen long years, was done for labour, or for the labouring classes, by Toryism. We had a commission appointed in those days. Some twelve years or so before the Tory Party

went out of power in 1896 there was a commission appointed with Doctor MacLeod—I forget where he came from—at its head. He joined that commission as an active young man, but before anything was reported he died of old age, and nothing was done. The Liberal Party came into power and found nothing but the ashes of this commission, with no possible result. That is all that was done by, or that stands to the credit of, the Tory Party for labour in this country during those eighteen years. Now these things may be disagreeable, they may sound harsh, but such in the case; and, as I said, those very principles have been handed down to this Government; and while it may have been retrograde in other matters, while it may have been inconsistent in other respects, it has been faithful to the law in carrying out Tory doctrine in dealing with labour, and it was determined to do nothing until such conditions as we have now presented themselves. It is no surprise to me, Sir, to find that the same old conditions are in vogue to-day that have been in vogue for the last fifty, sixty or hundred years, as far as the dealing of this party with questions of this kind are concerned.

It has been said that the labour people should have waited, that something was going to be done. I wish to point out that in the carrying out of what I said, the same principle, the same rule, the same tactics as in past years have been followed exactly since the present Government came into power. In 1917 I and others urged in this House upon the then Minister of Labour that something should be done to allay the conditions that then existed. After some trouble, and after some sarcastic speeches had been made against us, the so-called O'Connor Commission was appointed. Mr. O'Connor made a report which if acted upon might have been of some benefit and might have inspired the labouring people with some confidence. What occurred? The men who are said to own the Government rose in their might and declared, "The O'Connor Report is absolutely false." Mr. Henderson was then appointed a Court of Appeal to deal with Mr. O'Connor. A year or so passed before we heard anything of Mr. Henderson and when we did hear from him nothing at all was done. Time passed, and even now we find that the Government is still in the dark and does not see a glimmer of light anywhere. We heard a great deal of my own "light in the window," and there was a lot of fun made of it, but it appeared that even "the light in the window" has not been seen by the Government from either the O'Connor or the Henderson Report, because, forsooth, they said, "O'Connor was a mere lawyer and Henderson was a mere lawyer. Now we must get a judge of the Supreme Court to perform the operation of trying to penetrate our six-by-eight skulls and get some knowledge and light and leading into them." A commission on which a judge of the Supreme Court sits is now travelling from coast to coast, trying to get information for the Government. It was not very long until the Government discovered that that was not enough, and the hon. gentleman who led the ministry in the absence of the Prime Minister thought at last he had struck on the remedy, the panacea, for all the ills, and he was going to appoint a Committee of this House. So that we now have a committee appointed to try and get information. We had the O'Connor Report and the Henderson Report; we are having Judge Mather's Report; and now we have the promise of a committee report, but nothing in the world has been done. Is it to be expected when the poor people whose bread is so high that they cannot get enough for their children, whose flour is beyond all reach, and everything else that comes upon the table of the poor man is getting entirely out of control, is it any wonder that they should give up all hope of this Government doing anything and should try to take matters into their own hands? This is where the Government, it seems, cannot assert its rights. As I was pointing out a little while ago, it is the duty of the Government to exercise its vigilance and display its anxiety for the poor man and the people generally and when the Government fails to do that, then to some extent—although rebellion, or trouble, or violation of the law, is never justified—a man is justified when he takes matters into his own hands and tries to do the very best he can. That, Sir, is the situation that faces us to-day, not only in Winnipeg, but in every other part of this country. Absolutely hopeless of getting any immediate action from the Government people are trying to do the best they can to bring about better conditions for themsleves by their own actions.

We are told that nothing can be done toward the cutting down of prices. That was the old doctrine of the Tory Government some twenty-three years ago. Nevertheless, this Government has done something, not in foodstuffs very much, but the principle is the same. It started out, I be-

lieve, by cutting down the price of newsprint, and it has done something to cut down the price of coal and other commodities; but as far as I know it has not done anything at all to make it easier for the poor man who has to go to his grocery store in the evening with his meagre earnings of the day to get enough to satisfy the necessities of the household wants. The Government has not done anything of that kind, and consequently we have the conditions which to-day prevail.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the chief thing is, what are we going to do? Is there nothing that can be suggested to better the existing conditions? Very shortly after the Prime Minister arrived home I took the responsibility of suggesting to him that the Government ought to have a conference of the leading men, both of labour and of capital, called to meet himself and his Government at Ottawa, and that some good results might follow the adoption of such a course. Nothing was done in that respect, and I suppose, possibly, there is not much good in talking about it now. However, I do not think it is too late, and the Government and the Prime Minister would get the credit of being in earnest if they would even now call upon the leading capitalists and the leading labour men to meet and see what can be brought about by a heart-to-heart talk in the presence of the Government and himself about matters of this kind. For the last number of years it has been in my mind, and I think I have expressed the opinion in this House more than once, that we should have in this country a court—not a commission but a court—of the highest possible class to deal with such conditions as we are now confronted with. It has been said that such courts have been a failure, but there is no use talking about it, we must have some definite, powerful, capable institution in this country to deal with matters of this kind. As far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to-day which this House or the Canadian people can deal with, the war being practically over, that is so pressingly important as the relations between capital and labour.

If we had a court of importance equal to that of the Supreme Court of Canada—or of more importance if you please—which would devote its attention absolutely to questions of this kind and give final judgments in them, I think that would be the only way in which such questions could be finally settled. I believe that the day will arrive when men of sound judgment will be surprised that we left the labouring people so long with no other remedy than the institution of the strike. Where can they go now for any remedy?

Mr. TWEEDIE: How would you enforce a judgment given by such court?

Mr. McKENZIE: Just as I would enforce every other judgment. If I had to deal with a company, I would deal with them by an order of the court for specific performance, and if they did not comply with that order or judgment they would suffer the consequences that follow non-compliance.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Supposing the decision was that 1,000 men should return to work in a factory at a certain hour, and they refused to obey, what would you do?

Mr. McKENZIE: The judgment of the court would have to provide penalties as against the man who would not obey, just as penalties are provided to-day for failing to obey the judgments of our courts.

Mr. TWEEDIE: What remedy would you suggest they should provide? That is what we want to get at. The workmen say, "We will not work." How would you compel them to work, or what punishment would you propose if they did not work?

Mr. McKENZIE: We have not quite reached that stage.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: Hon. gentlemen may laugh. But if a man to-day has a dispute over a foot of land do he and his neighbour fight for its possession? If before we had courts and got used to their judgments, a similar question might have been propounded to me had I recommended the parties to go to court to settle their boundary dispute instead of fighting to a finish: what would you do with a man who would not remove his fence after the Supreme Court said he must move it? We know what is happening now. The man will move his fence; or if he does not, he takes the consequences of the court moving it at his expense. If a prisoner to-day is told to do certain things under the criminal law, he must obey; if not he subjects himself to certain consequences. Does anybody suppose I am talking nonsense when I say that some better institution than the strike must be established in this country for the settlement of industrial disputes?

Mr. TWEEDIE: Do you advocate—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. gentleman to submit his question through the Chair.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I would ask the hon. gentleman if he advocates taking away from the workmen of this country the right to strike?

Mr. McKENZIE: I say to my hon. friend, and to the Government, and to the country, on my responsibility as a member of this House, that if a capable court is constituted, composed perhaps of nine members, representing all the provinces, the best men that we can produce, an institution where I am satisfied that every man will be fully heard and a decision properly reached, then I say: take away the right to strike. If that is any satisfaction to my hon. friend, that is where I stand. And I so stand as the friend of the working man. I can assure my hon. friend and the House generally that such a court will not be five years in operation before every one will say: It is a great pity that we did not have this institution long ago.

I submit that such a court is well worth establishing, and I contend that it would be one of the safest methods of dealing with disputes between capital and labour. I submit that remedy. Sir, and I think that a Bill could be put through this House and through the Senate in less than a week, and that such a court in ten days could be sitting in Winnipeg to deal with the strike there. We would show our friends on both sides, capital and labour, that we are in earnest and are determined to give them an opportunity of dealing with their grievances in a proper way. The procedure can be by what is called a stated case, or by the hearing of evidence.

I may be absolutely wrong in this idea, but I am giving you, Sir, and the Government my honest opinion in the matter, an opinion which I have arrived at after several years' deliberation. For a long time I have held the belief that the only satisfactory way to settle a dispute is to settle it finally. A right of appeal might be provided for, but there must be established in this country an institution that will deal with these industrial disputes finally and settle them to the fair satisfaction of both parties. Hon. gentlemen may think that public opinion will not develop along this line. But when it is known that a court of the highest standing has deliberately heard a case and delivered judgment, that judgment appearing in the newspapers and the public being seized of the fact, I am convinced that public opinion would develop to such an extent that no man would dare oppose the judgments of such a court. But if he were so foolish, then, as we have been told by the Acting Minister of Justice tonight, he would be running against the best thought of the country, as some men in the city of Winnipeg, he says, have been running against the strong current of public opinion in that city, with results familiar to us all.

Now, Sir, I have no other remedy to suggest. I submit, however, that the Government has been too slow entirely in dealing with these questions. The Winnipeg strike was in full blast, as I understand it, before the Minister of Labour and the Acting Minister of Justice left Ottawa. It has already been pointed out that they should have gone at a very much earlier stage and should have stopped this trouble at its inception.

I may not have had very much to do with this question, but it should be pointed out to the Government that the tendency of their work for the last three or four years has been to create dissensions and divisions in this country for their own benefit, and they find now there are in Canada more dissensions and divisions, at all events, between capital and labour than they counted upon. They were willing to get power and to hold power by dividing this country, they cared not into what divisions of race and religion, one against the other. Now they find, when they are in power, they have lost that respect of the large body of the people which they would have held if they were in power by the lawful constitutional means which usually put governments into and out of power.

As I said at the begining, for my part, I am willing and anxious to respect the Government because they are the representatives of the people while they are here. At the same time, as we are all democrats and anxious to represent democracy in this House, it is only fair to point out to the people that they are capable of making grave mistakes, and that they made a great mistake when they thought they were getting a democratic government in the one that rules to-day in Canada. I trust that although we have heard nothing yet of a practical nature from the Government, the Prime Minister himself or some other hon. gentleman will, before this debate closes, tell us, and the people of Winnipeg, and the people of Canada generally, that the Government have some proposition

by which the conditions of this country will be bettered and troubles of this kind will not be likely to break out in future in the violent manner in which they have broken out in Winnipeg and other places lately. I trust that better conditions will prevail, that good judgment will prevail, and that there will be no clash of any kind that will give this Canada of ours a bad name or any name of being unable or incapable of settling our disputes in a proper and constitutional way.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has delivered a very interesting speech, part of it critical, part of it inspired certainly by an earnest desire to offer some constructive suggestion. I shall not dwell very long upon what might be called the controversial portion of his observations. When he suggests that this Government is subject to the dictation of any outside influence, or rather when he says that such is the belief, and that it may be true for all he knows, I wish to assure him of what I am sure he must be convinced in his heart, namely, that this Government is subject to no influence and no dictation outside of this Parliament and never will be so long as I am at the head of it. He has referred at some length in somewhat discursive style to inquiries that were made two years ago or thereabouts. I venture to remind him that as the result of those inquiries, the most drastic measure of taxation was imposed by Order in Council on those engaged in the packing industry in Canada that has ever been known since this war began, or before it began, for that matter, taxation far in excess of anything suggested or carried out in the United States. It was so drastic that when the Order in Council was under consideration, the companies affected came before us and implored us not to go so far. Those big interests that are supposed to dominate this Government told us that their businesses would be absolutely ruined and destroyed if we persisted in going to the length that we purposed. Notwithstanding those protests from the big interests alluded to, the Government carried out precisely what it purposed, and that remains as the law of this country from that time up to the present.

My hon. friend was distressed because of his apparent belief that the present Administration had never, from first to last, taken a single step in the interest of labour since it came into power. Let me tell him that it did what no previous Government in Canada had ever done or ever thought of doing, so far as I know; it selected a man who then was and still is a member of a labour organization in Canada, made him first a member of the Government without portfolio and afterwards made him Minister of Labour, which position he holds until this day. I need not dwell further on the controversial portion of my hon. friend's remarks.

He attributes an extreme antiquity to what he is pleased to designate as Toryism. One thousand years ago, he said it began. I have been disposed to think, and I may tell my hon. friend in the greatest confidence, that there are many people who think that he is about as good a sample of fine old crusted Toryism as is to be found anywhere in Canada.

The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) made a number of interesting observations, very largely of a critical nature, but I did not observe anything very constructive in his remarks from beginning to end. He made one suggestion which seemed to be hardly sensible. He said that the Government had allowed matters to drift so long that it was entirely too late to do anything, but nevertheless it was absolutely necessary that something should be done at once. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) took upon himself to justify, so far as I could understand, the breaking of a solemn treaty by Germany in his effort to justify the breaking of contracts which had been alluded to by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). These, however, are not of sufficient importance to justify me in wasting the time of the House upon them, because, after all, we come here for the purpose of taking counsel together and of endeavouring to find some suggestions, some light, some assistance in solving the difficult conditions that lie before this country at present.

Let me say to the hon. leader of the Opposition, lest I should forget it, that he is entirely mistaken in supposing that this Government has not called into conference both employers and employed in this country during the past two years. The Government has done that not once nor twice, but repeatedly, to my knowledge. I recollect that on the very last occasion that I sat in council before leaving Ottawa on the 8th November last, the Minister of Labour told me that for the first time in this country, employers and employed had come together

to take counsel of each other in reasonable conference, so that they might arrive at a better understanding, have better relations and prevent interruptions by strike. It is quite possible that our anticipations at that time have not been wholly justified by subsequent results; but I know that during my absence, my colleague, the Minister of Labour, in conjunction with the other members of the Government has, from time to time, been in conference with employers and with employed. It was out of the conferences which he had with employers and employed that the idea was evolved which resulted in the appointment of the commission that is now investigating labour conditions in Canada.

So that, the reproach now put forward, that the Government has had no desire and made no attempt to assist in the solution of these problems, is wholly undeserved.

I shall now approach the conditions that prevail, not only in this country, but throughout the world, with a view to pointing out the tremendous problems that lie before all the nations, and the absolute importance that we in Canada, both employers and employed, should keep our heads and seek to work out our abundant opportunities for useful service to our country and to the world.

World conditions! Do hon. gentlemen in this House remember that the greatest financial experts in the world said that the war which has lasted for five years could not possibly last more than one year, because the resources of the world would not allow the nations to continue longer? It has lasted for five years, and during that period about 50,000,000 men have been withdrawn from productive activity. During that same period the waste which has gone on throughout the world in the endeavour of the nations on the one side and on the other to obtain a decisive victory is absolutely beyond our comprehension. We may state it in figures, but no man in the world can really comprehend or understand what it means. Would you like to have a reasonable estimate of what conditions were in Europe before this war began?—and during the past six months I have learned something of what they are to-day. A very important authority used this language in placing the situation of Europe before the British delegations at the Peace Conference:

> By far the most important task before the Allied Governments is to get production and internal and external "exchange economy" working again on something like normal lines. Before the war some 400,000,000 Europeans by working their hardest just managed to feed, clothe and house themselves and perhaps amass six months capital on which to live. That capital has vanished; the complicated machinery of internal and external production is more or less smashed; production has to a great extent ceased. The largely increasing population of Europe has only been maintained by the increasing development and inter-connection of world industry and finance. If this is not only checked, but for the time being destroyed, it is difficult to see how the population can be maintained at any rate during the very painful period of drastic readjustment. If free movement were possible and other countries could absorb it, there would inevitably be a vast emigration from Europe, until an equilibrium were established between the numbers of the population and the means of livelihood. As that is not possible this equilibrium must be reached in some other way.

Then he goes on to point out in a very graphic manner the almost insuperable difficulties that lie before the nations engaged in the task of reconstructing Europe to-day.

What does the present condition in Canada mean? We undoubtedly have very difficult problems before us but we have them in common with the rest of the world, and I fully believe that there is no country among all the nations where those problems are easier of solution than they are in Canada, if we are only true to our purpose, and have reasonable common understanding and common effort. This problem of industrial disturbance, inflation, and high prices, is not a new problem in the world's history. There has never been a war after which these phenomena did not make their appearance. It was the same a hundred years ago after the Napoleonic wars. After 1815 there were inflated prices and industrial disturbances. It was the same after the Crimean war of 1854. These are phenomena which makes their appearance inevitably after every considerable war, and after this the greatest of all wars in human history it was not only absolutely certain that these phenomena would make their appearance, but possible that they might continue for a longer period than ever before known.

It must be apparent to honourable gentlemen that in common with most thinking people in Canada, the Government foresaw there would be a very difficult period of reconstruction after the cessation of hostilities and the conclusion of peace. We sought a year, or eighteen months ago, to foresee conditions as best we could, to make such provision as is within the power of a government for conditions that were certain to arise. I hope honourable gentlemen will

realize, having regard to what I alluded to a moment ago—the withdrawal from productive activity of 50,000,000 men for nearly five years, the non-production and the terrible waste during that period, and the inflation consequent upon waste and non-production—that it is not possible for the Government of Canada or the Government of the United States or the Government of the United Kingdom or for the Legislatures of any of those countries or of all the countries of the world to fully remedy or remove conditions that have been thus created. But it was the duty of the Government to foresee as best it could, and to provide for as best it could, the conditions which were certain to ensue.

What have we done? The hour is too late for me to make more than a passing allusion to measures and policies which have been undertaken by the Government. As to the men who have fought the battle of freedom beyond the seas we believed that it would take a year or possibly eighteen months to effect their demobilization, but from the time that the armistice was signed until they will all be returned to Canada I believe that a period of not more than eight months will have elapsed. In order that they may have an opportunity of establishing themselves we have provided a war gratuity more generous, I believe, than has been provided by any other country in the world.

We have arranged conditions of land settlement which we have certainly endeavoured to make both reasonable and effective. We have provided as best we could for their settlement in various vocations and for their training for that purpose. We have established reasonable conditions to enable them to obtain that training. In addition we have made permanent provision for those who are afflicted with disease as a direct result of the war, and particularly for patients who have shown themselves to be infected by the scourge of tuberculosis. These are only a few of the measures the Government has had in mind and carried out. We realized that as soon as the demand for munitions would cease there must be an earnest effort on the part of the Government to provide employment not only for the returning men, but also for those who could no longer find employment in the production of munitions. We went about that in two ways. In the first place we endeavoured to assure the working men of this country a share in the reconstruction of the devastated regions, and a share in the provision of necessary articles for those countries in Europe which have been engaged in war during the past five years. Thus we have established not less than one hundred and twenty-five, or one hundred and thirty millions of dollars of credits in order that products which give employment to the working men in Canada, shall have their proper place in the markets of the world. More than that, we have embarked upon a policy of undertaking important public works for the purpose of affording employment, although otherwise we would have preferred to postpone the undertaking of these works until a season when the finances of the country were in better condition than at present. Now some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have spoken of blunders of the Government and some of them have referred to the alleged inaction of the Government.

Is there a single one of them who has found fault with the Government in respect of any of the matters just mentioned? And is there a single one of them who has even suggested to the House the taking of any step which the Government has not taken? The conditions of unrest throughout this country are undoubtedly serious. I say, and say it with regret, that they are still more serious in the European countries which are now awaiting reconstruction. In Europe the problems that confront governments and parliaments in the various countries are, I repeat, infinitely more serious than any that confront us. Here is the situation in Europe as outlined by a very high authority:

> The obstacles to the resumption of production are numerous. The main ones are the following:—
>
> (1) Destruction or disrepair of fixed plant and means of transportation, i.e., railways, canal, factories:
>
> (2) Lack of raw materials, i.e., destruction by war of all working capital:
>
> (3) Consequent loss of external purchasing power, i.e., lack of exports:
>
> (4) Depreciation of currency; often chaos of currency system:
>
> (5) Huge rise in prices, consequent loss of equilibrium between internal prices and world prices rendering export difficult:
>
> (6) Huge floating indebtedness to other countries:
>
> (7) Reduction of agricultural production owing to currency troubles and lack of purchasing power on the part of the industrial populations.
>
> (8) Enormous taxation, acting as almost complete deterrent to new enterprise;

We have hardly any of these difficulties. Certainly they do not exist in an accentuated form in this country. Except for differences that ought to be composed between employer and employed, there is no

difficulty whatever which should prevent our country going on her way with renewed vigour and increased production, no difficulty in giving to every person capable of work an opportunity of employment which will assure him a reasonable living wage. The high cost of living is due absolutely to the world-wide conditions to which I have alluded, and over which no government and no combination of governments can exercise effective control. It is due to the enormous number of men withdrawn from productive activity, to the incredible economic waste of the past five years and to non-production at the present time. Such non-production is occasioned by the causes I have just enumerated so far as Europe is concerned. The high cost of commodities is due also to that world-wide inflation from which we cannot wholly escape. We have a duty in this Parliament, I have no doubt, to prevent as far as we possibly can undue combination and extortion, and it has been the policy and the effort of the Government during the past two years to carry out that policy. I think we have carried it out in reasonable measure. The tariff is alluded to and reductions in the tariff are advocated. They may be necessary or desirable. But, Mr. Speaker, I invite your consideration to this question. Having regard to conditions as they are in the world to-day—because the cost of living is much higher in the European countries that I have visited than it is in Canada;—having regard to conditions in the United States, where the cost of living is I believe as high as it is in Canada, is there any one of us who can say that if the tariff were not modified or lowered but absolutely wiped out root and branch to-morrow, the cost of living would be appreciably lower in this country? If we are to benefit in that way we must first find a country where the cost of living is lower than it is here. Let us consider whether the lowering or the abolition of the tariff in the United States, or France, or Canada, or any other country, could overcome the world-wide conditions to which I have directed your attention? Some corporations and companies have made great profits. There is no doubt about that, and we have endeavoured to remedy that condition by the excess profits tax. But I want you to bear in mind that Canada is not the only country that has suffered in that way. In Italy, France, Belgium, and Great Britain itself, the cry is against the enormous profits made by some people in connection with the production of munitions, and otherwise. In every country the chief remedy sought, so far as I am aware, is to bring a large proportion of such profits into the public treasury for the benefit of the whole people.

Now, coming to the immediate question of the labour disturbances which unfortunately prevail in different parts of Canada let me say, so far as the eight-hour day is concerned, that we are committed to the proposals which are embodied in the Treaty of Peace, and the Federal Government proposes to carry them out to the extent of its jurisdiction and is impressed with the duty of doing so. To quote from the terms of the treaty:

> First. The guiding principle above enunciated that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce.

That stands as the first principle in the labour creed adopted by the nations which sat around the Peace table.

> Second. The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers.

We are committed to those proposals, and it is the intention, so far as the influence of the Federal Government is concerned, to carry them out. And although my hon. friend from the Cartier division of Montreal (Mr. Jacobs) seemed to consider it entirely a matter of no consequence as to whether or not we have constitutional power, surely the House will realize that we cannot invade the sphere of provincial jurisdiction merely because labour troubles at the present time are serious.

I took occasion to inform myself as to the respective powers of this Parliament and the provincial legislatures on this question and I have been advised by the law officers of the Crown that these are matters within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures and not within the jurisdiction of the federal Parliament. I observe that in the session of 1910-11 the then Minister of Labour, Hon. Mackenzie King, speaking on a Bill introduced by Mr. Verville referred to the question of jurisdiction in these words:

> Every hon. member of this House knows that no Bill can be passed by the Parliament of Canada which will give to the working classes generally an eight hour day. They know that that is the business of the provinces primarily, that it is the duty of the provincial legislatures to fix the hours of labour governing any particular industries.

If hon. gentlemen who are interested in this question will turn to the "Labour Gazette" of May 19, page 598, they will find that every province of Canada, except Prince Edward Island, has repeatedly legislated on the conditions and hours of labour and that the jurisdiction of the provincial

legislatures to deal with the question is sustained not only by the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, by the opinion of the Minister of Labour in the late Government, but also by the universal practice every since Confederation under which the provincial legislatures have dealt with this subject.

As to collective bargaining, I put forward the same view, that conditions of labour and matters of that nature all come within the purview of the provincial legislatures. But in so far as our influence and example are concerned, we have encouraged collective bargaining in the sense in which we understand it. The Railway War Board, which was established by this Government about a year, or a year and a half ago is one of the most useful examples of collective bargaining in its best sense that I know of. We meet our own employees at conferences and we have repeatedly brought about conferences between the employers and their men. We have taken every possible step towards a solution of these difficulties by mediation and conciliation and we are doing our best in composing these differences.

The leader of the Opposition has made a very important suggestion as to the enactment of a statute by this Parliament which will virtually abolish strikes and compel employers and employed to submit their differences to a fixed Tribunal. I have discussed the question of the right of the men to strike on many occasions and I would suggest to my hon. friend that before we undertake so drastic a step as to take away from the labour men of Canada a right which they prize as the Magna Charta of their liberties, we should require to have a very careful conference with them unless we were prepared to make matters very much worse than they are at present. The large majority of the labouring men in Canada are, in my judg-
12m. ment, disposed to look upon these questions in a reasonable way.

It would be one of the greatest mistakes that this Parliament could make to drive into what one might call the extreme wing of the labour party in Canada men who have as a whole been fair and reasonable in their attitude towards this question. At the same time I am disposed to say to-night what I have said many times to labour men, that surely, by a fair and reasonable spirit on one side and on the other, we can eventually, not by means of drastic legislation but by a better comprehension of each other's attitude, find some means more reasonable and more effective than the strike for composing differences between employers and employed. I most sincerely hope and, more than that, I believe, that the labouring men of Canada will see their way to adopt that principle in the early future.

I put the case before them, I think it was last summer, in the city of Toronto. We were discussing the question of the League of Nations and the abolition of war by means of conference discussion and publicity, with force perhaps in the background but only in the background. Take twenty-five or thirty nations speaking different languages with absolutely different ideals and at different stages of development and having a hard task in comprehending or realizing each other's outlook; if you expect these nations to unite for mutual discussion in the council of the League of Nations and thus compose their differences and if you base some reasonable hope upon the outcome of that proposal, surely the people of this country, living under the same laws and having very much the same ideals and the same point of view should be able to compose their differences at between employers and employed without resorting to the strike which has been described as little short of civil war. Indeed, a general strike carried out, as some people would desire to have it carried out, is little short of civil war.

I do hope, indeed, that the ideal which the leader of the Opposition has put before us to-night may be realized. I am not prepared to say it can be accomplished by the drastic methods which he has suggested. I rather think it must be accomplished by the better education of employers and employed, and by a realization of the new ideals which are an outcome of this war. In this connection I must express the hope—the very earnest hope—that some of the employers will give better indication of their comprehension of the new conditions and the new ideals arising out of war conditions. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let us have good confidence in the sound, practical common sense of the people, of the workingmen of Canada, to find a solution for our difficulties in the not distant future. And let there be not the slightest doubt that in so far as the Federal Government and Parliament are concerned, and in so far as they have the right to speak or to legislate, their aid and co-operation will not be wanting to bring about a solution of these difficulties.

Mr. G. W. ALLAN (South Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, in the debate precipitated this afternoon by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake), the discussion has taken a very wide range.

During the course of the afternoon the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) gave to the House his views as regards not only the metal workers' strike, but the sympathetic strike, and although the hour is late I feel I must crave the indulgence of the House. I think it would not be inopportune if, at this stage, before the debate is closed, I should give the point of view as to these happenings, first of all of the employers, or the so-called ironmasters, and secondly of that large portion of the population of the city of Winnipeg that were—not directly at any rate, and to a very slight extent indirectly—in any way interested in the matter in dispute in the so-called metal workers' strike. I was in Winnipeg five days, returning last Thursday, so that I can speak with some confidence, having been on the spot for that period of time, as regards what the conditions produced by the metal workers' strike, and by the subsequent sympathetic strike, in that city actually were. I should like, first of all, to read a letter which was handed to me on my arrival by the assistant general manager of the Manitoba Bridge and Iron Works, Limited. I desire to state to the House that I happened to have had an early and a continuous connection with that company from the time it employed only a few men until now it has grown to be a company of some considerable proportions, employing a large number of men in Winnipeg —in fact, between it and its subsidiaries, giving employment to between six and seven hundred men. I am satisfied from the inquiries I made, and from meeting with pretty well every phase of the question, that this letter will give the very closest approximation of the actual happening with the three iron companies, and that absolutely, completely, and without any possibility of contradiction or mistake, it gives the actualities of the happenings with this particular metal company. I may say that the letter does not happen to be dated, but was handed to me on the morning of the day following my arrival in Winnipeg. The letter is as follows:

> The present situation developed, so far as our company is concerned, in the latter part of April, through the presentation of a schedule by the Metal Trades Council requiring the signing of an agreement, with that body, whereby many drastic changes would be made in our operations principally:
>
> (a) substitution of the 8-hour day for 10 hours.
>
> (b) An increase in wages of from 30 to 60 per cent.
>
> (c) The submission of our Shop Rules to regulation by the Metal Trades Council.
>
> (d) The payment of a uniform wage irrespective of ability.
>
> (e) The arbitrary classification of men on a Railway Shop basis.
>
> The officials of the company posted a notice intimating that they would be glad to discuss with the Shop Committee this, or any other matter considered to be requiring adjustment. A meeting was held and the company after some discussion offered, as had been done some weeks previously to grant a nine-hour day with ten hours pay and a minimum wage of $4 per day, or practically 45 cents per hour for common labour. We pointed out that as our business was taken in competition with Eastern Canada and the United States our hours and working conditions must be governed by the conditions prevailing there, we therefore made the proposition that should it be established that the eight-hour day was in effect in competitive plants in the East, that it should be immediately put into force here; the same pay as for ten hours being given, that is, the hourly rate would be increased 25 per cent. It was thought and stated that this investigation which would be carried on by employees and employers independently would take a month or six weeks. It was also pointed out that for the present the company was prepared to deal with its own men only. The Shop Committee agreed to consider the proposal, and the following day submitted a schedule from which the name of the Metal Trades Council had been eliminated. The company's officials repeated the offer concerning the eight hour day, and stated that rates could be discussed, also other minor conditions.
>
> On May the larger number of our workmen were called out, many of them stating that they left against their will, and since that date we have not been operating except in a limited way.
>
> On May 8th, with Messrs. Barrett and Warren, representing the Vulcan Iron Works and the Dominion Bridge Company, I was called into conference with the Mayor and we suggested to him that we were willing to submit all differences to arbitration. He stated that he would put the suggestion before the labour people. This resulted in a meeting being held in the Builders' Exchange May 9th, at which Premier Norris, Mayor Gray, Mr. Winning and other representatives of the Trades and Labour Council were present, together with Mr. Hazelton, president of the Builders' Exchange, and we three representatives of the Iron Working Shops. At this meeting the question of arbitration was barely mentioned and little was accomplished. The following day a meeting was held, Premier Norris presiding, in the Builders' Exchange, at which there were present five representatives of the Metal Trades Council, and the three representatives of the Iron Shops. The following suggestions were offered by the employers:
>
> First. The establishment of a 45-hour week on 55-hour pay.
>
> Second. The deferment of the matter of recognition of the union until such time as an Employers' Association

as outlined before the Mathers Commission had been formed, and the necessary machinery established to make such agreements effective.

Third. The submission to a board of arbitration to be appointed wholly by the Premier of all points at issue.

The first suggestion was not unfavourably received, the second not discussed but the Labour representatives stated they would submit the third to their meeting the following morning. Premier Norris then proposed the Board as follows, and gave the names to the meeting:

T. J. Murray, Solicitor for the Trades and Labour Council.

R. B. Russell, Secretary of the Machinists' Union.

R. F. McWilliams, Solicitor.

H. B. Lyall, Manufacturer.

The following morning the Premier named Mr. R. D. Waugh, Chairman, and advised those who had been present at the meeting accordingly. Late that day, on making inquiry, he was informed by Secretary Robinson of the Trades and Labour Council, that it was not an acceptable solution. In the meantime before the hour set by the committee who represented the Labour organization before Premier Norris, for the consideration of his proposal, the notices calling a general strike were being delivered. Since the general strike has been called the Iron Shops, at the request of the Citizens' Committee have agreed to enter into no negotiations or make no settlement until the sympathetic strike has been abandoned, and conditions have become normal again in Winnipeg.

The cause of the strike is the alleged refusal of the Iron Companies to recognize "Collective bargaining," which the strikers interpret to mean the signing of agreements with the Metal Trades Council, a local federation of Metal Tradesmen of different crafts. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the Metal Trades Council is not generally recognized by the railways who have agreements with different crafts only. The term "Collective bargaining" is susceptible apparently of different interpretations. In the report of the Mathers Commission of 1918 signed by ex-President Tipping of the Trades and Labour Council, the system then in vogue with at least two of the companies and their employees, whereby they met committees of their own men, and arranged matters pertaining to the individual shops is referred to as "Collective bargaining." This system of arranging the settlement of all differences and co-operating with employees by committees in regular conferences with them is as effective a method of "bargaining collectively" as can be conceived. True it does not recognize the Business Agent of the Union as it is assumed that he not having knowledge of the conditions in our shops, and not being on our pay-roll should not exercise any authority in our plant; nor does it contemplate the signing of agreements with any but our own men.

On the other hand under the system no distinction is made between men belonging to the union, and those who do not, and our Shop Rules distinctly provide that we recognize the right of men to organize in any way and to be members of unions. For some months past we have had weekly meetings with Shop Committees at which all conditions were fully and freely discussed with very gratifying results.

[Mr. Allan.]

Our reasons for objecting to becoming parties to an agreement with the Metal Trades Council at Winnipeg are briefly these:

First. Fully 80 per cent of our business is secured in competition with shops in Eastern Canada, and the United States, and our very existence depends upon conditions being no more onerous in our shops than in competitive plants. No shops in Canada or in the United States, to our knowledge, with whom we compete, operate under restrictive union conditions. We are a relatively small factory in the manufacturing field and cannot take the initiative in inaugurating new conditions.

Second. Winnipeg being a railway centre, probably eighty-five per cent of the metal workers of the city are employed in railway shops. The proposal is that we should sign an agreement putting into force railway shop conditions in our plant. These conditions are notoriously unadaptable to competitive business through restrictions on output, and imposition of rules respecting use of machines, classes of work which certain men shall do, etc. The preponderance of railway employees in such unions would inevitably lead to the domination of our shops by men who have no understanding of the necessities of competitive business.

Third. Any agreement made with the Metal Trades' Council of Winnipeg as at present constituted would, in our opinion, be participation in a plan to place industry in Canada under the control of interests which do not truly represent labour, but which have other aims in view than the betterment of social conditions in this country.

Fourth. Until the principle of the sympathetic strike is discarded the signing of an agreement which may be broken the next day on account of a disagreement in some other plant is useless, and would render contract business impossible.

I beg, however, to call your attention to the proposed plan placed before the Mather Commission on Industrial Relations, when it was sitting in Winnipeg this month, by Winnipeg Manufacturers. This plan is an adaptation of the Whitley, Rockfeller, and other systems now in successful operation, and provides for the making of agreements between responsible organizations of Employers and Employees with Councils, Local, Provincial, and Federal, through which adjustment of any difficulties can be had. To this plan we can give our hearty assent believing it will solve our particular trouble, and it is the earnest hope of Metal Trades Manufacturers that it may be adopted in some form or another.

Yours very truly,

H B. B. Lyall.

I now wish to say a few words as to what results the sympathetic strike produced upon that very large portion of the population of Winnipeg that had no special interest in and was in no way connected with the metal workers or the metal employers. The sympathetic strike took the people by surprise as it came so quickly, very much after the fashion of the war and due to the difficulty we experienced in believing that it

would be suddenly precipitated upon us in so comprehensive a manner. I for one, having lived in Winnipeg practically all my life—forty years this month—would not have believed it if any one had put it up to me six weeks ago—although I had followed fairly closely the events in that city and mixed freely with all classes of our people—that for a brief period, the Government of the city could have been taken over by the so called " Big Five " or council of five. But the fact was that practically out of the blue the city of Winnipeg was closed up about as tight as a box. The post office facilities came abruptly to an end and also the telegraphic facilities. The going out on sympathetic strike of the employees of the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, and the Civic Government, and the suspension of many services and many businesses produced the most drastic discomfort, at any rate for a short period, and this discomfort still subsists to a very considerable extent. The police voted to go out on sympathetic strike, but remained at their duty at the request of the Strike Committee. What degree of reliance could be placed upon them, I think, can very well be appraised under such conditions. The firemen went out. Then the water supply, the removal of garbage—all those services which are necessary for the comfort of the city with a population of approximately 200,000 people, were impaired or were suddenly brought to an end. The water supply as controlled, was absolutely inadequate for the purposes of protection against fire; and for a time the city was practically helpless in this particular. The pressure was such that no water could go beyond the ground floor of any building. To a very large extent, in common with all western cities, Winnipeg has a markedly large number of apartment houses, and it can be easily imagined, without my labouring the subject, what that meant so far as discomfort is concerned, and also what the cutting off of bread and milk meant, particularly to the patients in the hospitals and to babies. Those conditions in which seemingly for a time there was partially usurped the Federal, the Provincial and the Civic authority passed away very soon, and there is no doubt what precipitated prompt organization on the part of all citizens who were not participating in the strike was produced by the practical tie up of the city, and the attempt to usurp governmental control. What was produced there was a banding together with extraordinary solidarity, which I have absolute confidence will remain to the end, of all those who felt that their property, the lives of their families and the ordinary comforts and protections to which they were entitled demanded their attention and care. They felt that they should, to the full extent of their ability do what the Federal authorities required of them. To voluntarily assist wherever the public service was affected, which meant that when the 400-odd employees of the post office went out, the Citizens' Committee were prepared promptly to give whatever number of voluntary assistants could be taken charge of by some fourteen men who remained in the service of the post office. The statement was made: We will replace either the number that have gone out of the service of the post office on strike, or we will give you a larger number, or we will give you any number that you can handle and will increase that from time to time promptly on your demand. I may say that in the choice of those whom they turned over as volunteers to this Government, they gave the men most capable of according effective service. Among others sorting letters in the Winnipeg Post Office were Mr. C. P. Wilson, K.C., leader of the Manitoba Bar, and Mr. P. A. Macdonald, Utilities Commissioner of the Province of Manitoba. I saw man after man the heads of large concerns and others holding important positions in the city so occupied during the first period in which voluntary relief was accorded to the postal service.

To the province similarly the Citizens' Committee accorded volunteer assistance through their daughters and wives to the telephone exchanges to take the place of sympathetically striking telephone operators. Their offer was accepted by the Provincial Government and was of great advantage during the period that I was in Winnipeg. Of fourteen firehalls in Winnipeg, thirteen were fully manned by volunteers offered promptly by the Citizens' Committee to the civil authorities. There was not, on the part of the people in the district surrounding one firehall in Weston, which happens to be a suburb near the Canadian Pacific shops, seemingly a desire to have volunteer assistance, and that is the only firehall out of fourteen that I was informed was not fully manned. During my visit a fire that had often been dreaded in Winnipeg, and which might have had the most serious results, started next to the Hudson Bay departmental store on Main street, skipped, owing to the wind being in the

east, over the entire Hudson Bay store, a city block beyond, and caught fire on the roof of the Auditorium rink, which has, since its erection, been a recognized menace and has been, as I was informed, with all insurance men "K.O." or keep off. This building caught fire in many places on the roof, and if it had not been successfully fought, what had always been feared would doubtless have taken place, namely a very large conflagration in the Hudson Bay Reserve section of the city of Winnipeg, but that volunteer fire force in about two and a half hours' fighting extinguished the fire.

It was clearly ascertained on my arrival in Winnipeg that the sole objective of the Citizens' Committee was to afford the assistance that I have just set forth to the federal, provincial and civic authorities to protect property, and to render conditions in the city normal as rapidly as possible. I think I omitted to say that to General Ketchen they offered to fulfill any requirements he might have as regards men. The offer was that if he wanted anything up to 10,000 men they would be forthcoming immediately, and if I remember aright, he promptly enrolled some 4,000 men, and he has in barracks to-day over 1,000 men, who have signed up under the Militia Act for the prescribed period of service.

I wish to say just one thing in connection with the people of Winnipeg generally. I am profoundly convinced that the heart of the great bulk of labour in Winnipeg is absolutely sound. I feel that their loyalty to the constituted government of this country is beyond all possible suspicion. I believe it will be shown, before these troublesome times which are apparently upon us now are brought to an end, that loyalty to constitutional government will be displayed by the great bulk of labour from one end of Canada to the other. I must frankly state that, although the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews), if I understood him correctly, expressed feelings that "the big five" were all that they should be, I do not and cannot share his views. I regret this, because I would much rather that those men were of a character that could carry all men's confidences, but I feel very strongly that there are in Winnipeg many thousands of people that share the view which I am forced to express in that particular. I do not wish to dwell upon it except to say that labour in Winnipeg has, I believe, during the last two or three years, got into troublous times as regards its leaders owing to the supplanting of the labour leaders of a few years ago, men like Puttee, Ward, Rigg and Tipping, president of the Trades and Labour Council, who, the moment he signed that unanimous report of the Mathers' Commission last year and said that when he accepted that position he felt it was a quasi-judicial position and he would have to decide according to the evidence, was dismissed from his position. I think those who have replaced him and those into whose hands the real power has latterly fallen are men in whom the general public has no confidence, and I believe there is a daily, and, indeed, an hourly growing want of confidence in them on the part of the broad ranks of labour in Winnipeg. The trend of the strike in Winnipeg to-day has taken the sting out of the sympathetic strikes in other western cities. The fundamental mistakes that they indulged in at the start have not been repeated in Calgary, Edmonton and other western points, and I believe will not be repeated anywhere else in Canada. If there is one thing which is calculated to deprive strikers absolutely and completely of the sympathy of the public it is such action as took place in Winnipeg in the early days of the sympathetic strike. I have every confidence that the sympathetic strike in the city of Winnipeg will be brought to an end at no distant date, and I believe it will be brought to an end without violence; but if violence should unfortunately occur I believe that the military forces and the Mounted Police would be equal promptly and effectually to cope with any eventualities. I sincerely trust, and my belief is, that there will be no necessity for them to intervene. I have been a resident of the city of Winnipeg all my life, and my fond hope is that at the conclusion of this strike the action not only of the citizens of Winnipeg, of the Citizens' Committee, but of all employers as well, will be such as not to embitter the situation. I believe that the attitude of the employers generally will be to try to avoid imposing hardships on their employees because of their misguided action in going out on this sympathetic strike. I believe that when this strike is brought to an end, justice, fairness, and a complete absence of bombast, which we do not tolerate in the West, no matter who may be the upper dog, will prevail in the city of Winnipeg. I firmly believe that when the sympathetic strike is brought to an end the metal workers strike will be settled very readily, and on absolutely just and absolutely fair lines as between employ-

ers and employees. Having regard to all the conditions affecting these three metal shops of comparatively small size, stowed away in the middle of the continent, and having regard also to the large competitors of these three shops in the East and in the United States, I believe that what is reasonable and just in the premises will be done.

A statement was made this afternoon by one hon. member that thousands of returned soldiers in Winnipeg were indulging in something of a disturbing or riotous nature. My ears were naturally pricked up during the course of the afternoon and evening, not that I had a chip on my shoulder, but I am sensitive where my own city is concerned, and I wish to say in closing that I do not believe there ever was a strike of the proportions of this strike in a population of 200,000 souls in which there was such a complete absence of violence of any kind.

As I have already said what I believe about labour, I wish to say that I believe it is the intention of the great mass of the people who have formed the Citizens' Committee not to become in any way partisans in the dispute between the so-called iron masters and their employees. The necessities of the case demanded that they should organize and give unremitting and unselfish service. Furthermore, to my mind nothing could exceed the absolute propriety of what you might call the neutrality of the returned soldiers. After due deliberation they determined to stand apart and not participate in the dispute in any way, either in the original strike of the metal workers, or in the sympathetic strike. To suggest for one moment that the great body of returned soldiers in the city of Winnipeg, exceeding 15,000 men, have been guilty of any misconduct from the commencement of the original strike down to the present moment is most unfair and most unjust, because it is absolutely untrue. To accentuate what I have said about the returned soldier, let me say that on Tuesday last I left Winnipeg to come to Ottawa, and on the previous Sunday the 27th Battalion returned to Winnipeg. The 27th had been in France in General Ketchen's brigade. When this body of seasoned troops just back from the front returned to Winnipeg what happened? Was there a moment's hesitation about demobilizing them? Was it suggested that they should be kept in arms for one solitary moment longer than was necessary to demobilize them? No, they were welcomed by the people of the city of Winnipeg, and after General Ketchen had taken the salute the battalion was demobilized and went to their homes—all except 280 who belonged to the city of Winnipeg. These men of Winnipeg gathered around General Ketchen to say good-bye, and their last words to him were: "Well, General, we will be here in Winnipeg, and you will know where to find us if you want us."

Motion (Mr. Blake) to adjourn the House negatived.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved: That when this House adjourns this day, it stand adjourned until Wednesday, 4th June.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 12.50 a.m.

Wednesday, June 4, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS AND JOURNALS.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston) presented the first report of the committee, as follows:

The Special Committee appointed to consider the question of consolidating the Votes and Proceedings and Journals of the House of Commons with a view to economy, beg leave to present the following as their report:

Your committee having carefully considered the matter recommend that the distribution of the bound copies of the Votes and Proceedings be dispensed with.

As the Journals in their present form show a great deal of unnecessary repetition and redundancy and the Votes and Proceedings as being at present compiled with the adoption of certain forms used in the Journals, give a complete and accurate report of the proceedings of the House, your committee are of the opinion that, a change would be advantageous both as regards efficiency and economy and recommend that the record used at present as the Votes and Proceedings be substituted for that of the Journals, thus obviating the necessity of resetting the type for the Journals.

SENATE BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 126, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Redman.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What were the gross receipts, per month, in 1918, of each station of the Transcontinental Railway?

2. How many cars were received and despatched, per month, at each of said stations, in 1918?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. It is not in the interest of the Canadian National Railways System that information as to the business done at each station, either by way of receipts or cars despatched, should be given to competing systems.

2. Answered by No. 1.

ALLEYN TASCHEREAU.

Mr. MORPHY:

1. Was Alleyn Taschereau an officer of the Justice Department at the city of Quebec in connection with the Military Service Act?

2. Was his conduct as such called in question as respects his handling of public moneys?

3. Were instructions given for his prosecution?

4. If so, why has he not been prosecuted?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. A warrant was applied for by representatives of the Department of Justice. An inquiry was held by the magistrate at Quebec, who refused to issue a warrant. All information was sent to the Attorney-General of the province of Quebec, calling attention to the matter and asking him to take such steps as might be necessary in the interests of justice.

BOARD OF PENSION COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. How many members are there on the Board of Pension Commissioners of Canada?

2. What are their names, and the dates of their respective appointments?

3. Who is the Secretary of the Board?

4. What is his overseas military record, if any?

5. Is it a fact that there are medical, legal or other officials employed by the Board who have had no overseas military service?

6. If so, what are their names, and what remuneration are they receiving?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. There are at present two members on the Board of Pension Commissioners, one commissionership being vacant.

2. Lt.-Col. J. T. C. Thompson, D.S.O., who was appointed the 9th December, 1918, and Major Stanley B. Coristine, who was appointed the 17th February, 1919.

3. The position of secretary is vacant at present. The duties of the position are, however, being temporarily performed by the former secretary, Major Stanley B. Coristine, in addition to his other duties.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Yes.

6. Mr. K. Archibald, $4,800 per annum; Mr. F. C. Baker, $2,200; Mr. R. R. Belanger, $1,700; Dr. W. D. M. Bell, $3,500; Col. C. W. Belton, $5,000; Col. J. S. Dunbar, $4,700; Capt. W. L. Germaine, $2,600; Dr. W. O. Gliddon, $3,500; Mr. J. Inglis, $420, (for part time service in Brandon); Capt. E. King, $2,900; Mr. J. Kittle, $1,700; Mr. J. C. Letellier, $1,500; Mr. N. McIlveen, $1,800; Mr. F. T. Orgill, $1,800; Mr. J. A. W. Paton, $2,900; Mr. G. Sleeman, $1,600; Mr. P. Williams, $1,100.

In addition to the foregoing, Mr. M. E. Bailey, consulting mechanical and efficiency engineer, was employed temporarily by Commander J. K. L. Ross at a rate of $833.32 per month. This employment will cease on the 18th August, 1919.

HIS HONOUR JUDGE CLEMENS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Which Royal Commissioner held an investigation relating to His Honour Judge Clemens, of British Columbia, and when was the said investigation held?

2. What amount has been paid by the Government to the said Royal Commissioner therefor?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The Government is not aware of the appointment of such a commissioner.

2. Answered by No. 1.

NOVA SCOTIA CARRIAGES LTD.

*Mr. DUFF:

1. What amount of rental has been paid by the Government to the Nova Scotia Carriages, Limited, or the liquidators or bondholders thereof, for the use by the Militia Department of the carriage factory building at Amherst, Nova Scotia, and to whom were such payments made?

2. What use is being made of the building at the present time?

3. When does the contract for occupation terminate?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

Department of Public Works—

1. $3,500 to 25th March, 1919; (b) paid to Percy C. Black of Amherst, and John W. Regan of Halifax, N.S., as liquidators of Nova Scotia Carriages, Limited.

Department of Militia and Defence—

1. $100 for rental of a floor in the factory building for one week only.

2. Accommodation for returning troops which may have to be held over on their way from Halifax, and accommodation for dispersal station, Military District No. 6, at Amherst.

3. 25th March, 1920.

COL. F. W. MARLOW.

*Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. Was Colonel F. W. Marlow instructed to investigate the Canadian Army Medical Service in Canada?

2. If so, did Colonel Marlow conduct such

an investigation and later submit a report giving the results of his inquiry?

3. If so, when was such report received?

4. Will the said report be laid on the table of the House?

5. If not, why not?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Under instructions issued by the Adjutant General, dated August 14, 1916, Colonel Frederick William Marlow was detailed by the General Officer Commanding, Military District No. 2, for the duty as Principal Medical Inspector to make a special report on the Medical Services in connection with the Overseas Services in Canada.

2. Colonel Marlow completed such inspection on October 16, 1916.

3. Completed and forwarded his report on October 20, 1916, to the General Officer Commanding, Military District No. 2, who in turn, under date October 23, 1916, forwarded the same to the secretary, Militia Council, Ottawa. Practically all of the recommendations in the report have been put into effect.

4. Yes, if asked for.

5. Answered by No. 4.

LIEUTENANT R. BATEMAN ET AL.

*Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. What were the places of enlistment in Canada of Lieutenant R. Bateman, Lieutenant J. Sanders, Major W. J. Hamilton, Corporal Richard William Morsdale, No. 410667, and Corporal George Sweeney, No. 410632, who went overseas with the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?

2. Where are these persons at present?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 and 2.

Name.	Place of Enlistment.	Present Whereabouts.
Lt. R. Bateman, 94th Batt....	Kenora, Ont...	Still Overseas.
Maj. W. J. Hamilton, 21st Reserve Battalion.	Fort William, Ont.....	Struck off strength in Winnipeg, Man., 9-8-18.
410667, Cpl. R. W. Worsdale, 38th Battalion	Ottawa, Ont.....	Still on strength in Toronto, Ont.
410632, Cpl. George Sweeney, 38th Battalion	Ottawa, Ont	Still Overseas.
Lt. J. Sanders, C.A.D.C.....	Kemptville, Ont.....	Resigned commission June 14th, 1916.

PUGWASH SPUR.

Mr. COPP:

1. What has been the cost of the railway spur from the main line of the Government Railway to the brick works at Pugwash, Nova Scotia, and when was the work completed?

2. Are there any outstanding accounts in connection therewith?

3. What have been the total receipts from said spur?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. $92,452.67. Work was completed August 28, 1918.

2. Yes—there are four portions of right of way not paid for:—From Vickery Estate 2,700 sq. ft. of land and boat landing shut off by embankment, estimated value, $44. Estate Daniel Rogers, right of way 2,700 sq. ft., estimated value, $82.50. In both these cases title not clear. From Estate Edgar Bent, area 2,098 sq. ft., value, $50. Mr. Bent has just returned from overseas and is willing to accept this amount. Estate John Tucker, right of way 12,632 sq. ft., estimated value, $19.14., also two borrow pits outside right of way, area 1.78 acres, value, $257 total amount. Tucker Estate, $286.14. This was refused by Colonel Tucker, but heirs now willing to accept.

3. The same freight rates apply on traffic from and to the Nova Scotia Clay Works Spur as from Pugwash proper, except on shipments of oil on which there is a switching charge of one cent per 100 lbs. The total receipts from such switching charges to the end of March, 1919, amounted to $82.40. The total tonnage handled over spur from same date, opened in August to end of March, 1919, was 2,479 tons and the total Canadian Government Railways' earnings from originating point to destination on such shipments were $5,167.63. In connection with this spur the Nova Scotia Clay Works Limited is to pay an annual rental of $1,700 for 15 years.

LAKE ST. JOSEPH HOTEL.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is the Lake St. Joseph Hotel, Lake St. Joseph, Quebec, the property of the Canadian National Railway?

2. If so, does the Canadian National Railway intend leasing this property to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Lake St. Joseph Hotel is owned by the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, the stock of which is 88.5 per cent owned by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, which forms part of the Canadian National Railways.

2. No.

FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORIES.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has the Government received any complaints with regard to the Forest Products Laboratories of the Department of the Interior?

2. Have certain of the leading officials of these laboratories left, and are others about to leave, owing to the fact that wholly inadequate salaries are being paid?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the salaries of trained experts in this department in order that its value to the lumbermen and paper makers of Canada may be increased?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Representations have been made that a higher scale of salaries should be paid to the technical staff.

2. Certain officials have resigned intimating that better opportunities were offered outside.

3. The matter of salaries is being dealt with by the Civil Service Commission in connection with the re-classification of the Civil Service.

MAJOR ARGUE.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is Major Argue the officer commanding the Sanford Fleming Home, Ottawa?

2. Has this officer been overseas?

3. If so, how long?

4. With what units?

5. If not, what are his particular qualifications for the position he now holds?

6. What is his pay?

7. What are his allowances?

8. How long has he been in charge of this hospital?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. No. It is presumed that this inquiry refers to Lt.-Col. J. Fenton Argue, Ottawa.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Answered by No. 2.

5. Lt.-Col. Argue is President of the Standing Medical Board, Ottawa, and has shown throughout many years of service the highest degree of professional and military efficiency in the discharge of duty.

6. Pay of his rank, $7 per day (as officer in charge of medical boards).

7. $1.25 per day field allowance.

8. Answered by No. 1.

J. H. LEWIS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What is the position held by J. H. Lewis, an official of the Post Office Department?

2. When was he appointed?

3. Was he appointed by Order in Council? If so, on what date?

4. Has he been promoted from one sub-division to another?

5. If so, under what clause of the Civil Service Act was this promotion made?

6. What is his salary at present, and what are his duties?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Purchasing agent.

2. 26th September, 1886.

3. Yes. Order in Council dated 16th October, 1886.

4. Yes.

5. Section 24, Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.

6. $2,900. Full charge and control over the purchasing and contracting for all articles of mail equipment and supplies generally under the supervision of the War Purchasing Commission, and also in charge of the distribution of the said articles and supplies except those obtained through the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

SOCIAL HYGIENE CONFERENCE.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Was a Social Hygiene Conference held lately in Ottawa?

2. Did the Government call the conference or assist in calling it? If so, at whose suggestion or request?

3. Were the invitations to attend the conference sent out by the Government? If so, how, and by whom, were the persons selected to whom such invitations were sent?

4. Which member of the Government was charged with the duty of sending out the invitations and through what department were they sent out?

5. Has the Government paid or is it the intention of the Government to pay the whole or part of the expense of holding the convention? If so, what will be the total amount?

6. Out of what fund or vote will the money for the said payment be taken?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. At the request of the health authorities of the Federal and Provincial Governments embodied in a resolution passed at a conference of these authorities held in Ottawa on the 3rd day of February, 1919.

3. Yes. The persons invited consisted of the health authorities of the Federal and Provincial Governments and representatives of the social organizations or agencies interested in the subject matter of the conference. A list of those to be invited was submitted to the Government by Mr. C. V. Massey, who was secretary of the Conference of the Federal and Provincial Health Authorities which requested the calling of the Social Hygiene Conference, and Captain Gordon Bates, who was secretary of the Social Hygiene Conference.

4. The invitations were sent out by Sir Thomas White as Acting Prime Minister. The arrangements and detailed work in connection with sending out the invitations were in charge of Mr. C. V. Massey.

5. The Government has not paid any expenses so far, and does not expect to pay any expenses of representatives of provincial health authorities attending the conference, but will pay the other expenses of the conference.

6. Out of the item of contingencies for the Department of Health, which will appear in the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1919-1920.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. GAUTHIER:

1. What amount of goods, free of duty, has been imported by the Dominion Steel Corporation, Limited, into Canada pursuant to contract based on Order in Council, P.C. 758?
2. What was the nature of these goods?
3. Were they raw material or manufactured goods?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Referring to page 459 of the Report of the Ministry Overseas Military Forces of Canada, 1918, and to paragraph (c) Topical Films; what was the total amount paid for the films in question?
2. Was such payment made by or through the Canadian War Records Office in London? If not, by whom was such payment made?
3. To whom was such payment made?
4. Were the said films, or moving pictures, exhibited in Canada and elsewhere? If so, in what countries have they been exhibited?
5. Was an admission fee charged at each of such exhibitions? If so, what was the total cash proceeds, and to whom was the money paid?
6. Has the Canadian Government received the whole, or any part of the said cash proceeds? If not, what action, if any, has been taken to recover the money?
7. Were the said films given, sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of to a private company? If so, on what terms and what are the names of the members of such company?
8. Is it true, as alleged in certain English papers, that the cost of the Canadian War Paintings which were exhibited in England, was defrayed out of the proceeds of the exhibition of the said films, or moving pictures? If so, who had the custody of the funds if they were not turned over to the Government?
9. Had the Famous Players Film Company any connection with any of the matters hereinbefore inquired about? If so, what and on what terms?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What was the initial cost of the thirty-six drifters known as the "C.D's" referred to by the Honourable Minister of Naval Affairs on page 2916 of Unrevised Hansard?
2. How much was expended in repairing these vessels from date of purchase to November 11, 1918?
3. Who, on behalf of the Government, looked after the building of these vessels?
4. Who accepted these vessels from the builders?
5. Is he still in the service?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

For a copy of the report made by Mr. Décarie, local superintendent of the Department of Public Works, relating to the wharf at Cacouna East; also copy of the petition showing the names of the persons who signed requesting the construction of said wharf; also copy of the reports, letters, petitions and requests received from J. A. Tremblay respecting said wharf.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): May I be permitted to put to the Prime Minister a question which he can answer at his leisure? If there be any truth in the newspaper rumour that the questions raised by the Franchise Bill are to be postponed until a later period of the year, will he consider the advisability of taking up with the Cabinet the question of having a Speaker's Conference during the recess to look into the matter of proportional representation? I am quite sure that such an inquiry would meet a very large amount of really earnest public sentiment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can say at once to my hon. friend that, with my colleagues, I shall give very attentive consideration to the suggestion he has put forward.

INDUSTRIAL UNREST IN CANADA.

THE WINNIPEG STRIKE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): May I ask the Prime Minister if he has any further information to give to the House with regard to the settlement of the strikes in Western Canada?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think there is anything of importance beyond what has already appeared in the public press. The Minister of Labour (Hon. G. D. Robertson) returned from Winnipeg yesterday and gave us an account of the events which have taken place there. There is nothing I can usefully add to the very lucid statement which was given in the House the other evening by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Arthur Meighen), who was with the Minister of Labour in Winnipeg. We receive a good many communications on this subject from day to day; I have not thought

it worth while to burden the House by reading them. If any communication of an exceptionally important character is received, I should, of course, feel it my duty to communicate it to the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: We see in the papers from day to day references to some railway committee or body of railway men who are acting as intermediaries in the Winnipeg strike. Is that really going on?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it is quite true that the six great international railway organizations have offered their services as mediators and that they are now engaged in the task of endeavouring to bring the parties together and to reach a common agreement.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION ON VANCOUVER –SKAGWAY ROUTE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon): May I ask the Minister of Marine whether negotiations are proceding with the United States Government regarding further aids to navigation on the route between Vancouver and Skagway, Alaska? I have in mind the wreck of the Princess Sophia off the Lynn canal last October.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE: No negotiations are going on at the present time between the Canadian Government and the Government of the United States with regard to that part of the coast on which the United States have to provide the necessary aids to navigation. The unfortunate accident to the Princess Sophia on the Vanderbilt Ledge occurred on a part of the coast which is under the control of the United States Government; Canada has no jurisdiction over it. The Canadian coast line extends northward to the entrance to Portland canal, near Port Simpson; follows the Portland canal to the head, and thence proceeds in a northwesterly direction inland. South of the International boundary the inland waterway is well marked; indeed there are very few representations in that regard from shipping interests that remain unsatisfied. Every reasonable endeavour is made to meet requirements as they arise. Northward of Port Simpson the inland waterway lies in United States territory, the point where the Princess Sophia was lost being about 350 miles up the coast north of the International boundary.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 125, to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks' Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Long Lake Forest Reserve:

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain this?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The clauses of the Bill are all in principle alike. All the Bill does is to take certain areas out of forest reserves as at present established by Statute. The purpose of taking these portions out is to make them available for soldier settlement. All the portions have been examined and in every case where possible representatives of the Forestry Department have been engaged in the examination.

Mr. CAHILL: Are these changes to be made only in specific cases, or are you taking power to make similar changes in respect of all forest reserves?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill specifies in each case the exact area to be taken out of these reserves. We are asking no powers for the Governor in Council.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Larch Hills forest reserve:

Mr. ROSS: What is the total acreage made available for settlement in all these forest reserves?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not made up the total. In the last line of each paragraph the exact acreage that is being taken up in each case is given.

On section 6—Riding Mountain forest reserve:

Mr. CAMPBELL: Are any copies of this Bill available for distribution?

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill has already been distributed and should be on the files of hon. members; they can be obtained at the Distribution Office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I assume that the hon. gentleman is interested in the application of the Bill to the Porcupine and Riding Mountain reserves. This Bill takes a very considerable area out of No. 2 Porcupine reserve—that is, that portion of the Porcupine reserve that is in Saskatchewan. The area taken out is defined in the Bill, and

I have the maps here showing the area. I naturally cannot make the map available to all at once, and except by laying the map on the table, which I am ready to do, I cannot give any explanation other than what is in the Bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I understand that it is the intention of the minister to take out of the reserve a certain number of townships now and later on a further area. Is that correct?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should not like to make a statement as to the taking out of any further area. The area taken out now is quite a substantial one.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Porcupine Forest Reserve No. 1:

Mr. CAMPBELL: Just what area is being taken out of this Reserve?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Porcupine Reserve in the province of Manitoba covers an area of 777·5 square miles, and we are taking out of that 2·5 square miles. Out of the Porcupine Reserve in Saskatchewan we are taking 376·5 square miles which will reduce the present area of the reserve in Saskatchewan from 3,246·75 to 2,870·25.

Mr. CAHILL: How far from a railway will settlement be permitted in these reserves?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have not adopted any rigid rule in that regard. While the reserve remains as such, there is necessarily no railway penetration, there being no need for railway service; but when these areas are taken out and settled, there will be need of railway service. Portions of the area we are taking out will doubtless be a considerable distance from a railway. The river—I forget its name—has to be traversed, and doubtless bridges will have to be built. The soldiers are very anxious to settle on this area and take their chances of a railway going in. I think the hon. member for Dauphin or the hon. member for Nelson could give the distance from the railway better than I could.

Mr. CAMPBELL: As I understand it, in the area that is being taken out, the shortest distance to the railway will 6 or 7 miles, running from 15 to 20 miles, and perhaps more, in other portions.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Are the lots being taken out in a solid block or being selected because of their suitability for agricultural purposes? My reason for asking is that where areas are selected through a forest reserve, and settlement is created within the reserve, there is very great danger of the reserve being entirely wiped out by fire.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Areas are not being taken out in any regular blocks. The first principle followed is this: The land must be reasonably fit for agricultural purposes or mixed farming. It must be found to be so, and we have tried to be very careful in that regard, because this reserve was first created on the assumption that it was more fit for forestry than anything else. We have had to exercise considerable caution not to be over-influenced by those anxious to settle on forest reserves, because very frequently they hastily come to the conclusion that it is agricultural land when really it is not. However, after the most careful survey we could make of this Porcupine reserve, which is the principal one we are dealing with in this Bill, we came to the conclusion that we could not justify retaining this area. What we are taking out is in two pieces. I cannot describe it better than by showing it to the hon. member on the map. The portion to the west is oblong in shape and about two townships wide, varying somewhat on the northern limit. The other portion is almost square in shape, situated more to the east, and is about twenty miles from the eastern boundary of the province of Saskatchewan.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I chance to be familiar with that part of the country. The area which is being taken out in Saskatchewan is south of the lower Red Deer river and southeast of Etomami Junction. It at one time formed the famous reserve owned by one of our worthy senators. It was covered with magnificent spruce, but in 1886 the reserve was burnt, and a second fire cleaned the timber right off. There is now no timber on it, and nearly every foot of it is fit for farming.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can more fully answer my hon. friend from Pontiac now. The large portion taken out of the Porcupine reserve runs in an oblong shape east and west. The Canadian Northern railway runs east and west along the north part of it, distant about seven or eight miles from the northern extremity of the excepted area. The excepted area is, generally speaking, about twelve miles deep. Very little of the land that is being taken out of the reserve is more than nineteen miles distant from a railway, and the average would be about twelve or thirteen miles.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Saskatchewan—Pines Forest Reserve:

Mr. CAHILL: What is the size of this reserve and of the area being taken out?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The total withdrawn from the Pines Forest reserve was only one and one-half quarter-section. Speaking from memory, I do not think that is for soldiers' settlement but was land granted to individual squatters upon which they had rights prior to the organization of reserves.

On section 10—Porcupine Forest No. 2:

Mr. CAHILL: What is the size of this reservation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount taken out of Porcupine Reserve No. 2 in Saskatchewan is 376·5 square miles. In No. 1, which is in Manitoba, only 2½ square miles have been taken out. The 2,305·5 at the end does not mean that so many miles have been taken out; it is merely descriptive.

On section 11—Alberta: The Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve:

Mr. MEIGHEN: The total area of that reserve is 20,805. It will be 20,804 after this, as only one square mile will be taken out for soldiers' settlement. It is at the extremity of the reserve and will not affect the consistency or shape of the reserve in any way.

Mr. CAHILL: Approximately, how far is it from the railway?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is some distance, but the land was located on before the reserve was established and therefore we are not concerned particularly with the distance. It is not for soldiers' settlement.

On section 12—British Columbia: Nicola Forest Reserve:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is three square miles.

On section 13—Fly Hill Forest Reserve:

Mr. MEIGHEN: About four square miles are taken out of this reserve for soldiers' settlement.

Mr. MOLLOY: Is this land to be thrown open to soldiers for home settlement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The method we have under consideration, and which I think will be carried out, will be to permit only soldier entry in the reserve. That is to say no one except a soldier can go in, and the soldier cannot get a homestead; all he can get is soldier entry, or the soldier homestead. The right to his other homestead will still remain intact. What we contemplate is to enable the soldier to take soldier entry of 160 acres in that reserve, and reserve 80 acres that adjoins in each case, so that if he makes good in the quarter-section we will subsequently let him have the 80 acres, probably by sale. It will possibly not be at full value but on terms that will be afterwards made known. In the meantime it is intended to make some provision by which he will have the use of that 80 acres. That is what the Soldiers' Settlement Board now have in mind. The scheme may be modified if it is deemed wise but at present we contemplate giving him a soldier entry there and reserving 80 acres for his use. Subsequently the land can be owned by him if he shows success as a farmer.

Sir SAM HUGHES: This will be quite a distance from the railway, and it would be only fair to have a branch of the Thunder Bay line serving this district. It is not reasonable to put soldiers twenty or thirty miles from a railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A railway is projected reaching from Priestville, Saskatchewan, and running northwesterly through this district and up to Hudson's Bay Junction. It is that road that is expected to serve the district.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That will still leave a lot east and west.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might, unless the line ran pretty well east and west.

Mr. CAHILL: What will be the basis of priority as regards settlement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is a difficult problem. In homesteading, so far the first man has always got entry. There are the gravest possible objections to that system, particularly in its application to soldiers, because in its ultimate operation in regard to soldiers it means that a man physically incapacitated by service is at a serious disadvantage. That is its fatal objection as applicable to soldiers and the board is considering, and will have power in the matter if the Soldiers' Settlement Act which is now before the House is passed, the adopting of another method, that of granting entry by lot. I do not particularly like that method, but I really am not able to think of anything better. There is no way by which any priority can be given on the part of the board which would be considered fair or acceptable, and the board is of the opinion

that the matter will have to be worked out on the lot principle in some way.

Mr. CAMPBELL: While I recognize the difficulty that the minister points out, I may say that this matter was brought to the attention of the Government largely through the efforts of certain returned soldiers who were particularly familiar with that district. The returned soldiers who went from the Dauphin district, and who had been up there and gone through the district on several occasions, brought this matter to the attention of the board. The father of one of these soldiers had been a squatter for some years. The point I wish to bring to the attention of the minister is this: Considering the work done by these soldiers, and the efforts made by them resulting in the whole of the land being thrown open, it is a question whether some consideration should not be given to them. They have done work which should be recognized in some way, and if they are just given the same terms and conditions as others it would hardly seem fair or right. I recognize the difficulty there is, but I desire to make a plea for these particular people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should be glad if the hon. member would formulate his views in the shape of a letter or memorandum, so that I could take them up with the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 19, to consolidate and amend the Railway Act—Mr. Boivin in the Chair. (Resumed from May 28).

On section 374—consent of municipality for transmission lines upon highways, etc.:

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): I have an amendment to move to subsection 5 of section 374 by striking out that subsection and making a substitution which I will explain as I proceed. The Senate has seen fit to alter the Bill as it left this House in 1917 so as to favour a particular group of electrical companies. They favour one company but really they favour a group of interlocking companies. The result of the amendment which appears in the Bill now before the Committee is that the special legislative bargain made in 1902, when the private Act of the Toronto Niagara Power Company was passed by this House, is annulled and has no effect. For these reasons I wish to take the opinion of the Committee as to restoring the course agreed upon by the House in 1917.

The matter has now been before members for some weeks; in fact, I might say for some years and in a case of this kind where definitely the rights of the public, as represented by the municipalities, come into collision with the private, corporate rights of those in a certain business, it must, and always does, follow that the case of the municipalities, being so widely distributed and the interests so general, does not receive the attention which is given to the other side of the case by large corporations who keep a close watch on legislation as a matter of business. The public has little or no machinery by which to use its persuasive powers on members of Parliament or otherwise, but fortunately there have always been in this House a number of members quick to discern what is in the interest of the public as against a special or private interest and to see that the public interest is protected. Members of Parliament have always been careful to study enactments proposed in order to see that public rights shall not be surrendered. Ordinary vigilance really is the price of liberty where great monetary interests are concerned and here we have, as I shall show in a minute or two, a charter which is to be given by this special clause contained in the amendment of the Senate which will be worth many millions of dollars—one cannot help saying that—and which will allow one company, or group of companies, to extend their operations not only in Ontario where they at present are but throughout the whole Dominion. It will be a charter which will allow exploitation in every province of the Dominion. While the companies concerned are now only operating in one province, yet the advantage gained by this amendment would be so obvious that they would have little difficulty in getting capital to proceed with operations in other provinces.

It might be thought that it is not necessary to go into the details of this matter because it has been so much discussed, but I find that in this discussion it is wonderful how some members only get the point of view of one person with whom they discussed the case, while another member only gets some other point of view. These views are disjointed, and in the committee of which I was a member and which reported this Bill as it is, there were a number of members who said that they thought they

understood the question before the committee and that they never imagined that so many arguments could be advanced on the side which they had made up their minds did not have the best of it. However, I have come to a conclusion upon the rights and wrongs of the parties opposed to each other in connection with this Bill without regard to the advocacy of any interest, and I deem it my duty to give the committee the benefit of the reasons which assisted me in reaching that conclusion. Late last session, for the purpose of getting at the bottom of it, I looked into the matter very carefully, I have come to a certain conclusion as the result of that investigation and I think it only proper, for the benefit of those who have not studied the matter closely, to give the House a short history of the matter and to point out the importance of the principle involved in this legislation.

The whole trouble arose really from a slip in the drafting of the statute. Our law clerk drew the statute in 1902 which formed the charter of the Toronto and Niagara Power company. So far so good, but our law clerk, when this statute came to be revised in 1903, forgot, or erred, in not looking after the rights of the public which were secured in the charter of the company. Lay members, of course, probably as well as lawyers, must know that from time to time the statutes of Canada, as of every other country, must, for public convenience, be revised and consolidated. Constant amendments are being made. It is very difficult, not only for the ordinary citizen, but for the practitioner, to go through all the statute-books and ascertain exactly what the law is.

So that at certain periods—it has been at intervals of twenty years in the Dominion, and at shorter intervals in the provinces—the public statutes have been revised and consolidated to make them more readable and more convenient for reference. So with the Railway Act which was known as the Railway Act of 1888 but which in 1903 was revised under the Railway Act of that year. The reason I say that our law clerk made a slip in legislation which, if we allow it to pass and to go uncorrected, will mean taking a great public right away from those to whom it was promised, is, that he neglected to carry into the Railway Act of 1903 the provisions of the special charter of the company taken from the Railway Act of 1899. So we come to this state of affairs: That Parliament passed in 1902 this charter which was satisfactory to both parties; then in 1903, the Railway Act being about to be consolidated, the draftsman, as is usual in these cases, inserted a clause that all previous Railway Acts should be repealed. Well, that was all very well, that was good enough if there had been brought forward into the new Consolidated Railway Act all the rights given to persons by the Act which had been repealed. I have no doubt that the law clerk thought he did so, but it might have been well if, at the time he was drawing the Consolidated Act in 1903, which repealed all previous Acts, the parties concerned, at any rate the public, had been represented, and that when he drew the clause to repeal the Act of 1899, under which the public rights were granted, the public guardian had said: Stay your hand; remember that under the Act of 1899 the public were given great privileges; be careful that you do not so consolidate the new Act and repeal the old Act as to take those rights away. If that had been done this contest would never have occurred. But unfortunately it did not occur to the law clerk that by repealing the former Railway Act of 1899 any such effect was being brought about. Such is the situation, however, and it is now being declared that the Act of 1899 does not control the Toronto, and Niagara Power Company.

Before I continue this branch of the subject let me say that we are not asking in the amendment to do anything which is unprecedented, or to take away rights which have been granted; we are only asking that the will of Parliament, clearly expressed in 1902, seventeen years ago, should obtain and be declared so as to govern the parties to this controversy at the present time. It is said that other interests and rights have intervened since that time which changed the condition of affairs. Let me say that Parliament has never been guided by any such principle at all, but has seemed anxious in the passing of corporate legislation to do what was right as between the corporations and the public that they serve. An instance of that is to be found in the amendment to the Bell Telephone Act of 1906. The Bell Telephone Company, it will be remembered, enjoyed great rights at first. The telephone was a new thing, and the public were anxious to have it in their shops and homes, and they did not know exactly what would be the result of a telephone company suddenly descending upon a town and doing its own will on the streets of that community without regard to the convenience of the people, or the rights of the council, or of a city or town engineer, to control those streets. So sure were the

Bell Telephone Company of their rights in this respect that they started to do work in the city of Toronto, interfering with the general rights of the public over their streets. Litigation ensued, the case went to the Privy Council, and that tribunal held that the Bell Telephone Company under its charter, had the right to do what it was doing without asking the consent of the municipal authorities. This made all the more acute the feeling on the part of the municipal authorities throughout Canada, and their champions in Parliament, and rendered it all the more imperative that everything must be done to guard municipal rights in regard to these big utility corporations. The consequence was that when the Bell Telephone Company came to Parliament in 1906 for an amendment to its charter, and to ask that the capital should be increased —not a very great desideratum, one would think—Parliament immediately took the opportunity to make a condition that the very same provision that had been inserted in the Act of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company should be embodied in the Bell Telephone Act of 1906. Now it is undoubted that Parliament, by putting into the Bell Telephone Act the provision that the company must obtain the consent of the municipal authorities before they entered a town, to that extent interfered with the vested rights of that particular company. It cut down those rights in a very considerable degree, and at the same time declared the rights of other telephone companies who desired, or might desire hereafter, to deal with the municipalities. It must have had that effect, nevertheless the Bell Telephone Company apparently submitted. I notice by reading Hansard of 1906 that the Bell Telephone Company Bill was in charge of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) and it was evidently intended to wangle the Bill through without this particular clause; but in the end the champions of public rights in Parliament, one of whom was Mr. Justice Lennox, then the representative for South Simcoe, and another Mr. W. F. Maclean, member for South York, sturdily opposed the passage of the Bill, until it was made perfectly clear that the Railway Act should apply to the Bell Telephone Company. The clause which was inserted at that time into the Bell Telephone Company Act is as follows:

4 p.m.

Chapter 61, Acts of 1906:

This Act and the Bell Telephone Company of Canada shall be subject to the provisions of the Railway Act 1903, and amendments thereto.

Here we have this well studied and deliberately determined upon precedent, that the rights of the public are to be considered and that vested rights cannot prevail against them. That is the principle that I ask the Committee to-day to re-adopt.

Taking the particular case in which we are interested to-day, it is that of the Toronto-Niagara Power Company which came to Parliament in 1902 and obtained corporate powers which were conceded by its advocates before the special committee on the Railway Bill, and which in fact, it is not disputed, are very generous and very ample. Those powers are very wide powers, largely no doubt owing to the fact that the people who obtained this Act were pioneers in the transmission of electric energy from Niagara Falls, and it was not then manifest what their attitude towards the public might be. The very fact that such full, generous, and ample powers were granted under this charter should make us, it seems to me, all the more careful that the rights of this company should be confined and restricted to the statute which was then passed, and which should not be departed from

If they got so much sweet out of the bargain, they must take what they consider is the sour part, for that is the only way in which justice can be done. I argue that the Act was the result of a distinct and special legislative bargain. Legislative bargains between Parliament and the promoters of a Bill have always been noticed by the courts. In fact, in this very Bell Telephone case that I have spoken of, reported in 1905 Appeal Cases, it will be seen that Lord Macnachten in discussing the Bill mentions the fact that the legislation was alleged to have been of the nature of a bargain; the Telephone Company asked for something, and conceded something, in order to get what is asked for; but he finds that there was not sufficient evidence of that to allow him to decide the point. Apparently he is quite of the opinion—I only quote this as one of many cases—that if a legislative bargain was made plain to the court, the court would not enforce any law which was abhorrent to that bargain.

I assert that this special Act was passed on the express understanding—more than that, on the express undertaking of the promoters—that the Railway Act of 1899—which gave very special privileges of control to municipalities—should be incorporated in it. Let me for a moment direct the attention of the Committee to section 21 of

the Company's Act, which provides that section 90 and sections 136 to 169, and so on, of the Railway Act are to apply to the company and its undertakings, "in so far as the said sections are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, and subject to the following: Wherever in the said sections of the Railway Act the word 'company' occurs, it shall mean the power company hereby incorporated."

I emphasize that because of the reason that since this slip in the draftmanship which I mentioned, it has been held that the clauses which were referred to related only to railway companies, and not to a power company such as this, although it is quite clear here that Parliament said expressly that "power company" was what it meant when it provided that the clauses of the 1899 Railway Act should apply and control and restrict this particular company.

What were the clauses of the Act of 1899 which were at the time incorporated in this clear language? They were very much as you find them in section 373 of this Bill which is before you as applicable to telephone companies, and rather than repeat them in section 374—the clause we are now considering—the draftsman in subsection 3 refers to section 373. And that was the reason for not setting out in the particular Act of 1902 all the clauses of the Railway Act which were meant to apply, it being more convenient to refer to the clauses.

When this company got its charter it got two things: a restriction in favour of the municipalities as to control of their streets, and also another thing that vastly outweighed that in importance, namely, the power to expropriate property. That was a very important clause, and I wonder if, when it is contended here that the Railway Act of 1899, incorporated by this clause 21, is gone by reason of bad draftsmanship as regards the restrictive rights of the municipalities, it will be conceded that the expropriation rights of the company are also gone. I do not think so. You will find that a company of this kind will fight to retain what is advantageous in its Act, and it will fight to exclude everything that it thinks is disadvantageous.

One would imagine that the fairest way of dealing with the whole thing would be to cut out the expropriation clauses granted by this particular charter, as it has been decided by the highest court that bad draftsmanship has eliminated the restrictive clauses. If they are to be relieved of the restrictions they ought to give up the benefits. But, of course, we cannot expect the company to do so, and it would not be business policy on their part.

Supposing clauses 136 to 169 inclusive had been actually set out, that would have taken up several pages of the statute book. and have made the charter very long. Therefore, it was generally felt at the time that it would be perfectly adequate for the purpose that the sections themselves should be simply referred to instead of being set out in extenso. I notice that in 1901—and I must give these things because I want to be absolutely fair—the Ottawa and Hull Power Company was incorporated, and there the very same language was used, namely, that:

> Section 90 of the Railway Act shall apply to the company, but no other provisions of the said Act shall apply thereto.

That is to say, they should have no expropriation rights such as this Niagara Power Company got. In the same year the St. Lawrence Power Company was incorporated, and the clause of the Railway Act was actually copied into the Special Act. If that had been done in this case we would not be here at all discussing this matter. But simply because of the peculiar algebraic way in which the legislation was affected by reference to an Act which was afterwards repealed, it has been held that with the repeal of the Act—inadvertently, as I say—the whole restriction is gone.

I now come to the point as to whether there was a legislative bargain. In 1902 two members of the House of Commons, who were either specially deputed by the municipalities or were so of their own choice, were the champions of public rights. One of these was Edward F. Clarke, one of the members for Toronto, a man with whom I had the closest intimacy and business associations, because when he was mayor of Toronto—and a better mayor Toronto never had—I happened to be one of the city solicitors and it was my privilege to meet Mr Clarke many and many a time.

I was impressed with the extraordinary interest and zeal that he showed in connection with one piece of legislation after another in favour of the rights of municipalities. He was the champion; he was the man who saw where some power could come in and destroy the well-earned or well bought liberties of municipalities. Mr. Clarke was associated with Mr. E. B. Osler, now Sir Edmund Osler, who was a little bit alarmed about section 90 when this Act went through; it was not his idea that section 90 should be mentioned as being included in

the Act. But Mr. Clarke said: Will it do any harm to set out in this charter exactly what the restrictive powers are in favour of the city engineer or the city or town council? But the very persons who insisted that this reference to the Railway Act was sufficient were the promoters of the Act; that is the important point to be kept in mind. It was not the clause of the municipalities; it was the clause of the promoters of this Act. Mr. Pringle, then the member for Stormont, who was in charge of the Bill and handled it with a great deal of ability, pointed out that the clause of the Railway Act was all-sufficient; that there was no necessity for spreading it out on the statute. Mr. Osler said, column 3629 of Hansard, 1902:

> Would it do any harm to put in this simple clause stating that this charter shall be subject to all Acts that may be passed by this House referring to electrical companies of this kind?
>
> The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Sutherland): There can be no doubt that it is.
>
> Mr. Osler: . . . If it is in the clause already, why not insert this and make it without any doubt?

Then Mr. M. K. Cowan, who was chairman of the special committee which considered this Bill, said:

> When this committee goes to erect poles or wires across the streets of Toronto it can only do so with the consent of the Municipal Council of that city, or of other municipalities in which it operates.

It is clear, therefore, that two members of the House, who were willing to take the word of lawyers in the committee—eminent counsel in charge of the Bill, and ministers of the Crown—thought that that was fair ground for letting the thing go through as it was. But in addition to that, Mr. Pringle after some discussion and some objections by Mr. Clarke, goes on to say, at column 3634:

> Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question to him? The question I wish to put is: How this section 90 of the Railway Act, as amended in 1899, affects this question?
>
> The amendment is as follows:
>
> "When any company has power by any Act of Parliament to construct and maintain lines of telegraph or telephone or lines for the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, such company may with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over any highway, square or other public place, enter thereon," etc.
>
> I rather gather, from what the hon. gentleman says, that the section of the Act does not mean what it purports. Well, I understand that it means just what it expresses. All companies have to obtain consent of a municipality before passing through it. And I want to ask, what is the effect on this question of section 90 of the Railway Act, as amended in 1899?

So that this section of the Act of 1899, which, we say, contained safeguards of the rights of the public, was put in there at the instance of the very company which is now seeking to destroy it by reason of a chance interpretation of the statute by the courts. But Parliament is above all courts. Parliament may express itself in a way to which the courts may seem inadequate, obscure, or in some other way objectionable. If so, all the courts have to do is direct attention to the matter. But to say that the Parliamen of Canada should be subject to the opinions of the courts is, to my mind, absurd; we are the law-makers here, and all the courts have to do is to interpret the laws that we make. If, as a matter of law, the courts say that we have not said what we meant to say, or that we have left out something that should have been put in, we are willing to remedy the matter. But I utterly repudiate the suggestion that our action as law-makers is to be controlled by the courts. So that on the whole we have here a distinct legislative bargain. This Bill went through despite the objections of these two champions of the rights of the public, because they were assured that section 90 of the Railway Act applied. And everybody thought that it did apply—the promoters of the Act more than anybody else, because it was they who fathered the clause.

This company, under section 12 of its Act, have the right to distribute electricity, to become a merchant in that commodity to sell it to users of electricity, and they had also the right to shove their trunk lines through municipalities without distributing electricity to the people of those municipalities. They had these two rights and they never for a moment objected to the restrictive powers that were inserted in the statute of 1902.

Then comes along the revision of 1903, repealing the Act of 1899. I may inform the laymen of the House, who may, perhaps, not be aware of it—I speak, of course, with reference to lawyers, because they know all about it—that the law is this: There is in every volume of revised or consolidated statutes a clause which says that the provisions of the repealed Act shall be carried on into the revised Act unless the contrary is expressed. Our last revision of the statutes was in 1906, and the way it is expressed in the interpretation clause of the revised statutes of Canada, 1906, section 1, is as follows:—

Whenever any Act is repealed or other provisions are substituted by way of consolidation, any reference in any unrepealed Act—

That is, this charter.

—to such repealed Act—

That is, the Railway Act of 1899.

—as regards any subsequent transaction shall be held and construed to a reference to the provisions of the substituted Act relating to the same subject matter as such repealed Act.

That is plain enough, is it not? One would have thought that when the Court of Appeal of Ontario—the Appellate Division, composed of five judges: Chief Justice Moss, Mr. Justice Garrow, Mr. Justice Magee, Mr. Justice Meredith, and Mr. Justice McLaren—held that it was plain enough that the revised statute did apply, the case would go no further; but it did. It went to the Privy Council, and it is because of the decision of the Privy Council, which was the luckiest decision any litigant ever got in this world, that this aggregation of companies now comes here and puts their case in this way, as it seems to me: We got a statute in 1902 which said that we must get the consent of municipalities before we could put down our poles; we accepted that interpretation until 1911, and then we began litigation as the only thing to do; the little town of North Toronto, some four miles north of Toronto, objected to our running transmission lines along certain streets, and started to cut down our poles; we commenced litigation and we won twice; we got a decision in our favour, which now gives us vested rights.

I shall have to detain the Committee for a moment while we see what there is in that contention. When this aggregation of companies say that they have vested rights by the decision of the highest court in the realm, one would naturally suppose that that meant that both parties had come before the highest court of the realm and put the merits of their respective cases before that court. You would naturally suppose that that was the case; that by the decision of the highest court of the realm the case of one of the parties was declared to be predominant upon its merits and upon the law. But was that the case? Very far from it; in fact, it is just the contrary. What this aggregation of companies won in the Privy Council decision was nothing more than a judicial decision on statutes and words used by our law clerk; that is all. It was alleged that it was highly important that this company, which was a pioneer in the transmission of Niagara power to the municipalities of Ontario, should not be impeded by having to ask the consent of municipalities through which they wanted to bring their lines, because some municipality, some miserable township it might be, might hold the company up by refusing to give consent, and the enterprise would be ruined. That was put before the Privy Council. On the other hand, the case of the municipalities was put before the Privy Council, to the effect that it was more important in the interests of this Dominion that municipalities should have the right to make mistakes if they wanted to and refuse, if they desired, consent to this power company going through their territory. They might be very foolish and very backward in doing that, but they had the right to refuse consent, and the right to make that mistake, if mistake it was. What does the Privy Council say on these two contrary placings of the merits of the case before them. It says this (page 840):

Lord Haldane: If the powers conferred by this section (section 90) displaced the less restricted powers of entering without any consent conferred by the Act of Incorporation, the appellants (the power company) are in the wrong.

Your lordships have, therefore, to determine this question. They have to bear in mind that a court of justice is not entitled to speculate as to which of two conflicting policies was intended to prevail, but must confine itself to the construction of the language of the relevant statutes read as a whole.

So that utterly precludes this aggregation of power companies from now saying that the decision of the Privy Council is in favour of their case on its merits. Because the Privy Council distinctly say: "We will not decide that; we will simply decide on the statutes." Any layman can see what an exceedingly narrow decision it was, and how it might just as well have been the other way. As it happened, the decision after running along the top of the fence, turned over to the corporate side. The decision was simply this. Their lordships said that while in this charter the Railway Act of 1899 is to apply, and wherever the word "company" occurs in the Railway Act it shall mean the power company, yet that Act was repealed, so there was nothing for them to do but to look to the Act of 1903 which repealed it, and that Act of 1903, unfortunately, defined "company" not as a power company, but as a railway company. That is the whole basis of the decision of the Privy Council, and is the result of ineffective legislation of ours here in this House, and of our law clerk not being alert to save the rights given

Parliament. The precautions we took to say that "company" meant power company are wasted, because the Railway Act of 1903 the Consolidating Act, says that "company" means only railway company. Therefore, as this power company is not a railway company it is free of the restrictions we imposed in 1902.

So it seems to me obvious that we must go back and place ourselves in the position of our predecessors in 1902, who meant to do a certain thing, who were commissioned by the public to protect their rights, and who did protect their rights by certain legislation. We should have no hesitation whatever, no matter what vested rights have occurred, in going back and doing what was done in 1902, and doing what was done by this House in 1917. Personally, I very much doubt whether there are any very great vested interests which would be affected. How can any interests be affected by a change in this section simply making effective the legislation of 1902? This corporation got its charter in 1902, and we never heard a word of this dispute until 1911. They agreed right up to that time that they had to get the consent of the municipality, and not only the consent, but a lot of other things set out in the statute of 1899. Older members of the House may remember how in the old days the Montreal Telegraph Company and the Dominion Telegraph Company, now consolidated, and the Bell Telephone Company, could put their poles through any town and do almost anything that they liked. There was absolutely no power to restrict them except that in one case they were obliged to paint the poles. But that is a small thing. We all remember that particularly in one of the best streets in the city they erected poles with wires on them which were so low that a man on top of a team load of hay could not pass under them. They would put up double lines of poles on one street and would so construct the poles that the firemen could not get their ladders from the street to a burning building, and in many other ways they became a menace to the life of the public. From the time that the first power company was incorporated by this Parliament in 1895, twenty-four years ago, there constantly grew a feeling on the part of Parliament that the rights of municipalities were supreme. So that in all legislation following that, and in the Railway Act, it is provided that they must consult the municipalities, and traffic must not be obstructed. Wires must be of a certain height and poles must be perpendicular. In addition, there must be the right to cut down poles and wires in case of fire without any obligation to pay compensation, and trees must not be injured. My hon. friend from Gaspé told us in the Committee that one of the companies went into his place and cut down a beautiful tree and there was no recourse against them. I hope the hon. member will bear that in mind when he comes to vote on the amendment. It was also provided that the work on any street or square should be done under the city engineer, and that the workmen should wear badges and not go into private houses without authority, and that temporary removal of wires and poles should be made if necessary. Twelve sub-clauses protecting the rights of the municipalities are now absolutely swept away by this Senate amendment unless it is rejected by this House. I do not think that the cry of vested rights should swerve us from our duty in respect of this amendment. In 1902 the company got the power to go anywhere in Canada and issue bonds. They are now in Ontario, but the franchise is so valuable that if they win here we may expect them in the near future to be in every province where there is any water-power at all. As I say, they got the power to go into any province and issue bonds to the extent of $1,500,000, and they did. In 1903, after they were incorporated by this charter, they sold out to another company, the Electrical Development Company, situate at Niagara Falls. That company took all their bonds of $1,500,000. So that so far as this company goes, its bonds are not affected because they are not in the stock markets. They claim that that does not matter so long as they are linked up with some other company. However, the Electrical Company got their bonds and was able to use the transmission company. They worked together, and afterwards there was a company formed, another company which held no physical assets. They had no property, but held all the stock of the Electrical Company, the Toronto Niagara Power Company, and, I think, the Toronto Electric Light Company. This combination was called the Toronto Power Company. The Toronto Power Company in 1911 issued a mortgage on all the assets of all the companies of naminally $25,000,000, of which they issued $18,000,000. But before this question of the rights of municipalities and their intervention had come up at all, the aggregation of these power companies had issued bonds to the

extent of $7,800,000, or nearly half the whole amount of bonds issued. One would say that if they had issued, in round numbers, $8,000,000 of bonds on this charter, which everyone believed gave the municipalities their rights, they could not have got very much more after they got a decision of the Privy Council in 1912. They now say: We have certain rivals. There is a semi-public utility in Ontario called the Hydro-Electric Company, and they have become our rivals, and this question of consent means a great deal more than it did then, for the municipalities may link up with the Hydro and may not give consent. But that could not have occurred in 1911 when they issued these bonds. When a company wants to sell its bonds it employs a well-read, expert counsel, a lawyer who is accustomed to commercial law. Without his opinion that under the statutes the basis of the bonds is good, they cannot possibly enter the stock market. But, suppose they asked Mr. Lash or any other good corporate lawyer for an opinion as to their bonds preparatory to going into the stock market, what would Mr. Lash have found? He would have found, if it was previous to 1912, when they got this decision as to bad draftmanship, that the very charter under which they were acting incorporated the Railway Act, which said that they had to get the consent of the municipalities. So that the public, who only look to the opinion of eminent counsel, would have only that information, and would have the right to say: "We gave you that charter only on condition that the municipalities had rights." But the answer is made: What does the public know about what occurred in Hansard and what Mr. Clark bargained for, or what Mr. Osler and Mr. Pringle said? They do not read Hansard and do not know anything about it. Well, the public may not read Hansard, but Mr. Lash knew all about the matter, because he and his friends had it put forward in Parliament, providing that the municipalities should have power to consent. Mr. Lash must therefore have known about it. Anyway, there it stares counsel in the face. He will argue: If I advise them to sell bonds on the assurance that they are good I am doing so knowing that they must get the consent of the municipalities. They say, that was very well up to 1912, but after 1912 conditions differed altogether. The Privy Council, the highest court in the land, decided in our favour. They do not tell the public that the decision of the Privy Council is based on mere words and not on merits. They say that alters the case. But does any expert counsel in Ontario or Montreal to whom they went not know that you cannot find out a gross error in legislation like this as a result of getting a decision of the Privy Council and have it rest at that and the whole thing put to sleep? No. The municipalities at once become alert, and every practical man knows that the fight only begins with the Privy Council's decision. They must have known and it was not contradicted, that the very next year, after 1912, the city council of Toronto through Mr. Geary sent down a memorandum calling for this very amendment, or one in practically the same terms. So the question has been before Parliament since the session of 1913. Every corporation lawyer and every bondholder must have known that this was a matter of most acute controversy and that it was not going to be allowed to pass simply because Parliament had been defeated of its will by reason of the inefficiency of a law clerk. Therefore, I do not think they are entitled to use that word "vested rights" with the unction with which they attempt to use it. I admit that there is a strong argument that no one wants to interfere with vested rights, because, in the first place, we are a borrowing nation and if we announce that we are going to interfere with vested rights it will interfere with our credit, a thing which we do not desire and we want to do the honest thing; we do not want to interfere with rights that have once been given. But vested rights mean rights that have been earned and interference with vested rights means legislation passed for an improper and dishonest purpose. If it is legislation passed only to right a wrong which has been inadvertently done, there is no interference with vested rights. In the Committee we—particularly the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Tweedie)—endeavoured to find out—what it ought to have been very easy to find out—where these bonds went. We had general statements made to the effect that they went to France, America, Britain and Canada. I venture to say that most of them were sold in Canada and that the persons who bought them were the same crowd that is in these amalgamated companies. I may be mistaken as to that but I have as much right to suppose and to suggest that as they have to assert the other thing because they did not show where the bonds had gone which they could very easily have done as the records would disclose it.

We had the benefit of the views of an eminent counsel from the city of New York. It was a great pleasure to hear him because he is not only a charming speaker but he is a very clever and highly intellectual man. That was Mr. James Beck and Mr. Beck said that he represented some bond company in the state of Wisconsin but he did not say the amount of bonds that they owned, nor did he say who they were. We were without definite information as to whether any body was fooled or misled in parting with his money by reason of this fortuitous end to the litigation in the Privy Council. I am inclined to think that that is not the real trouble but that is the best argument to use with the ordinary member of Parliament. Every one of us hesitates to vote for anything that interferes with vested rights and a great deal has been said in the last year or two about doing anything that will interfere with the credit of Canada. This eminent counsel from New York undertook to give us a lesson in commercial and legislative honesty. While he could give us lectures on commercial ethics, he confined his remarks to the bondholders and utterly ignored a discussion of what would be thought in his country of making a definite legislative bargain and then trying to repudiate it the moment they saw a little law in their favour. He confined his remarks absolutely to the poor, belated bondholders but if you are going to drag in the morality of the case then I say that it ill becomes any company or amalgamation of interlocking companies, to charge interference with vested rights or legislative immorality when they themselves are actually undertaking to sell to the public a security which they know is not the one that they got from Parliament because the clause which was put in was put in to protect a certain interest and put in at its behest.

Now, we must answer the great question: "What is the most important thing for us legislators to do under the circumstances? Is this a case which will hurt vested interests and interfere with the credit of Canada? Is it more important to say: "Walk slowly and safely; it is far better to let it go rather than to have it said in other countries that we had changed our legislation?" Is that to be our sole object, or is it more important to try to protect certain rights and interests? Twenty-five years ago a well-defined movement took place in this country and was brought to the attention of this Parliament. Public opinion demanded an assurance that groups of capitalists and exploiters would be prevented from using the streets of municipalities without the consent of those municipalities. Parliament gave that assurance. Are we now to say that we will break faith with the people in every little municipality in the country who have no time to come down to Parliament to present their case, because it is alleged by this corporation that they have a decision from the Privy Council in their favour, that this is the highest court in the land, and that therefore we must accept the situation? Does any member suppose that when he goes back to his little town, he is going to be able to make an argument of that kind to the people on the streets? His constituents would say to him: Are you going, by legislation, to do a thing of that kind; are you going to set up any such man of straw as that and to say that, because your law clerk misdrew your enactment you have not the power to re-enact it in order to carry out what we sent you to Parliament to do? That must be so. That is not only the argument that will be heard in Ontario, where these industries are being carried on, but that is the argument in every province in this Dominion. We made a distinct bargain with our people. You have on the one side the public unprotected except by more or less insignificant associations on the one side, you have the monetary interests on the other side, which is disadvantageous to the public interest. It is for us to say what we are going to do. Is it more important to break the bargain which we are said to have made, or to try and amend the bargain which we really made with these corporate interests? To me the question has but one answer, and it is that we must act as the representatives of the public, not as the representatives of the corporate interests, re-enact what we did in 1902, and put this matter really in the same position that it was in when it left this House in 1917.

Now, I come to the amendment. Referring to the present clause as adopted by the Senate, subsection 5, it is apparent that the Senate has brought in a cleverly drawn provision. Subsection 5 says:

> Any specific powers inconsistent with the provisions of this section—

With subsections 1, 2, 3, and 4 to which the muncipalities agree:

> —and conferred on any company—

That is the Toronto Niagara Power Company.

> —by any special—

That is their charter or authority as interpreted by the Privy Council.

—by any special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada or of any province shall not be affected by the provisions of this section,—

That is cut out as regards the Toronto Niagara Power Company. But here they have a sort of parenthesis and they pretend to give the municipalities some rights. They say:

—but if any municipality complain to the Board—

That is the Railway Board.

—that any company—

That is this company.

—whether incorporated by special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada is exercising its powers oppressively or in bad faith the Board may hear such complaint, and if it sees fit supervise the exercise of such powers.

Now it is perfectly obvious that these words "oppressively, or in bad faith" seem to give some rights to the municipality. In reality they do not give one particle of right, because the mere fact of putting a pole on a street, or putting it on both sides of the street, or putting it at a certain height, is something that is not done oppressively, and is certainly not done in bad faith. It is done in pursuance of the rights conferred by the charter, and such a thing could not possibly be said to be done in bad faith or oppressively. Therefore, if a particular municipality claims that the poles are crooked, or that they are so low as to interfere with firemen getting to a fire, that the poles were not painted, that they were not put down on a proper foundation and might fall, or that they were put down without the previous consent of the municipality's engineer—if any of these things are said and the municipality goes to the Railway Board with the request "We want an appeal from this?" the Railway Board would say, first of all, "You have got to show that these things were done oppressively or in bad faith." The municipality could not do so, because there would be no oppression and there would be no bad faith, and so these words amount to nothing, and should be cut out. They seem to be in favour of the municipalities, and I dare say the hope was entertained that municipalities that were not alert might accept them; but municipalities that are alert will not accept something that means nothing. Therefore we want these words out. I move:

[Mr. Mowat.]

To amend clause 374 by striking out subclause 5 thereof and replacing same by the following:

"(5) The provisions of the last preceding sub-section shall apply to and restrict the powers of any company heretofore incorporated by Special Act, or other authority of the Parliament of Canada, notwithstanding that such provisions may be inconsistent with the provisions of such Special Act or other authority, and notwithstanding the provisions of Section three of this Act.

(6) If any company heretofore incorporated by Special Act or other authority of the Parliament of Canada has acquired, or shall acquire assets or any part thereof, or the right to the possession or use of the assets or any part thereof, of any company or person operating a system for the distribution of light, heat, power or electricity, in any town, city, village or township, then in every such case the company so acquiring such assets shall carry out with the municipality all the obligations, in respect to the said assets whether arising under contract or in any other manner, of the company from which the said assets have been or shall be acquired."

The municipalities do not wish to give up any right they now have. That is natural, and the law since 1903 is that while a trunk line can be shoved through a municipality in the case of a transmission line, application must first of all be made for the municipality's consent, and if that consent is withheld the company can go to the Railway Board. But if this power company wants to sell electricity they cannot do it at all without the consent of the city or town, and there is no appeal to the Railway Board. We want to retain, and adhere to, the rights we have had since 1903. Let it be remembered, however, that the rights we had in 1902, under this charter, were that there was no appeal to the Railway Board at all either in case of power transmission or power selling by the company. In 1903 the Railway Act was passed, and now if the company wants the right to go into any municipality, and if the local authorities will not consent, there is the right of appeal to the Board; but so far as selling electricity in a municipality is concerned, we still want the right to say no. That is a right which we have enjoyed all these years. For the reasons which I have given—and I have taken too much time in my statement, not knowing we were going to have a temperature of ninety-four in the shade when I prepared my memoranda on the subject—I leave the matter to the decision of the committee, hoping that they will rule in favour of the municipalities.

Mr. STEVENS: I have listened to the lengthy statement of the hon. gentleman with a feeling of appreciation for the tre-

mendous amount of labour that he must have undergone in preparing his lengthy and technical argument on this subject. I feel somewhat modest in daring to raise my voice on the subject at all, in view of the oft-repeated references to "the simplicity of the average layman." Fortunately, or unfortunately, I do not happen to be a lawyer, and therefore I suppose, as a "layman" I am to be regarded as totally incapacitated from contributing anything to the discussion of this matter. However, as one who has followed the development of this question during the last two or three months with a great deal of interest and detailed attention, I wish briefly to state my views in regard to it and my reasons for casting my vote in the way I intend to do when the time comes.

5 p.m.

At the outset I desire to resent, and resent very strongly, the inference that any one who ventures to differ from a gentleman who is advocating what he chooses to call public rights is thereby a special pleader for moneyed interests and corporations. We have heard altogether too much of that sort of argument. As far as I am concerned my record is very clear along those lines; but there is an element of fair dealing and of common sense in all questions, and I claim the right to express my opinions without being subjected to such an aspersion. What we are asked to do is to introduce into a general Act which might be termed the most important civil statute we have on the statute books of Canada, the Railway Act, applying to all railways and to all telephone and telegraph companies, a special provision to deal with an alleged improvident power given to a company some fifteen years ago, thus enabling us by special language introduced into the general Act to remedy what is alleged to be a wrong.

Mr. FRIPP: Will the hon. gentleman kindly summarize for the benefit of those of us who were not able to be present at the sittings of the special committee just what the points in dispute are between the city of Toronto and the power company?

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend has followed the argument—

Mr. FRIPP: I could not follow the argument of the hon. member for Parkdale, and I have not yet learned what is the crucial point in dispute.

Mr. STEVENS: It was my intention to keep away from private disputes and not to be led into a discussion of them. The dispute in this case is between the city of Toronto and the Toronto, Niagara Power Company, and allied companies. The point I wish to make is that this Parliament is not concerned with a private dispute. It is now making a law which is applicable to all railway, power, telephone and telegraph companies, and therefore—

Mr. TWEEDIE: I must be permitted to take exception to that statement right from the start. This is not a dispute between the city of Toronto—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Vancouver has the floor and cannot be interrupted except with his consent.

Mr. STEVENS: I was saying that I was not going to discuss the question of any private rights, or any private disputes. I was going on to state that we are now passing legislation dealing with all companies of the character mentioned. Now we are asked—I am sure the laboured arguments of my hon. friend from Parkdale will permit me at least to make this reference without interruption—to introduce a provision to remedy an alleged wrong perpetrated in the Act of the Toronto, Niagara Power Company. What are the facts, as far as the framing of the Act we are now dealing with is concerned? The facts are that the disputed case was carried through the courts, the proper place to deal with it. It was dealt with in the court of Chancellor Boyd, who gave a certain decision which I am not going to discuss. On appeal to the Ontario Appellate Court that decision was reversed. An appeal was then taken to the Privy Council, which sustained the ruling of the trial judge. As far as I am concerned I take this stand on the merits of the case: the judgment of the trial judge and the Privy Council is sufficient for me.

The next point I wish to make is that for the past two months at least a special committee of this House sat and heard hour after hour and day after day an exhaustive discussion by the most learned counsel in Canada on behalf of both sides in relation to this case. After hearing them at great length the Committee came to a given decision which decision is contained in the reported Bill at present upon the table of the House. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question is brought up in this Committee—and I admit, it is perfectly proper to do so,—and we are asked to go through that whole process again of arguing this particular point.

If it is the intention of this Parliament to review powers given years ago in a special Act, it ought to be done only after an expert investigation has been held. Then, with the report following such expert investigation in the hands of the members, we should deal with the Act that it is alleged gave these improvident powers. I wish particularly to emphasize that point. I will repeat it in a slightly different form. If an improvident power was given to the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, and if by virtue of that power they are interfering with municipal rights wrongfully or oppressively or contrary to public interest, then I claim, Sir, that the way to remedy the evil is by special Act of Parliament limiting or amending or changng or restricting such power. I think I am on sound and safe ground when I make that statement. I do not think it is wise to attempt to deal with the matter as is proposed by the amendment.

The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) used an illustration as an argument for sustaining his process. He argued at great length that the Bell Telephone case is analogous to this case. But I would suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, that the Act of the Bell Telephone Company was a private Act, it was an amendment to their original statute, and that is exactly what I am asking this Committee to consider at this moment. The hon. member for Parkdale has provided me with the strongest possible argument for the position I am assuming, namely, that it should be by an amendment to the powers contained in the original charter of the company itself, and not in the general Act. And if the procedure regarding the Bell Telephone Company is worthy of the consideration that my hon. friend suggests then we must inevitably come to the conclusion that it is the proper procedure to follow in this case.

I suggest, Sir, and hold that it is a bad precedent to establish to redress an alleged wrong in a special private Act by amending a general Act. My hon. friend suggests that we are granting enlarged powers to the company. We are not doing anything of the kind and that ought to be made perfectly clear to the minds of hon. gentlemen who had not the privilege of sitting on the Special Committee. We are dealing with all companies in a general way in a general Act; which disposes of that argument at once.

Another point my hon. friend laid emphasis on was that the Senate had amended the Bill we had sent to them. I would remind him that this is a new Bill entirely. True, a similar Bill was before the House in 1917; but that has no relation whatever to this particular Bill. This is the Bill we are dealing with, and we are dealing with it on its merits.

The amendment of my hon. hon. friend reads in this way:

> The provisions of the last preceding subsection shall apply to and restrict the powers of any company heretofore incorporated by Special Act or other authority of the Parliament of Canada, notwithstanding that such provisions may be inconsistent with the provisions of such Special Act or other authority,

And further, and I wish the Committee to particularly mark this point—

> —and notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of this Act.

Mr. NESBITT: Read section 4 in connection with it.

Mr. STEVENS: Section 3 of this general Act—which we have already adopted, by the way—is in this form:

> where the provisions of this Act and of any Special Act passed by the Parliament of Canada relate to the same subject-matter the provisions of the Special Act shall, in so far as is necessary to give effect to such Special Act, be taken to over-ride the provisions of this Act.

We are asked to introduce into the Bill another clause which says that notwithstanding that clause we shall disregard the powers given in the special Act. In other words, in one clause we assert a certain principle, and in another clause we reverse that principle. I submit that that is a very unwise proceeding.

It should also be borne in mind that we do not know what other Acts will be affected. We say in this proffered amendment that it shall apply to all special Acts. During the past fifty years, or since Confederation, hundreds of bona fide Acts have been passed granting powers to telephone companies, electric power companies, telegraph companies, and such like, and yet this committee is asked—and I wish the committee to give this special consideration—to adopt a clause which will disregard all the powers given to private companies up to the present time. And we are asked to disregard them without knowing what powers we are disregarding. I submit that if we are to be consistent at all, if we are going to amend powers given in private Acts, we ought to have at least some knowledge of the Acts we are amending and the powers we are restricting.

I have not the statutes before me, but I will illustrate the point by referring to a

couple of companies that I am familiar with. We have in the city of Vancouver a harbour commission incorporated by a special Act of this Parliament. That Act gives to the commission power to bring electricity into the city of Vancouver for the service of power to the harbour, and in the near future the commission are expecting to exercise that power. Now we are asking that that commission shall not have the right to exercise that power, although it was given to them in perfect good faith six years ago. In other words, we are asked to take away or amend or restrict that power as given by the special Act. Then I refer to two large companies we have in British Columbia carrying on street railway and electric power enterprises. These two companies are incorporated by special Acts of Parliament. I do not know of any complaint that they have exercised their powers unwisely, unjustly or without due consideration of public rights. As far as I am aware, except for a few local disputes which must necessarily occur, the Western Canada Power Company and the British Columbia Electric Railway Company are both acting in a fairly harmonious manner with the municipalities which they serve, and yet we are asking this Parliament to restrict the powers given to those companies so that they will be subject absolutely to the municipalities.

Mr. TWEEDIE: What powers will be restricted?

Mr. STEVENS: As I said a moment ago, I cannot cite the powers. I am merely giving the case of these two companies, of which I have personal knowledge; there must be seventy-five or a hundred other such companies in Canada. Without examining the charters of these companies, should we unreasonably and unduly restrict any powers they may have?

Mr. TWEEDIE: Can my hon. friend name one single provision in the charter of the Western Canada Power Company, or of the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, which will be restricted by this proposed amendment?

Mr. STEVENS: In his question, my hon. friend provides the answer. The House is not cognizant at this time of what powers these many companies have; nor can they be without examining each charter—which I am sure I do not propose to do, and I am sure members of the committee do not propose to do.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Can my hon. friend name one single provision in the charters of these companies which will be restricted or affected by this legislation?

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot speak from memory in regard to any one. I did cite the case—had my hon. friend chosen to listen, he would have heard me mention it —of the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, who are empowered to bring in and distribute power to their harbour works. As they have, for instance, reclaimed areas where they rent or lease lands for factory purposes, and so on, this right is a very important one. Under this amendment, the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners would be made absolutely subject to municipal control. I am not saying for a moment that the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners intend or desire to do anything against the interests of the municipalities. But my hon. friend is drawing me entirely away from the point which I wish to make. We are asked ignorantly to restrict—I will put it that way —the powers of private companies by this amendment. Such legislation I allege to be very wrong and very poor, and a dangerour precedent for us to set up in this House.

I wish very briefly to direct the attention of the Committee to that portion of the clause which we are asked to delete. The Committee must get this point into its mind: We are not, under the Bill as it stands, depriving Parliament of any power it may wish to exercise regarding the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. Any time we choose to do so, we can amend that charter; we can do anything we choose with it. We are asked to delete subsection 5 of section 374, the clause which protects the public in what I consider to be a very reasonable manner. It provides that if a company incorporated under the authority of Parliament exercises its powers oppressively or in bad faith, the Board of Railway Commissioners may hear any complaint in that regard and, if it sees fit, supervise the exercise of those powers. The member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) contended that in this clause we were using language which made it impossible to deal with the problem. He said that if a municipality went before the Railway Board, complained that this company was exercising its powers unreasonably and asked that its powers be restricted, the Board would insist upon some hair-splitting evidence or proof of oppressiveness. Now, the record of the Board of Railway Commissioners ever since its organization is before this country; it stands out as the one court in the land which ignores matters of hair-splitting evidence and the like. The

farmer, the worker, the private citizen may appear before the Board and get a hearing as good as, if not preferable to, that which he could get before the highest council in the land. I have been before the Railway Board many times, and I know that they particularly care for the interests of municipalities. Municipalities which make representations to the Board receive the most courteous and sympathetic attention. That is the record of the Board; that is what it is there for. It is not a court of law; it is a court of equity, a court created to protect the public interest, to administer this Act, and to see that its provisions are properly observed. What provision could be fairer than that if a company clothed with certain powers exercises them in any sense oppressively, the municipality—in fact, any person—may bring the matter before the Board of Railway Commissioners? The section provides that the Board may, if it sees fit, " supervise the exercise of such powers ". What does " supervise " mean? It means, direct exactly how a thing shall be done. Our legal friends who have such a profound contempt for the laymen of this House may advance technical arguments with regard to the meaning of words, but every experienced member of the House knows that the Railway Board acts fairly in these matters.

So that there are two points that I particularly wish to make: First, it is bad legislation to introduce into a general Act a remedy for an alleged wrong committed by a private company. If a case has been made and a remedy is required, that remedy should be provided by special Act and by amendment of the charter of the company. Second, I submit that the clause as it now stands affords adequate protection to municipalities, to private companies and to private citizens, by enabling this easy appeal to the Railway Board.

I resent the suggestion that any member who dares to raise his voice in opposition to a peculiar view held by our friends from Toronto on this question is derelict to his duty to the public. That is an imputation that should not be allowed to pass, because there are men in this House who are loyal and true to the interests of the public besides the hon. members who happen to sit for the great and holy city of Toronto.

For the reasons which I have stated, I propose to support the Bill as it comes from the special Committee appointed to consider this matter.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. W. D. EULER (Waterloo, North): Although I listened carefully to the address of the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), I could not entirely follow him; despite that fact, I am still in favour of the amendment. While the point taken by the member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) may have some value, it seems to me that in its nature it is more academic than practical. I cannot get past the fact that if this clause passes in its present form, the Toronto and Niagara Power Company will continue to have the power to invade the streets of any municipality in Canada—more particularly of any municipality in Ontario—without first obtaining the consent of the people of that municipality.

I think the mere enunciation of that proposition condemns it. I think it is a monstrous thing that any private company, no matter how it obtained its privileges, should be allowed to erect its poles and string its wires and carry on its other activities on the streets of any municipality without the consent of that municipality having first been obtained. I do not concern myself particularly about the interpretation of the law under which this company is working. The contention is made that if this amendment is carried Parliament will be interfering with vested rights. Surely, if vested rights perpetuate an injustice, it is not to be suggested that Parliament should not legislate in order to remove that injustice. If a law has been passed in days gone by on any subject that does an injustice to any section of the people or to any person, surely it is within the right of this Parliament to enact legislation that will remedy that injustice. Even the interpretation of the law is debatable apparently. The Toronto and Niagara Power Company, as I understand it, received its original charter in 1902 and the debates of that session make it perfectly clear that it was the intention of Parliament that the company should not have the right to go on the streets of municipalities without the consent of those municipalities. The case came before Chancellor Boyd and was decided in favour of the company. It was then carried to the Appeal Court of Ontario and was decided in favour of the municipalities. The Privy Council reversed that decision, and sustained the decision of Chancellor Boyd.

In passing, might I make this remark, which may not meet with the approval of the House? The President of the Privy Council has repeatedly stated in this House that Canada is now a nation. If that is the

case, I think the time has come when Canadian courts ought to give a final settlement of all disputes that arise in Canada, and cases should not have to be carried to the Privy Council overseas, no matter how fair their lordships may be. It seems to me that a Canadian court, being right on the spot, is in a better position to give a fair interpretation and a fair decision than any other court outside this country to which the case might be referred.

In this particular case, whatever the law may be, if the rights of the municipality are disregarded, this Parliament is the proper body to protect those rights. Toronto is merely a case in point, and I am very sorry to say that I believe there are members of this House who are prejudiced because they believe this is simply a case of the city of Toronto versus the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. I believe that unless this clause is amended the company will have the same rights with regard to the streets of any other municipality in the province of Ontario or in the Dominion that it now exercises in the city of Toronto. The company may have no intention of exercising those rights elsewhere, but it is not at all unlikely that it may do so. It may be that the company in the expansion of its business might see fit to go on the streets of Kitchener, Guelph, Stratford or any other municipality which now controls its own streets and has its own distributing system for Hydro-Electric power.

Mr. MORPHY: How do the municipalities of Ontario control their own streets? I submit that they are controlled by the Hydro-Electric Commission.

Mr. EULER: To some extent that is true. I am also of the opinion that the powers that are sometimes exercised by the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario are just a little greater than they ought to be, but that is by the way. Unless this clause is amended we shall be subtracting still further from the rights of the municipalities.

If as a result of this amendment being carried certain interests will be prejudiced and the bonds of innocent bondholders may depreciate, I do not think that is a sufficient reason why this Parliament should consent to perpetuate an injustice and a wrong, if the injustice and the wrong exist. While I believe it would be difficult to prove that any such depreciation would occur in the bonds that have been issued by this company, I would go so far as to say that if it can be shown that loss has been sustained by reason of the fact that a previous Parliament did not properly protect the rights of the municipalities, it would become the duty of this Parliament to assess and pay the damages incurred rather than perpetuate an injustice that will affect, so far as we know, all the municipalities of the whole Dominion for all time to come.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT: This question has improperly been regarded as one that concerns the municipality of Toronto alone. As I understand it, it is a question of vital importance to every municipality throughout the Dominion. While on some occasions I have been accused of standing inordinately for vested rights, I must say that on this occasion I have a perfectly clear conscience in standing for what I conceive to be the rights of the people with regard to municipal control of their streets as against any kind of company that can be chartered by the Dominion Parliament. This is not a new question, and it is one that has been debated by business men as well as lawyers, but in very much shorter terms. It may be that I have not the understanding of the question that some of our legal friends have. I felt this afternoon as if I were being taken on a long route march, and nearly fell out by the way. I shall endeavour to say what I have to say within fifteen minutes. This company got very special rights which it was not the intention of Parliament, at the time it got them, it should receive. I may be wrong, but I believe that it was not the intention of Parliament to allow the Toronto and Niagara Power Company to go wherever they liked in the city of Toronto or any other city in Ontario or the Dominion. Otherwise, a private company would have the right to travel all over this country regardless of the wishes of the people and trample upon property that this House, and this Dominion—and I say this advisedly—does not own in the true sense of the term, because I look upon a municipal street as the absolute property of the municipality in which it exists. Municipal rights as against all comers are to be first considered.

Was that done in this case? Not at all. This company apparently was enabled to ride rough shod over the wishes of the city of Toronto or of any other municipality in which they chose to plant their wires and poles. Now, what we sometimes term vested rights are really, in the final analysis, vested wrongs, and I say that this is absolutely one of those. It is a vested

wrong; for it gave to a company, either wittingly or unwittingly, property which the giver did not own or control. That is my point. I am trying to make it very clear that in my judgment the Dominion of Canada did not own those streets and had no right to trample upon the wishes of any municipality. The municipality laid out those streets and probably paid for them. It held the deeds of possession from some one giving it the authority to take those streets for the uses of the municipality, and its uses alone. But it was not so much in this that the Parliament of Canada went astray, as it was to declare an Act to be for the general advantage of Canada while it was in reality an Act for the general disadvantage of the municipality concerned. That is what the Act did. It was an Act for the general disadvantage of the municipality and would have been better to characterize it in such terms than to say that it was for the general advantage of Canada. I know it will be asked in this House: How are you going to build railways if you do not allow them to expropriate the land through which they are going? Well, the railway when it expropriates land has to pay to the last farthing every one whom it ruins. I do not find that this power company did anything of the kind. They are on the streets and purpose to remain there absolutely forevermore against the wishes of the municipality. Not only are they on the streets at present occupied, but they propose to go on further streets and to expand indefinitely for all time to come. I cannot conceive of any Parliament ever contemplating giving such rights as this to any private company. It has been said, it is true, that this objection has arisen simply because the Hydro-Electric Power Company is now in the field to distribute power. I do not think for a moment that that is the case. If I thought that that was the only thing at the back of it, I certainly would have nothing to do with it, though I am a hearty supporter of Hydro power. But I do not believe in giving supreme powers of this kind over streets or lanes or, for that matter, over highways in any municipality in the country. I think they should be obtained by proper authority, and in my conception of it, proper authority in this respect is not within the province of this House. Those who want to use the streets should go to the municipality that owns the deeds as against all comers, and where this House made the mistake was to declare that this Act was for the general advantage of Canada when, as I contend, it was distinctly to the general disadvantage of every municipality into which this or any other company might go.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. member modify his remarks in regard to transmission?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Transmission of electric power? I would not be disposed to give to the Hydro-Electric Power Company of Ontario any rights against the wishes of the municipality that I would not give to another private company.

Mr. BURNHAM: I understand the hon. member to say that he would make the municipality supreme How about transmission? Does he modify his remarks in regard to transmission?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. A transmission line, according to my judgment, would be allowed to go through by every reasonable municipality, but only on such streets as they felt they could afford to give for the purpose. Unfortunately for us in the city of Brantford, just as well as in Toronto, though we are a much smaller burg, we have a crying injustice with regard to telephone and telegraph transmission. We have a narrow public street like Sparks street in Ottawa, and the firemen complain that they cannot raise a ladder to fight any fires throughout the whole length of the street, because Parliament about fifty or sixty years ago, gave a private company powers which they should never have conveyed. A ladder cannot be raised now on Colborne street, Brantford, because the Great North Western Telegraph Company and the Bell Telephone Company, in spite of local remonstrances, continue to occupy the street with their poles and wires, to the detriment of the municipality. I say that when transmission is going through the city it should take only those streets that the municipality itself feels it can spare. And further, I would concede that only under limitations. A municipality to-day being a village of about 100 persons and consisting of a blacksmith shop, two or three general stores, a church or two, a hotel or some other institutions might be looking forward with hope to becoming a big city some time in the future. But suppose in the meantime they tell all comers that they are welcome. Suppose they say: Here is our street; take the best you can; help yourself to any part of the street you like. Well, in twenty-five or fifty years you might find that this little village had become a city of 25,000, 50,000 or 100,000 people. Will any one

contend that because a company got in there when there was a handful of people they should be given rights for all time upon what is really the property of the city? I cannot conceive of that. Whether this amendment of my hon. friend from Parkdale, which he had beclouded with considerable legal verbiage I do not comprehend, will accomplish all he wishes, I do not know. But I am willing for once to place myself in the hands of a lawyer. I do not like doing so and do it only under strong stress. But in this case I feel that having no better leadership than the hon. member for Parkdale, who has carefully drafted the amendment and assures me that he believes it will accomplish the purpose in view, I intend to vote for it. In my judgment, this House effected this purpose two years ago, and why should we take anything back? I cannot understand what inspired that special committee that they should have brought down what I conceive to be a stultification of the position we took in this House two years ago, that municipalities should be able to control their own streets, on which companies could go only by their leave, which will always be given in a reasonable way if it is to the advantage of the municipality that the company should be allowed to go there.

Mr. BURNHAM: I was not on that Committee, and I am merely anxious to get some information. The hon. member lays down the unqualified proposition that the municipalities are supreme, and then I understand him to modify his remarks in regard to transmission lines.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I say that the municipality should have absolute control of its own streets, lanes and highways, and that only by their permission or under the regulations which they enact should companies be allowed to go ruthlessly through any city, town or village. In other words, they must confine themselves to what the municipality is pleased to give them, and not to be told by this House that it is to the general advantage of Canada that they should go where they like, consequently choosing the best street in the city, to the great detriment for all time, of every one who uses the street. I hope I make it clear to the hon. member that I do not believe the municipality would deny any reasonable requests. A few years ago I happened to be on the committee dealing with the question that arose when the Bell Telephone Company appealed to the Privy Council as to what rights the city of Toronto—I think it was Toronto—had to tell them anything about where they should plant their poles. What do you think was the decision on that occasion? It was almost as remarkable as the one we have under our hands to-day with regard to this matter. The city of Toronto was told by the Privy Council that while the Act said they had the right of supervision with regard to poles, it meant that they could supervise the digging of the holes but had no right to say where the holes should be dug. A beautiful situation certainly! I think that that is legal interpretation run wild—absolutely wild. The intention of this House was to tell the Bell Telephone Company where they should put their poles, and where to dig the holes.

An. hon. MEMBER: Why didn't they say so?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: They trusted to the lawyers. But they expressed it in verbiage that obscured the comprehension of the ordinary layman. The laymen who were in the House at that time would say that the intention was to give them the right to dig a hole only where the municipalities permitted. But these men went ahead and dug where they wanted to, dug in the middle of the pavements and the sidewalks with a perfect disregard of the wishes of the people. I have exceeded my fifteen minutes and I do not believe that I have covered all the points I intended to. I want to recapitulate, and in the first place I say that this Parliament never intended to do what is held to be the meaning of the Act. In the second place it is untenable to say that an open franchise of this kind should exist for all time and without limit. There is the question of overhead wires. Does any hon. gentleman believe that if this company is allowed to erect its poles on the streets of towns and cities any private company competing with it would be able to go underground which would cost five times as much as the overhead system? How are you ever going to have the wires placed underground if one company with a capital of $30,000,000 is going to have the exclusive right to string its wires in the air? How did this company get a blanket charter? It must have been while some of our legislators were asleep at the switch, while others had no knowledge of what was going on. I was not on the special committee and I am sorry I was not able to attend many of its meetings. But I heard part of the special pleading of Mr. Beck of New York.

I was carried away with his eloquence but he only touched the corner of the situation, and that was that when the Government of Canada declared that this was a work for the general advantge of Canada there was taken away from all the municipalities throughout the Dominion the control of their streets, walks and highways. I cannot conceive of such a thing as that. I want to say to our lay brothers who are as ignorant of the law as I am, that I believe they will take a practical view of this matter and say that no private company should be allowed to go on the streets, sidewalks, lands and highways of a municipality against the wishes of that municipality, because this undertaking has been declared by Parliament to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. I am reminded that the municipality has recourse to the Railway Board. I think it is provided in the Act that either the company or the municipality may have recourse to the Railway Board. The clause says:

> But if any municipality complains to the Board that any company whether incorporated by Special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada is exercising its powers oppressively or in bad faith the Board may hear such complaint and if it sees fit supervise the exercise of such powers.

That, to my mind, is holding out a very small straw for the municipalities to grasp at. It says that the Railway Board "may" hear complaints if it sees fit and it "may" exercise some power. But if the Railway Board does not see it in that light there will be no recourse and there will be nothing to do further than that; it costs money to appeal to Ottawa. It costs money for municipalities to come down at their own cost with special lawyers and put up a fight before the Railway Board. That provision is a very unsatisfactory one, and I trust this House, before it stultifies itself—as I think it will if it passes this Act in its present form—will take into full consideration the right of the municipalities to control their own streets, walks, lanes and highways. If this House does that in the spirit in which it was originally intended, I feel sure that this amendment, or an amendment directed towards the same purpose, should be incorporated in the Bill. I have much pleasure in supporting the hon. member (Mr. Mowat) in the position which he has taken in regard to this question.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have not had the privilege of being on the special committee that dealt with this question, but I have listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), and I must do him the honour and credit of saying that I always thought he was a lawyer. I have, for the years that he has been in this House, followed the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in the discussions in which he has taken part, and although I had no proof of it, I was always led to the conclusion that the hon. member belonged to that learned profession. I must say for his consolation to-day, that he discussed a principle that is well known to and recognized by the courts of the country, and that principle is that there must be a direct, instead of a lateral, attack upon any point. He argued, and I think conclusively, that if there is anything the matter with the charter of this company there should be a direct and immediate limit to the provisions of the charter, and not a lateral attack upon the company. Our courts, up to the Privy Council, have for years recognized the principle that you cannot laterally—that is by some side issue—attack a right which a person may have, but that you must make an attack direct. If that direct attack is made upon the rights of this company to-day you can, if necessary, give the remedy to Toronto or to any other city that has complained of certain conditions. If Toronto, which is particularly before our minds at present, although this condition might apply elsewhere, is complaining that undue powers have been given to this Toronto, Niagara Power Company, then it has the right to come before this House and say that this power must be cut out, and it is open to the House to say that that shall be done. But the power having been granted to this company, they had a perfect right to its exercise. The Privy Council held that the company interpreted the Act properly. Chancellor Boyd, a very distinguished judge of Ontario, has said that the company understood the Act properly. Chancellor Boyd held that they understood their rights; the Privy Council also held that they are merely exercising the powers which the Parliament of Canada gave them. We may have made a mistake in granting these powers, but they were properly understood, they were properly exercised, and if they are to be taken away it is for us to see that nobody shall suffer by reason of any mistake having been made.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Will my hon. friend say what he thinks in regard to the opinion expressed by our High Court? He mentions Chancellor Boyd and the Privy Council, but

he omits to mention the third party to the judgment.

Mr. McKENZIE: That does not count; that was wiped out by the Privy Council, and so it is not necessary for me to say anything about it, as it is absolutely ineffective. The Privy Council said the judgment of the Appellate Court was wrong, and they restored the decision of Chancellor Boyd, and it is that decision which we have to deal with so far as the construction of the law is concerned. I therefore submit that Chancellor Boyd having said those men had properly used their rights, the Privy Council having said so and confirmed Chancellor Boyd's decision, the Senate of Canada having said that the Bill as presented to us is all right and a committee of this House having done what it considered fair and right with this Bill after having given a proper hearing to everybody who wished to come before them, it is rather late for us—who have not heard the facts, and who have not heard counsel except through the very learned and helpful discussion that took place this afternoon—and rather dangerous for us to interfere with the Bill as presented to us after all the consideration which it has received. I would say to my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) and to those who support him, in the first place, that I think they have slept on their rights, although that should not weigh with Parliament. This Act was passed in 1902, giving this company the powers they have been exercising down to the present, and it is only within a recent period that anything has been brought before Parliament in regard to it. I submit, on the principle so well advanced by my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), that the attacks should be made directly upon the spot where the mistake took place, and that it should not be sought to secure a remedy by a general Act of this kind, which may do far more harm than the remedy which it is hoped to produce, and which may strike a dozen companies that it is not intended to strike. If it is necessary to provide a proper remedy for the city of Toronto against this power company let the matter come straight before Parliament on its own merits, supported by the essential facts, and then Parliament should be able to deal with it. As far as I am concerned, I cannot see that I would be on safe ground in departing from the conclusions which have been reached by the courts which dealt with the matter, as also by the Senate, and by a special committee of this House.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROSS: It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to go into a detailed argument in regard to this matter; I prefer rather to pursue the course adopted by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). I wish to reply to some extent to the remarks made by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). As I understood the hon. gentleman, he said that he thought this House should to a great extent be bound by the finding of the Special Committee appointed to consider the Railway Act. If that had been the only finding, there might be some force in his contention. But I would remind him that at a previous session not only did the Railway Committee of this House, but this House itself, pass an amendment to the Railway Act which was much more radical than the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Parkdale.

I am not going to review the history of the legislation; it has been done so often that the subject is now threadbare. But it seems to me that there are only two or three points of importance in connection with the whole matter. In the first place, we must start out with the primary rights not only of the municipalities of the province of Ontario but of the municipalities of the whole Dominion. These rights were granted to the municipalities as a matter of course long before this special Act incorporating this company was ever thought of, and the municipalities should be given first consideration in any decision this House may come to.

I think no hon. gentleman will dispute the fact that the municipalities have always been accorded the privilege of controlling their own streets, their own highways, their own public squares, and their own lanes, and I do not think that any person will wish to gainsay them that right. It is a form of local self-government that is not only good liberalism, but is good government. It seems to me that this special Act passed in 1902 was a direct violation of those municipal rights. The opponents of this amendment may argue that Parliament has by a special Act given this company the right to interfere with the streets and highways of the municipalities, and that that right should not be restricted. But I think, Sir, it has been abundantly proved

by hon. members who have preceded me that it was far from the intention of Parliament to grant the extraordinary privilege of going upon the streets and roads of the municipalities without their consent. Therefore on that account alone we are in a position to review the action of Parliament in 1902, and to pass what at this time is practically a declaratory law—which has been done on many occasions by all parliaments within the British Empire—that it was not the intention of Parliament at that time to enact what the company now claims, and that the law is and should be as this amendment tends to make it.

All the arguments not only in the Special Committee but in this House seem to come down to one question—that of vested rights. No one seems to dispute as a general principle the right of the municipalities to control their own streets. The opponents of this amendment say that on account of the decision of the Privy Council in 1911—after this Act had been in force for some time—investors were induced to put their money into the bonds of this company and those affiliated companies, and that on that account we should not now interfere with the rights given by Parliament in 1902. It seems to me that that contention cannot be sustained, and I think that the hon. member for West Calgary completely annihilated it before the Special Committee.

These people came to us with a charter and they say that they have certain rights—rights decided by the Privy Council to be so and so. But they do not tell us, Sir, that in that very charter, which they allege as the foundation of their rights, their bond issue is limited to $1,500,000. I understand that is the fact. It does not seem to me that, because of their having affiliated with the other companies which have larger bond issues, their claim should be allowed that their charter—Magna Charta, as it were, of their rights—shall not be controlled by the limitations embodied in the charter itself.

It seems to me that they cannot claim the privileges and the rights which their charter appears to give them—although unintentionally—and not at the same time be willing to be bound by the limitations that that charter imposes upon them.

As I understand the matter this company has invested some eight or nine million dollars of its money and therefore it is more than able to take care of all the bonds that have been issued by the officers against its assets. Consequently I do not think it lies with the investors to come before this House and say that the vested interests of this company are going to be interfered with by the action of this Parliament if this amendment is passed. As I see it, they have no further rights beyond the $1,500,000 which is the limit of the company's bonding powers under its charter.

An effort has been made to arouse prejudice. Some people in the lobbies and some hon. gentlemen—probably not intentionally—in the special committee and before this House have, as I see it, tried to induce hon. members to believe that this is a question between the city of Toronto and the Toronto and Niagara Transmission Company. For my own part, speaking on behalf of the many municipalities in the county of Middlesex, I wish to say that this is not a struggle between the city of Toronto, acting in conjunction with the Hydro Electric Commission of Ontario and the said company; but that if this Bill is allowed to stand in its present form the privileges of every municipality, particularly in the western part of the province of Ontario, are in danger.

I am not an intimate or personal friend of Sir Adam Beck, but I wish to say for him and for his commission that he has done good work in the province. I can speak from the experience of my home town of Strathroy, and I can candidly say that since the Hydro Electric Commission has taken charge of the distribution of electrical energy and electric light in that town the rates have greatly decreased, and I believe that is the experience of every other town in western Ontario.

Without going further into the argument, because I do not think it is necessary, as others better acquainted with the facts and the law will deal with the matter, I just want to say, that for the reasons I have given I am heartily in favour of the amendment

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (York, East): I have made up my mind to support the amendment of the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat). I think it is a move in the right direction; and it is in the interests of the people of this country and against the interests of great promoting companies. The organization behind this company are the greatest promoters of franchises that can be found in Canada. Not only do they receive a large number of franchises; they are exploiters as well. Some twenty-eight years ago this company succeeded in get-

ting the franchise of the Toronto Street Railway. Every one is familiar with this company, the Mackenzie & Mann Company; there is no greater promoting or exploiting company in the Dominion. They paid some $2,500,000 to the city of Toronto for that street railway franchise, which is one of the best franchises ever given to a company in this country. Within a year or two they issued securities to the extent of about $6,500,000. They then secured the Toronto Electric Light Company. The city was to have the first opportunity of securing the benefits of the franchise of the Incandescent Light Company, which was operating at that time, but apparently Toronto was asleep at the switch because this promoting company stepped in and acquired a majority of the stock. A short time after that these promoters undertook to secure what was called the Niagara Development Company. That company has a franchise from the provincial government and supplies power to the Toronto Railway Company and to North Toronto. The franchise of two of these companies expires within the next six months. It was Toronto's intention to secure these two or three companies by arbitration, so they gave a year's notice that they intended to take them over. But at a special meeting of the Toronto city council held a few months ago it was decided to cancel that arrangement and to forego the taking over of these franchises; they decided to allow them to continue for another twenty-one years. The city was quite justified in the attitude which it took. When they gave the notice they felt that they were free to purchase these companies at arbitrated value, but they discovered that the Niagara Power Company had a franchise which permitted them to transmit and retail electric power to consumers in Toronto. Why then, should the city undertake to buy, at a possible cost of eight or nine millions, the companies at present established there, having regard to the fact that if they did they would be subject to such strong competition? I think they were wise in taking the course that they did, leaving themselves free to meet the competition of the Niagara Power Company if that company chose to enter upon a policy of dealing in power, as their franchise entitles them to do.

It was thought in 1902 by Mr. Osler, Mr. Clarke and Mr. Pringle that the municipalities were well protected. They put up a splendid fight, but they discovered, after some appeals had been made to the Privy Council, that instead of getting something substantial in the interests of the people, they were handed a gold brick. The Toronto Street Railway Company was an excellent company, having regard to its earnings and the value of its stock. But this promoting company was not content to treat the people as they should be treated; they commenced to exploit the revenues and the earnings of the Toronto Railway Company, and there has been continuous litigation in an effort to get some rights for the people. We thought that the agreement which we had with the company in this case was an excellent one. We knew that we had to be extra careful in dealing with this franchise. We had a splendid mayor at the time, Mr. Clarke, who was always prepared to look after the interests of the people, and he assisted in the effort to get a good agreement from that company. We secured what we thought was the best legal talent in Toronto; some $50,000 was spent in the preparation of the agreement; we thought that it would stand any test in our courts or even before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But to our surprise, as soon as this company got the franchise, they watered the stock, started litigation, went to various courts, appealed to the Privy Council, tied up actions there for months—and invariably the city seemed to get the worst of it; there was some legal point that gave the company the advantage over the people. Instead of extending the street railway system into congested and newly developed parts of the city, they continued to operate on the old lines and refused to extend. The result was that the city was forced to spend millions to give accommodation to the people who needed it. There was nothing but a continuous jamming of people into the cars, in order that the promoters might get the largest possible earnings out of the system. Into a car of a capacity of say one hundred people, two hundred or two hundred and fifty people would be jammed. The way the women and girls of Toronto were jammed into those cars was a shame and a disgrace. It shows what these promoting and exploiting companies will do to take all they can out of the people and give nothing in return.

It is said that we are hard on these large corporations; that they have vested rights, and that we should be more sympathetic. Of course they get vested rights, and whenever they get them they begin to exploit them. It is said that in this case $29,000,000 have been invested; that money has been brought here from England, France and United States, to say nothing of what has come from our own country. Well, the

people in those various countries have been exploited to the extent of almost $30,000,000. This shows the cleverness of these exploiters when they get a franchise; they are prepared to go to various countries and get the money in some way in order that they may continue their exploitation and get other franchises.

This legislation was before this House in 1917 when the Consolidated Railway Act was revised. It was thought that we had framed an Act that was reasonable and in the interest of the people, but when it got to the Senate it was rejected and all the good work done by members of this House was undone. The Act was so amended by the Senate that it was impossible for this House to accept it. Last session the Act was not before this House at all; it was tied up for months, but was sent here this session from the Senate and referred to a Special Committee. We are up against a body of people in the Senate not responsible to the electors. If they were responsible, it would be quite different, but when this House has passed an Act it goes to a body that is responsible to nobody. I have come to the conclusion, and I think thousands of people throughout this Dominion also believe, that it is time the Senate was reformed, either elected by the people—or Oslerized.

In competition with the private-owned electric system we have in Ontario the Hydro, supplying light, heat and power. It has come to the rescue of the people of the province, and I believe other provinces will follow Ontario's example. Hon. gentlemen may have seen the report that was issued a few days ago of what the Hydro has done for the province of Ontario. It has saved in a year to the people of the province some 400,000 or 500,000 tons of coal, representing a money saving of some $5,000,000 a year. Since the inception of the system—and it is only in its inception, the system is going to be immense eventually, and will be one of the greatest public utilities controlled by the people—there has been saved to the people of the province of Ontario $12,500,000 in the last seven or eight years. I think that is a wonderful record. Not only has there been a rebate given in connection with the lighting of the city, amounting to $22,000, but a rebate has also been given of from $8 to $7 per lamp, representing a saving of $45,000 per year to the city in lighting its streets. If this system, which is only in its infancy, has already saved the people between $12,000,000 and $13,000,000, and is saving them over $5,000,000 a year, what will it save when we have a full development of the water-power of the province? It will mean the saving of millions of dollars and of hundreds of thousands of tons of coal. We shall be independent of the United States, because we shall be able to generate our own power, and light and heat every house and factory throughout the whole province and Dominion, and light our streets as well. Surely such an enterprise should be encouraged, not discouraged.

The Toronto and Niagara Power Company are not satisfied with getting into Toronto, but are manipulating to get into other municipalities. Toronto has been a gold mine for them in the past, and will be in the future if this amendment is not carried. The people have some rights. We are always preaching that the masses should have some consideration, as against the great corporations. Others argue that you should protect the corporations. I say we need not worry about the corporations, because they are quite capable at all times of looking after their own interests. This company which has made millions of dollars out of its franchise, and given no accommodation to the people who have given it this great franchise, is treating the people worse than a drover or a stockman is permitted to treat his stock. A drover shipping a carload of horses, sheep, hogs or cattle to the stock yards is prosecuted if he overcrowds a car, and there is not a day in Toronto that does not see a prosecution and a penalty imposed for this offence; but the Toronto Street Railway can jam as much humanity as they like into their street cars, loading them from 100 to 150 per cent above their capacity, without being prosecuted, and yet hon. members sympathize with this poor company, and say it has certain vested rights which should be protected. I say we should protect the masses of this country first, last, and all the time, and let the corporations look after themselves because they are quite capable of doing it. This is not the only promoting company in this Dominion. There are a number of them, and if you mix amongst the people you will find that the cause of the unrest prevailing to-day is the big corporations which are hoarding and storing up instead of handing out to the people what has been produced by the people. Corporations are making millions of dollars out of what they have hoarded up for speculative purposes, and I think it is time we should call a halt and should legislate in the interests of the

masses. I think the hon. member for Parkdale and the hon. member for Calgary have taken a step in the right direction in bringing this amendment before the House, and I trust that every hon. member who wants to do what is right and have a clear conscience, who wants to vote as he preaches most of the time, will support the amendment.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am going to support the amendment at the request of the city council of New Westminster, who have wired me to support it as a municipal amendment. I understand that this amendment has received the approval of the Union of Canadian Municipalities. Personally, I am not interested in any dispute between the companies which have been referred to. As a matter of fact, I do not know their names. I am looking at the question from the viewpoint of the municipalities, and it seems to me the question involved in this amendment is whether or not the rights of the people as represented by the municipalities shall be superseded by the rights or privileges of the big corporations. I think it is wrong in principle to allow a great corporation, electric or any other kind, to construct poles and wires on the streets of any municipality without the consent of the people of that municipality. It is admitted that such a privilege should not be granted in the future to any company seeking it.

I take it from the wording of this section that all companies which have not, by their charters obtained special powers permitting them to go on the streets of municipalities without consent, are required to obtain that consent. I think it is quite clear to everyone that a great many of the special powers contained in Acts of Parliament are obtained without the knowledge of Parliament that they are being conferred. Later on to-night, if I have an opportunity to do so, I shall refer to a case which occurred in this particular session of Parliament in which a very important section of this Railway Act was put through the special committee practically without discussion, and put through this Committee as a non-contentious section. It seems to me that where a thing of that kind happens and where the fact is brought to the attention of the House, it is for Parliament to rectify the condition. It is pointed out that when a company has received these special powers and has obtained what are called vested rights, it is unfair to take these rights away and to require them to get consent, as in the case of the city of Toronto, and it is suggested that the city of Toronto is trying to hold up this particular company. Now, I think that if this House is shown on a future occasion that the city of Toronto or any other city or municipality is holding up a public corporation, it will very soon pass legislation to meet the situation.

Mr. FIELDING: It has been said several times during this debate that this whole trouble which has disturbed and obstructed our legislation for three years, is due to the bungling of legal gentlemen who were entrusted with the drafting of these statutes some years ago. If that be true, then there is some excuse for those of us who are not lawyers but just ordinary laymen who are taking some part in the discussion. I have not been able to follow the whole matter as closely as some gentlemen, and therefore any opinions I have to offer should be expressed with hesitation and some reserve. I think, however, that I have heard enough of the discussion to grasp the real question that is at issue. I was much impressed by the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) as to the unfortunate position in which we are placed when we are asked to use the machinery of a very important general Act for the purpose of making an attack upon the chartered rights of a private company. I think that his argument, that if we wanted to attack the rights of that company we should do it directly and squarely, was an excellent one. However, we must deal with the question in the form in which it is now presented to us.

This is really a fight between vested rights and modern views concerning such rights. I am afraid there is a growing lack of that reverence which existed in olden times for vested rights, and on the other hand that there is a tendency to go a little too far in the other direction. There is much to be said in favour of the old-fashioned idea that a bargain is a bargain and a contract a contract, and that all who make it should be prepared to stand by it; and I have a great respect for those who still stand firmly on that view. But there is a strong modern contention that even vested rights must at times be challenged and set aside where they seem to be at variance with public interest. In this case the company has a charter the character of which has been discussed very much here to-day, and, I think, in a manner which perhaps is hardly appropriate. It will not profit us to discuss what was the intention of Parliament when that charter was passed. My legal friends know, better

than do we laymen, that the intention of an Act of Parliament must be gathered from the Act itself, and not from what any one says or thinks about it. In this case, the quality of the company's charter was attacked. They have been able to defend it before the Privy Council, and it stands before us now as a contract which the company say should be observed. But the Senate, sedate and conservative body as it is, and our Committee of this House which has confirmed the Senate's view, have come to the conclusion that even vested rights may in some degree be questioned, and so the Senate has endeavoured to propose something that looks like a compromise. The Senate has virtually said to the company: True, you have these vested rights and we do not want to take them away from you, for we respect vested rights, and so on, but we want to be assured that you will exercise them with discretion; and so we include in this Bill a clause which says that if the company in any case—take the case of Toronto, which is very much in evidence—if the company shall attempt to exercise these rights oppressively and in bad faith, then there shall be an appeal to the Railway Board.

Let us dwell on that for a moment. It is a great departure from the old-time doctrine. It means the raising of a question as to these vested rights, and is an admission that, in the modern view of things, even vested rights may be challenged. But if the Senate—I speak of the Senate because the motion was initiated by them, although it is now before us as a report of a Committee of this House—desired to grant an appeal to the Railway Commission under certain conditions, they might very well have made the appeal more effective. I think the form in which the appeal comes to us is better than what is presented to us by the hon. member for Parkdale, whose amendment does not commend itself to my judgment. I would rather have the appeal in the form in which we have it now than accept his amendment. But while I think that the intention of the Senate in that respect was good, I am of the opinion that if they wanted to give an appeal they should make it a more effective appeal. They say that if the company go into Toronto, say, and dig up the streets and erect poles and create trouble generally, the Toronto City Council may claim that this is acting oppressively and not in good faith, and may raise an issue before the Railway Commissioners. It seems to me that if that is a good policy, a better one would be to raise the issue before they dig up the streets or put up the poles, before they exercise any powers at all. My suggestion therefore would be, not to deny the rights of the company, but to provide that if they want to exercise those rights within Toronto or any other city they must first make application to the council of the municipality and see if they cannot come to an understanding with them. I have cast my thoughts into the form of a roughly-drafted amendment, which I shall read in order that the Committee may have clearly before it what I am contending. It will not be in order at this moment, but possibly after the motion of my friend from Parkdale is disposed of I may find it convenient to move it. In the meantime I may read it to inform the Committee of what seems to me to be a fairly good solution of the difficulty:

> But when any such company desires to exercise its powers on, in, over, or under any street in any city, town, village or township, it shall be subject to the following conditions:
>
> (a) The company, when intending to so exercise its powers or any of them, shall give notice in writing to the municipality of such intention and shall, with such notice, furnish plans and specifications of the work proposed to be done.
>
> (b) If within ten days of the giving of such notice the municipality fail to give notice in writing to the company of objections to the proposed operations the company may proceed to carry on the work in accordance with the plans and specifications.
>
> (c) If within such ten days the municipality propose to the company in writing changes in the said plans and specifications the adoption of which will remove the municipality's objections, the company shall carefully consider such proposed changes and shall approve them if they are deemed fair and reasonable, and thereupon the company may proceed to carry on the work in accordance with the plans and specifications as thus modified.
>
> (d) If the company are unable to approve of the changes of plans and specifications proposed by the municipality, the company may appeal to the Board and the Board, after hearing both parties, may make such order as it may deem expedient, having due regard to the rights of the company and to the public interests affected.

The substance of it is that instead of waiting for Toronto to make a complaint, instead of waiting until the company dig up the streets, put up their poles and raise the devil generally, as the first step notice shall be given to the municipality that they intend to do this. It is hardly an application for permission—the company have a right to do it subject to certain conditions—but before they do it, they shall notify the municipality and give the muni-

cipality a chance to make representations. They may be able to agree. Failing in that they shall then go to the board. The difference between that and the provision in the Bill is that while in the Bill as it now stands you would first allow action to be taken, putting up the poles, digging up the street, etc., and then go before the Board of Railway Commissioners and ask them to determine whether this action was oppressive or taken in bad faith, you would have the company first go to the municipality and endeavour to come to an understanding. If they failed they would then proceed to bring the matter before the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Chairman, the very logical remarks of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) emphasizes the importance of the statement made by my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) at the beginning of this debate. That is that an Act referring to what is purely a local matter within one municipality or a number of municipalities ought not to be incorporated in the general Railway Bill of Canada. I think that if my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens had been on the sub-committee and had followed the debate, as I am quite sure he would have had he been there, he would have different views from those which he presented to-night. It only shows that when you try to provide for a specific case in a general Act you are sure to land in trouble. There is no set of lawyers in the world who can under such conditions draft a scheme which will not mean trouble in the end. I profess to know something about this question because I was a member of the sub-committee in 1917 which had this matter under consideration, and we spent, I think, five or six weeks over the whole Railway Bill and some days over this particular clause. Also I was here when the matter was discussed in Committee of the Whole House, and while I was in the minority on that occasion still I had very pronounced views on the whole question, and I have the same views to-night. I was a member also of the subcommittee appointed a few weeks ago to consider the Railway Bill and spent two or three days over this particular case. We had evidence brought by all the parties, and I believe the subcommittee which dealt with this matter had every particle of evidence which it was possible to obtain or necessary to an intelligent decision. Whether or not the majority gave an intelligent decision is a question for each individual member's opinion. But it certainly is the fact that the vote was more than two to one in favour of the Bill as it came from the Senate. It is so much like an ordinary lawsuit, so much special evidence bearing upon this point or upon that point, it is such a localized affair, that one would require to have gone through all the phases of the matter to appreciate the whole position.

My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens has put up to-day practically the proposition I put up two years ago in principle, but I did not get very far until I saw that there were difficulties ahead, that there were lions in the path. My hon. friend talks about going to a municipality—mind you, I am talking about this particular case; on the general case I agree with him at once; I do not think that any corporation should receive the right to go upon the streets and public squares of any municipality without the consent of that municipality; in the light of our experience I doubt if there is a man in the House of Commons or the Senate who would advocate that we should give a charter to-day such as was given in 1902. But my hon. friend was discussing this matter from a general standpoint and from the general standpoint he is absolutely logical. He says that before anything is done the corporation should give notice to the municipality of their desires accompanied by plans and specifications of the works and ask if the municipality is prepared to consent; if they do not object in ten days, go on with the work, if they do object, go to the board. But my hon. friend fails to realize and—I say this in no offensive way—fails to understand that a municipality in the province of Ontario has nothing to say about it, absolutely nothing. I know my hon. friend will hardly believe that statement——

Mr. FIELDING: I think I do.

Mr. CARVELL: —but I want to read to him the law of Ontario to-day. A municipality has no control over its streets when it comes to the question of erecting poles for the transmission of electricity. By an Act passed in 1914 it is provided that:

> Notwithstanding anything in any Act contained a municipal corporation shall not hereafter enter into any agreement with any such company or pass any by-law in relation to any public utility which has been declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, or which is not within the legislative control of Ontario, until the Lieutenant-Governor in Council approved of such agreement or by-law, and every agreement entered into and by-law

passed in violation of this section shall be utterly void and of no effect.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that Ontario law?

Mr. CARVELL: That is Ontario law.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend will find in the suggestion I offered that there was nothing about making an agreement with the municipal council. What I suggested was that the municipal council should be afforded an opportunity of accepting or of stating their objections. I thought I succeeded in steering clear of the trouble to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not want to steer clear of it; I want to face it; let us try to face it and see if we can get legislation passed which will be equitable and will meet the situation. There is nothing here about any notice to the municipality, and you have the right to erect poles on any one of their streets without the municipality having anything to say about it.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not propose that they shall ask for the right. I say, on the contrary, that the company have the right, but it is a question as to the manner in which they shall exercise it. I do not propose that they shall go to Toronto and ask them for the privilege, but that they shall go to Toronto and say: We have the privilege; we come to say that we will exercise that privilege in the way we think best, but we want to afford you an opportunity of filing objections.

Mr. BRISTOL: Has not the municipality a perfect right to pass a by-law? But the opinion of the minister is that the Government of Ontario would never consent to its enforcement.

Mr. CARVELL: I will read that over again. First, I will answer my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's and then my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol). This subsection that I have read was framed by a man who evidently knew what he was doing, because they do not apply this to all corporations, but to corporations which have been declared works for the general advantage of Canada—which means the Toronto Niagara Power company and allied interests. It uses the word "agreement." If the suggestion of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's were carried out, if an application were made to the municipality and if the company said: We want to erect these poles and build this line under certain conditions; and if no objections were made, that would be an agreement. I think it comes within the purview of the amendment and therefore I would add here to my former statement that the municipality is absolutely powerless. Now, to answer the hon. member for Centre Toronto, this law specially declares that:—

—and every agreement entered into and by-law passed in violation of this section shall be utterly void and of no effect.

Mr. BRISTOL: That is the point I make: They can pass this by-law, but it is no good without the sanction of the provincial government.

Mr. CARVELL: Exactly, it is only a scrap of paper, and the whole legislation was framed in order to prevent the Toronto and Niagara Power Company from doing business. I want now to discuss for a moment or two the general question involved.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the minister leaves that subject, there is a point that I do not quite follow. If the company created, or incorporated, by this House is given certain rights in any province of Canada, does the minister think those rights can be taken away by a provincial enactment?

Mr. CARVELL: No, but I have no doubt that the province of Ontario is quite right in saying that a contract made by one of its municipalities with this corporation would be void. I think they are right in that and that is what they have done. They have not said that the Toronto and Niagara Power Company cannot do certain things, but they have said that no municipality can pass a by-law agreeing that anything shall be done by this corporation without its being null and void.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is not that an indirect way of doing the same thng?

Mr. CARVELL: It may be, but I believe that under the British North America Act they have those rights; I believe their powers go that far.

Mr. FIELDING: Suppose the Toronto and Niagara Company notify the city council of Toronto that they intend to carry on certain work, under certain plans and specifications, and want to know if the council have any objection, and the council say they have no objection, does my hon. friend say that is a by-law?

Mr. CARVELL: I think it is, and I will go as far as to say this: If I were representing the province of Ontario, or the Hydro-Electric Commission, I would not hesitate a moment to take the case to the

courts and should expect to get a decision, because they have used the word "agreement," as well as "by-law." "Every agreement entered into, and by-law passed, in violation of this section shall be utterly void and of no effect." I think my hon. friend will find that the man who drew this section knew what he was doing. He knew he was aiming especially at the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, and he was determined that that company should not be able to do any business in competition with their own company. Now I have no fault to find with the province of Ontario in its Hydro-Electric proposition. I agree with my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) that the Hydro-Electric Commission in Ontario has done a great work, and I believe is destined to do still greater work in the near future. I am somewhat of an admirer of the commission for the way in which they have carried the work on. I do not believe they are getting as cheap power as they think they are, because they have to pay certain taxes; but there is no doubt in the world that the householder is getting cheap electricty. More than that he is getting a sufficient supply in ordinary times, which, after all, is more than the question of price. Therefore I have nothing but kind words for the Hydro-Electric Commission; and if it be the wish of the people of Ontario that that commission shall be the only corporation generating, transmitting, and distributing electricity in Ontario, that is their affair also; if they want to adopt that policy I do not think the Parliament of Canada should find any fault with it. But I do lay down this doctrine: That they have no right to ruthlessly step in and destroy other men's labours and destroy the capital which other men have put into these schemes before the Hydro-Electric was an entity at all. When we practically got through with the hearing of the evidence before the special committee I asked a series of questions of the gentlemen present. In a sense it was like a series of questions which a judge would propound to a jury in court, but the answers were given by both parties to the dispute. I am going to read to the committee the questions, and the answers, and therefore the committee can accept these as being the facts of the case as produced in the evidence before the special committee:

1. Q. When did the Toronto and Niagara, or subsidiaries, first deliver electricity in Toronto?—A. 1907.

2. Q. When did the Hydro-Electric Commission first deliver electricity in Toronto?—A. 1910.

3. Q. Has the city of Toronto the right to purchase the overhead system of the Toronto Electric Light Company?—A. Yes.

4. Q. Have they decided not to exercise the option?—A. Yes.

5. Q. Has the city the right to acquire the Toronto Electric Railway Company? If so, when?—A. Yes, in 1921.

6. Q. Does the Hydro-Electric maintain overhead wires for both transmission and distribution?—A. Yes.

I want the Committee to pay special attention to this question and answer.

Mr. McMASTER: What company is that?

Mr. CARVELL: That is the Hydro Electric Commission, or in other words, the province of Ontario.

Mr. CAHILL: Is not that the municipal company in Toronto?

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is the Hydro Electric Commission. I did not ask the details, but I presume a company—that is, the city of Toronto—is working with the Hydro-Electric Commission in buying electricity and distributing it, but that means a company in competition with the Toronto and Niagara.

Mr. SHEARD: Toronto is a customer of the Hydro Electric Commission?

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly, Toronto is a customer and the Hydro-Electric Commission is distributing electricity through the city for lighting purposes by overhead wires. That is admitted by everybody, and you will see why I asked that question a little later on.

7. Q: Can the Toronto Electric Light Company feed its underground system without using overhead lines in the city of Toronto? A: No.

8. Q: Has the Toronto and Niagara Company agreed to sell their whole scheme to the Hydro? A: Yes.

And furthermore, Mr. Fleming, the general manager of the railway company, said they would be willing to allow the price of the whole scheme to be decided as a going concern by any independent tribunal. Those are the facts which were submitted by all parties at the hearing of the special committee.

The further facts that I did not incorporate in these questions were these: The Toronto and Niagara Company was the parent company, and they say have a right of bond issue only to the extent of a million and a half of dollars, and

9 p.m. an argument was made before the special committee that there are plenty of assets, no matter what hap-

pens, to pay for this million and a half of bonds. I must say that while I have the very greatest respect for my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), who put forth that argument, I do not think he will consider I am unfair to him when I say the argument will not hold water when you apply business principles to it. In order to have a successful hydro-electric proposition you must have three things: First, a generating plant; second, a transmission line; and third, a distribution plant. Destroy any of these three branches and you destroy the whole system. The Toronto and Niagara Power Company have obtained legislation from this Parliament giving them the right to transmit and distribute electricity. As I said before, the powers are very broad—broader I think, in fact broader I know—than this Parliament gives to-day, and broader than they should have got.

Mr. SHEARD: Was there ever a promise, or an implied promise, on the part of the city of Toronto that they should furnish the Toronto and Niagara Power Company with a perpetual market for their product?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. SHEARD: Is not that the brunt of your argument?

Mr. CARVELL: No. I think before I get through my hon. friend will see that I have some other ideas in the back of my head on the subject besides that.

Mr. McMASTER: In a memorandum which was distributed among the members in the House the statement is made that when this charter was granted to the Toronto and Niagara Power Company it was thoroughly understood that the company obtained the right to go into Toronto subject to the approval of the municipality. I would like to hear the minister on that point, as it appears to me to be important.

Mr. CARVELL: I was not a member of Parliament at that time, and therefore I have no personal knowledge of the matter. However, from reading Hansard of that day there is no doubt that the matter was discussed, and I think that very many people believed that they would not have the right to invade the streets of any city without the consent of the municipality.

But my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) in his usual logical fashion has, I think, answered that question. It is not a question of what he or I or some other member of Parliament may have thought; Parliament acts as a whole, and the combined wisdom of the whole Parliament finally incorporates certain ideas into law; and from that day forth it is a question for the courts to decide what Parliament did intend to do. And the Privy Council has said that Parliament intended that the company should have the right to go on the streets of every municipality in the province of Ontario.

Mr. McMASTER: The House of Lords decided that all the property of the Presbyterian Church was to go to the "Wee Frees," and legislation had to be passed to correct such an absurdity.

Mr. CARVELL: My friend is a better authority on that then I am, and therefore I will not be drawn into that discussion,—theology is not my strong point. When I was interrupted I was stating that it takes three things to make a successful hydro-electric scheme after the parent company was formed—and without the parent company the scheme was never possible, because unless they had the right to transmit and distribute energy they never would have spent a dollar. Therefore, all the corporations that have been built up around this company were built up because of the rights and powers granted to the parent company by Parliament in 1902. They got these three things going and spent about $35,000,000. It is in evidence, and not denied, that there are $29,000,000 worth of bonds now outstanding against the scheme, and $9,000,000 of those bonds have actually been absorbed by the purchasing public since the decision of the Privy Council in 1912. I think it is a fair assumption that the people who bought those bonds since 1912 bought them on the strength of the law as interpreted by the Privy Council—that this company had the right to distribute electricity through the municipalities of Ontario or anywhere else that they might be able to go to.

In pursuance of those rights the company built a transmission line from the Falls to the city of Toronto. Then they had a contract with the city of Toronto by which they were given the right to erect certain poles in the city for the purpose of lighting the streets. The contract extended down to 1915 or 1916—I have forgotten the actual date. The Privy Council decided that the company had no further right to maintain those poles on the streets of Toronto—that is the Toronto and Niagara syndicate now—because they got the right up to a certain date for the specific purpose of transmitting electricity for street lighting, and when that

contract expired the right to maintain the poles expired with it; and that is where the matter stands to-day. It is also a fact that the Toronto Electric Light Company, which is a part of this scheme, has a very extensive underground system in the centre or congested portions of the city.

Mr. McCOIG: Is not the question of having overhead wires entirely one for the municipalities? What right have we to interfere? And if the municipality is going to allow the Hydro-Electric to distribute their power in that way, why should we interfere?

Mr. CARVELL: Not at all.

Mr. McCOIG: Then why make a point of it?

Mr. CARVELL: I am pointing out that the city of Toronto have no objection to overhead wires in their streets, because they have allowed the Hydro-Electric to distribute everywhere they want to by an overhead system; but when it comes to a competing company the city say to them: "No, you must not distribute your electricity by overhead wires." As I said before, the Toronto Electric Light Company have a very extensive underground system in the centre of the city, and that underground system is fed by overhead wires, and if this company is not allowed the right to use overhead wires in conjunction with their underground system, then that underground system is no good except as junk. Because, they might have the most elaborate distribution system in the world, but if they cannot get current to it it is only junk. If this amendment were passed —let there be no misunderstanding about it—the Toronto and Niagara Company cannot maintain a single wire in the city of Toronto, they cannot get a watt of electricity through their underground system, and their underground system becomes absolute junk and is only worth junk value.

Mr. CAHILL: I understood the Toronto officials to say they would allow the company to transmit power on the overhead lines to the underground.

Mr. CARVELL: My friend is usually more astute, and it is a confession that I did not expect him to make this evening, because that question was thrashed out in the special committee for hours, and he was there. I framed these questions based upon that very statement of facts: I asked:

Q. Does the Hydro-Electric maintain overhead wires for both transmission and distribution?—A. Yes.

Q. Can the Toronto Electric Light Company feed its underground system without using overhead lines in the city of Toronto?—A. No.

That was admitted by everybody.

Mr. CAHILL: Who answered that?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Fleming was there from one side, and Mr. Kilmer from the other.

Mr. CAHILL: Mr. Kilmer did not answer in that way.

Mr. MORPHY: No objection was taken to it.

Mr. CARVELL: I rather resent that statement from my friend (Mr. Cahill) and I say so frankly. I am not coming before this Committee to state what are not the facts. As my friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy) tells me, they stated the underground system was scattered over different parts of the city, and it would be a physical impossibility to dig a tunnel from the outskirts of the city to connect with that scattered system. There was no question about the matter at all; everybody admitted the facts were that without the overhead distribution system you could never feed the underground. I would not come here and misstate the facts. I have been at the bar too long to attempt such misrepresentation.

Let us see the result. My friend says, "Well, but they are going to allow them to distribute overhead." What does the amendment provide? Subsection 5 is as follows:

> The provisions of the last preceding subsection shall apply to and restrict the powers of any company heretofore incorporated by special Act or other authority of the Parliament of Canada, notwithstanding that such provisions may be inconsistent with the provisions of such special Act or other authority, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of this Act.

Section 3 provides that if they are not satisfied with the arrangements for distribution, if the conditions imposed are too onerous or unfair, they can apply to the board. Notwithstanding everything, if this amendment passes, then the Toronto and Niagara Company are absolutely barred from getting electricity for their underground system in Toronto. There you have the facts of the case put as plainly and concisely as I am able to express them. It is also admitted that their principal consumers are two corporations in Toronto: first, the Toronto Electric Light Company,

which the city of Toronto have the right to purchase up to the month of November next, but the city has now notified the officials of the company that they do not intend to purchase the system. If the amendment passes, the Toronto and Niagara Company cannot feed their underground system, and therefore that system is only junk.

It is also admitted that in 1921 the city has the right to take their next greatest customer, that is, the Toronto Railway Company. You take away from the Toronto and Niagara Power Company the Toronto Railway Company, and you put the Transmission Company where they cannot dispose of their power. What, then, are they going to do with their output? What is the value of their output in Toronto? What is the value of their transmission line? What is the value of their generating plant, if they are not allowed to transmit electricity to the United States? If this amendment passes I have no hesitation in saying that two years from now their bonds would not be worth 50, because the physical assets of the company that would be left to them would not realize more than fifty per cent on the value of the bonds. If the Parliament of Canada is absolutely to commandeer or destroy a corporation such as that, which has been built up on the basis of legislation passed by this Parliament in good faith, then it is for them to say so; but I want to see the members of this House vote to do that before I believe it is possible that the representatives of the people have reached the point where they will confiscate property which represents money invested in good faith at a time when the undertaking seemed very much of an experiment. I believe I am safe in saying that when this company decided to transmit electricity from Niagara Falls to Toronto it was the longest transmission line in existence in the world—nearly one hundred miles. They were pioneers in what became one of the greatest assets of the civilized world. They got a charter which, I admit, looking backward on it now, is a very favourable one; but they got it in good faith and invested their money in good faith. And if this amendment is adopted, the earning capacity of this property is absolutely gone; it can only be sold as junk.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is the section as it now stands in the Bill just as it was passed in the committee?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. The Bill before the House now is exactly as passed by the committee and by the Senate.

Mr. BRISTOL: Assuming that the right of the company to go on the streets of Montreal or any other city without the leave of the municipalities be taken away, on what does my hon. friend base the idea that these assets are worth only fifty cents on the dollar?

Mr. CARVELL: I thought I made that plain.

Mr. BRISTOL: They are developing 250,000 horse-power at Niagara Falls now.

Mr. CARVELL: We are dealing with a specific case, not with a general law. We have a case which ought not to be here at all, or which, if here at all, ought to be in the form of an amendment to the charter of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. But I will go over the ground again. The Toronto and Niagara Power Company have only two principal consumers of their product, first, the Toronto Street railway, which the city of Toronto will take over two years from now and which will be entirely operated by hydro-electric current;—my hon. friend will agree to that?

Mr. BRISTOL: Yes, but when they made that contract with the Toronto Railway Company they charged them $45 per horsepower and got the Toronto Railway Company to guarantee their bonds. It was that fact that caused Toronto and the whole of Ontario to look aghast on the whole situation.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is introducing local politics into the matter; I do not propose to drag such considerations into it at all. I do not care what their contract was in Toronto; I am dealing with the facts of the case as revealed in the Committee.

Mr. BRISTOL: But, pardon me; the franchise of the Toronto Street Railway Company expires in two years, anyway.

Mr. CARVELL: I know that; I am not so dense as not to realize all these things. I know that in two years from now they are going to lose the right to sell electricity to the Toronto Railway Company. Toronto has the right to abrogate that contract and take over the Toronto Electric Railway Company.

Mr. McMASTER: We should like to have the benefit of the whole of this discussion. We can hear the minister, but we cannot hear the member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Bristol).

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Public Works has the floor.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no objections whatever to interruptions; I am glad to argue the matter from every possible standpoint. I am not at all afraid of my premises; therefore I welcome any questions the member for Toronto Centre wants to put to me. Now, I will finish my answer to him. In the next place the greatest consumer of current from this company is the Toronto Electric Light Company. The city of Toronto has the right to buy that company out also. That right expires in November of this year and the city have now notified the company that they will not buy them out. I have pointed out that if this amendment carries there is no earthly possibility of the Toronto Electric Light Company getting their current to their underground system, because they cannot maintain one pole in Toronto, and if the Toronto and Niagara Power Company cannot get current to any part of that system, what earthly good is the Toronto Electric Light Company to them? It is absolutely useless; it is a dead horse to them, and they might as well sell it for ten per cent of what it cost them. I know something about this business; I have been in it for fifteen years, and I know what it means if you have a dead line and cannot get electricity to it. All you can do is to sell it as old copper; you can take the expensive switch-boards and sell them at twenty-five cents on the dollar. If the city of Toronto, or whoever the competing powers are, want to be fair, they will say: We will buy you out—and if they will buy them out, that is all right.

Now, I think I have answered my hon. friend. If you take from this company their two principal customers in Toronto you render the whole scheme absolutely useless, unless they are allowed to export electricity to the United States. But what is the position? We have the chairman of the Hydro-Electric demanding that we prohibit the export of electricity to the United States. Just as sure as this Bill went through, in the next week a demand would come up on behalf of certain people in Ontario that this Government prohibit the exportation to the United States of one watt of electricity generated by this company. If my premises are at all correct, I want the member for Toronto Centre, when he replies to me, as I assume he will, to show me where in the world this company is going to get the money to pay their bonds.

But the amendment goes further than that. The hon. member for Parkdale wants Parliament to say, in substance—it is very doubtful whether it could be said, under our constitution—that if the Toronto Electric Light Company has sold any part of its plant or assets to the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, the arrangement shall be void. In all my experience in Parliament, extending over a long period here and in New Brunswick, I have never heard a proposal to confiscate moneys put up in good faith, on the faith of legislation granted by Parliament. It may be good morals in Ontario, but I can tell you that in the part of Canada from which I have the honour to come, it would be considered mighty bad morals.

Now, owing to the manner in which we have discussed this thing, I have taken more time than I intended to take, but I wanted to lay before the committee the facts of the case as I view them. I hope that the Parliament of Canada will not stultify itself by adopting the amendment proposed by the member for Parkdale. I use the word advisedly; I know it is a strong one, but I have no other word in my vocabulary which correctly interprets my views on this matter. Something else might be done. Something might be done to limit the powers. The company might be limited territorially; they might be allowed only to proceed in certain portions of Canada; I am not so much concerned about that. But to say that the company shall not have the right to continue doing business, shall not have the right to carry on the business which Parliament gave it the right to carry on, is a doctrine which I do not think this Parliament will accept.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not have the privilege of hearing this matter discussed before the committee. Provided the rights of the city of Toronto are safeguarded in respect to the use of their streets, is there any special objection to the presence of this company doing business in the city?

Mr. CARVEVLL: I do not want to draw conclusions; I certainly do not want to impute motives, but you must remember that this company has just one competitor, and that is the province of Ontario, and you must remember that this company cannot make a contract with any municipality except with the consent and approval of its competitor. Now if this amendment passes, this company cannot do any business in the city of Toronto because the city of Toronto is its competitor. That is the reason why the city of Toronto will not buy out the Toronto Electric Light Company. We have heard it stated very plainly—I do not know that I can bring a man

here as a witness to swear to it—that the city of Toronto have refused to buy out the company because they say: "We can squeeze them out by refusing to feed their underground system, and if they cannot get their underground system fed we will take the company over as a junk proposition."

Mr. CAHILL: Does the minister believe that it was the intention of Parliament at that time to grant such wide powers? Does he believe that the company thought when they got this charter that they had a right to go on any street in any city in Canada and distribute power?

Mr. CARVELL: I can only answer that from the evidence. I believe that Mr. Clarke and Mr. Osler were satisfied that the company did not have the powers which it turned out they had. I think that probably Mr. Pringle and Mr. Cowan were two members of Parliament who at that time did not believe the company had the powers which it turns out they had. As to what the rest of Parliament believed I do not know, because the other two hundred and twenty members were silent on the question, and I have no way of going back seventeen years and divining their thoughts. There was no secret about it, because the very year Mr. Urquhart, mayor of Toronto, brought the matter to the attention of the city council and pointed out that the company had acquired the exact powers which the Privy Council says they got. That was told in the city council in 1903, and yet the city allowed this company to occupy their streets and do practically what they had a mind to with them for years and years, and it was not until 1914 or 1915, I believe, that the city raised a protest. So, no matter what may have been the views of four or five members of Parliament, the people of Toronto knew what powers this company had, and allowed them to exercise them without protest for ten or twelve years.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister stated that the city of Toronto wanted to squeeze out this company. Is it not true that the city of Toronto offered to buy out the company at 135?

Mr. CARVELL: I have been told that that is true, and that the stock was then worth about 160 and the company refused to sell. This is only hearsay, and I have no way of proving it. It was not mentioned in the sub-committee. No evidence was given to that effect; I am only giving hearsay.

Mr. NICKLE: If all the members of the House viewed this matter from the same point of view as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) there would be no discussion here and no difference of opinion, but I think that to get a true conception of the position of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company and of this legislation it is necessary that we should go back, although it may take a little time, to the inception of things. In 1902 application was made by certain gentlemen for the incorporation of a company to be known as the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. Section 12 of the Bill empowered the company:

> —to acquire, construct, maintain and operate works for the production, sale, and distribution of electricity and power for any purpose for which such electricity or power can be used.

It also gave them power to:

> —construct, maintain and operate lines of wire, poles, tunnels, conduits and other works in the manner and to the extent required for the corporate purposes of the Company.

Section 13 gave them power to erect poles, construct trenches or conduits and do all other things necessary for the transmission of power, light, heat, and so on. Section 21 incorporated sections 40 to 61, both inclusive, section 90, sections 93 to 98 both inclusive, and sections 136 to 169 both inclusive, of the Railway Act, and says that these sections:

> shall apply to the Company and its undertakings in so far as the said sections are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act—

subject to certain conditions thereafter enumerated. Now the Minister of Public Works was asked a question as to what was the intention of Parliament when that Act was obtained, and he said he could not state what the intention of Parliament was, although he was aware what the position and opinions of certain gentlemen were. If you will turn to Hansard of 1902, page 3629, you will see that Mr. Osler, then a member of this House, asked this question:

> Would it do any harm to put in this simple clause stating that this charter shall be subject to all Acts that may be passed by this House referring to electrical companies of this kind?
>
> The Minister of Marine and Fisheries: There can be no doubt that it is.

Mr. Pringle, who was the promoter of the Bill, said:

> I cannot see the necessity for adding that clause. Parliament is supreme in these matters,

and it can at any time pass a general Bill which will govern matters of this sort.

At page 3630, Mr. Cowan, who was the Chairman of the then Railway Committee, said:

When this Company goes to erect poles or wires across the streets of Toronto it can only do so with the consent of the municipal council of that city.

At page 3633, Mr. Clarke, who was a member for one of the Torontos, said:

If the hon. gentlemen opposite who are objecting to these amendments will provide in this Bill that this Company cannot enter into the city of Toronto or exercise the powers asked for under this Bill without the consent of the municipality, we shall be prepared to withdraw all these amendments.

To this Mr. Pringle replied—(page 3634):

Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question to him? The question I wish to put is: How this section 90 of the Railway Act, as amended in 1899, affects this question? The amendment is as follows:

When any Company has power by any Act of Parliament to construct and maintain lines of telegraph or telephone or lines for the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, su Company may with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over any highway, square or other public place, enter thereon, etc.

—subject to certain provisions. And the following provisions refer to damages, compensation, and so on. Mr. Pringle said further:

I understand that it (the section of the Act) means just what it expresses. All companies have to obtain the consent of a municipality before passing through it.

So that it is not difficult to argue, in fact it is absolutely impossible to take a contrary position, that at the time that debate took place in the House of Commons in 1902, Mr. Osler and Mr. Clarke, members for Toronto, were endeavouring to have inserted in the Bill a provision that would put beyond the possibility of misunderstanding what they thought should be in the Bill. These gentlemen were not lawyers, and Mr. Cowan the Chairman of the Railway Committee, and Mr. Pringle, the sponsor of the Bill, made it abundantly clear that in their opinion these amendments were not necessary because they were covered by section 90 of the Railway Act, which was incorporated in the Bill. Now the Minister of Public Works says he does not know what Parliament intended when that Bill was before the House for consideration. I would draw his attention to this fact: If section 90 was incorporated in the Bill—and it certainly was, and if any gentleman doubts my word he has only to look at section 21—it was inserted for the reason that something was intended by that incorporation, and what was intended by that incorporation was this: That this company should not have the right either for transmission or distribution purposes to enter on the streets of any municipality without they first obtained the consent of that municipality. And in the face of section 90 being incorporated in the legislation embodied in section 21, and in view of the discussions to which I have referred, I am utterly at a loss to see how the Minister of Public Works arrives at the conclusion that Parliament was not of the intention, and did not believe, that the rights of the company should be restricted according to section 90.

But, you will say to me, if that was the intention of Parliament, how is it that when the Act reached the Privy Council it was differently construed? When the Act got to the Privy Council for construction the construction was not on the broad basis of the rights of this Parliament to consider conditions in existence when this Act was passed, but on the narrow basis that determines and limits the right of a court in construing an Act of Parliament. The Lords of the Privy Council in their decision made it abundantly clear to those who argued the case and those who care to read it, that they were not in a position to endeavour to interpret the meaning of the Act by going outside its four corners. We as a Parliament, when this measure is before us for consideration, are within our parliamentary rights and discharge our parliamentary duties when we endeavour to secure the meaning of an Act of Parliament by looking over the conditions under which that Act was passed and reviewing the discussions which took place in Committee and in the House. But the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, when the matter was before them, said that they were guided and influenced and determined by totally different considerations. Those who represented the municipality of North Toronto before the Privy Council argued that the members of the House of Lords were within their rights in giving consideration to what transpired in the House and before the Committee of that day. But the Privy Council in giving their decision said:

They have to bear in mind that a court of justice is not entitled to speculate as to which of two conflicting policies was intended to prevail, but must confine itself to the construction of the language of the relevant statutes read as a whole.

In other words, the Lords of the Privy Council said, in the interpretation of this Act, that they could not read nor consider anything that might have been done or said when the matter was before this House, but had to determine the Act purely within the four corners of the statute. The Minister of Public Works, if I am correctly advised,—it may be that I am not—is wrong in his contention that from 1902 to 1911 this company went on and exercised its rights ruthlessly and without regard for the municipalities. If I am correctly informed, this company bought its right of way for its transmission line from Niagara to Toronto and did not force itself through municipalities but worked itself along as a transmission line by purchase or with the consent of the municipalities through which it passed.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the hon. member pardon me. I do not think I said "ruthlessly," and certainly I did not intend to say so. I said they went on and developed under the powers given them by Parliament. I have never heard that they have done anything but carry on a straight business proposition, and I would be the last man to say that they ruthlessly invaded any rights. I did not say so.

Mr. NICKLE: As I understand the minister now he says the company went on and exercised its statutory rights.

Mr. CARVELL: That is right.

Mr. NICKLE: Let us see how they exercised those rights. From 1902 to 1911 they did not presume to erect poles or wires either for transmission or distribution in any municipality without the consent of the municipality. But in 1911 there was a change of policy. In that year they entered the streets of a suburban district of Toronto known as North Toronto, and without obtaining the consent of that municipality, proceeded to erect poles and wires for the purpose at least of transmission, and, I think, also of distribution. An action was launched by the town of North Toronto and was first heard by Mr. Justice Boyd of the Supreme Court of Ontario who gave a decision to the effect that they had a right to erect those poles and wires provided they did not incommode the people of that municipality. But in so far as the reading of that case leads one to a conclusion, the attention of the Chancellor was not directed to the fact that section 90 of the Railway Act was incorporated in the Act of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. From the decision of the Chancellor an appeal was taken to the Court of Appeal by the municipality of North Toronto, and the Court of Appeal unanimously was of the opinion that the Toronto and Niagara Power Company had not the right to erect poles and wires in that or any other municipality without obtaining the consent of the municipality. They were of the opinion that section 90, incorporated in the act of incorporation of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company by section 21 of that Act, was not inconsistent with the powers given by sections 12 and 13, but simply qualified those sections, and that the consent of the municipality had to be obtained before poles or wires either for transmission or distribution could be erected. An appeal was then taken by the Toronto and Niagara Power Company to the Privy Council, with the result that the Privy Council, relying on the principle of law which I enunciated a few moments ago, that they could not go outside the four corners of the statute, reached the conclusion and gave a decision that section 90 had no application to the charter of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, and for the first time the residents of the province of Ontario, to say nothing of the people of Canada, woke up to the fact that the Toronto and Niagara Power Company had a right that enabled them to go on the streets of any municipality either for the purpose of transmission or for the purpose of distribution, and that there was no municipal power in Canada that could say them nay. Not only had they this right for a limited period of time, but they had a perpetual charter extending not only in the province of Ontario but from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Now, let us understand exactly what the rights of this company are as claimed to-day and what rights we, as members of this House, are asked to confer by passing the legislation as it comes to us from the Senate. Hon. gentlemen present in this House to-night are being asked to say that the Toronto and Niagara Power Company have the right to erect distribution poles and wires in any municipality in Canada without getting the consent of that municipality. Now, Sir, had it not been that representations were made to the Committee in 1902 and again to the House in the same year to the effect that these rights should not be exercised except with the consent of the municipality, I am inclined to the opinion that I would find myself in the same quandary in which the Minister of Public Works is placed to-night. The difference between us lies in this: He does not view the matter in such a way as

to feel justified in going beyond the four corners of the Act; I view the matter in a broader way, or perhaps I should say, in a more extended way, I think that we as a high court of Parliament have the right to go beyond the Act and to study and give consideration to, and to have our decision influenced by, the conditions and representations under which that Act was obtained. I say that it is a sound principle of law that if A represents as a fact to B something upon which B relies as a fact and acts thereon, A is estopped from contending as to the truth of the representations made. Applying that principle of law to the charter that is before the Committee to-night for consideration indirectly, I say that in my opinion this House has the right to say that if the promoters of this legislation in 1902 represented to this Parliament that they were only getting a limited franchise, when they either knew they were getting a more extended franchise or were ignorant of the fact that they were getting a more extended franchise, we as a House of Commons have the right to say: You are bound by the representations you made in 1902 and have no greater privileges and rights than you protested and led the House of Commons to believe you had. It is on that principle that the Minister of Public Works and I differ. He takes—if I may use the expression without being considered offensive—the narrow legalistic position that might be taken by a judge. On the other hand, I take what I consider to be the more extended position, that as a member of Parliament I have the right to review the conditions under which any legislation is obtained. It is a question on which men of different minds may reach different conclusions, and different conclusions may be honestly reached. But in my judgment there is no anomaly in this Parliament saying, by the legislation that is proposed by the hon. member for Toronto, we are going to bind this company to the same principles that they were prepared to accept in 1902.

The hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) this afternoon raised the contention that we were doing an unusual and ridiculous thing in trying by a general Act to curtail the powers given the company by its special Act. But is not that what was attempted to be done in 1902 when section 90 of the General Railway Act was incorporated into a private Act? All that is being asked here to-night is that section 374, which is, if I may use the figure, the legitimate descendant of section 90, shall be so amended that it will carry out in letter, in spirit and in effect the very principles that the Parliament of 1902 designed to enact, as made plain by the discussion in this House at that date. That was thought to be binding on the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.

Let us see what this wide charter means —because this is not a fight between Toronto and the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, as was said by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver. It is not even a fight between the Toronto Niagara Power Company and the Hydro-Electric; it is the determination of a principle which will affect every municipality from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Pass this legislation as it comes from the Senate and the Toronto Niagara Power Company have the right, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to erect distribution lines in each municipality and no municipal power can say them nay. They have the right to enter every municipality in the country, to erect poles in that municipality, and no municipality can prevent them. Since 1899 the principle has been recognized that municipalities should have control of their streets. If, in 1902, when the Toronto-Niagara Power Company obtained their charter, there was an evasion of that principle, it was an evasion that was obtained through Parliament being made to think that the principle was not being renounced.

The Minister of Public Works dealt at some length with the conditions as they are in Toronto to-day, and perhaps it would not be unreasonable if I should follow him into the arena into which he has led us. Let us see what the condition in Toronto is. The Toronto Electric Light Company had the right, under a charter which has expired, to erect poles in Toronto for the purpose of lighting the streets. The right to maintain those poles by the Toronto Electric Light Company on the streets of Toronto has expired. Action was taken by Toronto for a judicial interpretation of those rights and that action was taken not only before the Supreme Court of Ontario and the Court of Appeal, but it was taken to the Privy Council. The Privy Council determined that the poles of the Toronto Electric Light Company had no right to remain on the streets of Toronto, that they should be removed and that their continuance there was a trespass. We have heard considerable to-night from the Minister of Public Works regarding the sacredness of contracts. He says that contracts should be respected and that a decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Coun-

cil is something to which we must all bow. I agree with him in the soundness of his law. When the Privy Council makes an enunciation as to a principle of law, that is the law until the Privy Council changes its view, and there is no power than can change that law except the power of Parliament. When the Privy Council says that the poles of the Toronto Electric Light Company are on the streets of Toronto as trespassing poles and should be removed, is it right or just that Toronto should be obliged to permit these poles to remain on its streets because the Toronto Niagara Power Company have bought them? They claim that under their statute of 1902 although these poles would have had to be removed had they remained the property of the Toronto Electric Light Company, the fact that they have passed from the Toronto Electric Light Company to the Toronto Niagara Power Company gives the Toronto Niagara Power Company the right to insist that these poles must remain on the streets of Toronto, not because the Toronto Electric Light Company have any right to maintain them there but because the Toronto Niagara Power Company under the "rights" they obtained by this charter, have the right, through the acquisition of the Toronto Electric Light Company assets, to insist that the poles shall remain on the streets of Toronto.

Mr. CARVELL: Is it not a fact that subsection 6 of the proposed amendment aims to prevent the transfer of these poles from the Toronto Electric Light Company to the Toronto Niagara Power Company?

Mr. NICKLE: Not as I read that section. Section 6 to which the minister directs our attention says:

If any company heretofore incorporated by Special Act or other authority of the Parliament of Canada has acquired, or shall acquire the assets or any part thereof, or the right to the possession or use of the assets or any part thereof, of any company or person operating a system for the distribution of light, heat, power, or electricity, in any city, town, village, or township, then and in every such case, the company so acquiring such assets shall carry out with the municipality all the obligations in respect of the said assets, whether arising under contract or in any other manner, of the company from which the said assets shall be or have been acquired.

Does the minister give me to understand that that section has been incorporated?

Mr. CARVELL: It is incorporated in the proposed amendment.

[Mr. Nickle.]

Mr. NICKLE: No.

Mr. CARVELL: Well that is what has been handed to me by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid) as the proposed amendment.

Mr. NICKLE: Then, it is something that we have not heard.

Mr. CARVELL: I got it from the Minister of Railways.

Mr. J. D. REID: They have changed it.

Mr. CARVELL: I was not aware of it.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment which has been handed to the Chairman certainly contains two new paragraphs—5 and 6.

Mr. CARVELL: Had we not better have the amendment read? Possibly I have been discussing something that was not germane to the issue at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mowat moves to amend section 374 by striking out subclause 5 thereof and replacing it by the following sub-clause:

The provisions of the last preceding subsection shall apply to and restrict the powers of any company heretofore incorporated by Special Act, or other authority of the Parliament of Canada, notwithstanding that such provisions may be inconsistent with the provisions of such special Act or other authority, and notwithstanding the provision of section 3 of this Act.

And that all the words after the word "provided" in the sub-clause should be replaced by a new paragraph (6) as follows:

6. If any company heretofore incorporated by Special Act or other authority of the Parliament of Canada has acquired, or shall acquire the assets or any part thereof, or the right to the possession or use of the assets or any part thereof, of any company or person operating a system for the distribution of light, heat, power, or electricity, in any city, town, village, or township, than and in every such case, the company so acquiring such asset shall carry out with the municipality all the obligations in respect of the said assets, whether arising under contract or in any other manner, of the company from which the said assets shall be or have been acquired.

Mr. CARVELL: Exactly.

Mr. NICKLE: That amendment is not before the House.

The CHAIRMAN: It is handed to me and was proposed by Mr. Mowat in concluding his remarks.

Mr. MORPHY: Who moved that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mowat, this afternoon.

Mr. MOWAT: I moved subsection 5 in order to get the section before the House and this is the amendment to subsection 6 which the Chairman has read. I did intend subsequently to submit the amendment which the Chairman has read, but I did not read it. I gave a copy of it to the Chairman and I intended to move it in due course.

Mr. NICKLE: It is the first I have heard of that amendment.

Mr. MORPHY: May I ask the Chairman if the two clauses constitute one amendment?

Mr. MOWAT: Two amendments.

Mr. MORPHY: Is it all one?

The CHAIRMAN: There cannot be more than one amendment to a clause at the same time.

Mr. MORPHY: Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN: The entire subsection is proposed to be stricken out according to the two amendments, which were pinned together and handed to me this afternoon when the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) concluded his speech.

Mr. CAHILL: The whole clause?

The CHAIRMAN: No, subsection 5.

Mr. CARVELL: And a new 5 and a new 6 added?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: In view of the fact that this debate is likely to be a lengthy one, might I suggest that the amendments be copied and distributed among members?

Mr. NICKLE: I was in the House this afternoon when the member for Parkdale moved his amendment, which was to the following effect:

That all the words in the first ten lines of subsection 5 of section 374 down to and inclusive of the word "powers" be struck out, and the following be substituted therefor:

5. The provisions of the last preceding subsection shall apply to and restrict the powers of any company heretofore incorporated by special Act, or other authority of the Parliament of Canada notwithstanding that such provisions may be inconsistent with the provisions of such Special Act, or other authority, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of this Act.

Now, as the Minister of Public Works asked me the question, and so that this matter be represented correctly, I might say that if subsection 6 to which he just now directed my attention was adopted by this House the adoption of the word "obligations", which is very much broader than the word "rights" appearing in the Bill as it comes to us from the Senate, would, in all probability, compel the Toronto and Niagara Power Company to be bound in reference to the removal of the poles of that company since acquired from the Toronto Electric Light Company. But when I was discussing the matter with the Minister of Public Works, subsection 6 was not, and is not now, I understand, before the Committee for consideration and decision.

The hon. member for Centre Vancouver said this afternoon that the Railway Board would give courteous and sympathetic consideration to any application that was made to them under section 5 of the Act as it comes to us from the Senate. But let us see what the language of that section is:

Any specific powers inconsistent with the provisions of this section and conferred on any company by any special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada or of any province, shall not be affected by the provisions of this section, but if any municipality complains to the Board that any company, whether incorporated by special or other act or authority of the Parliament of Canada, is exercising its powers oppressively or in bad faith, the Board may hear such complaint, and, if it sees fit, supervise the exercise of such powers.

Now the Railway Commission may be animated with the best intentions in the world, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, their power in respect of any matter that comes before them for consideration are determined and limited by the language that gives them that power. Indeed the language of subsection 5, as it appears in the Act simply gives the Railway Commission power to supervise when the powers are oppressively or in bad faith exercised. Now that practically means nothing; they can simply supervise, they cannot prohibit. I would think that the extent that would permit them to go would be thus far: If the Toronto and Niagara Power Company determined that they would erect a very unsightly and unseemly class of poles on a certain thoroughfare through which the use of that street would be greatly encumbered and the people greatly irritated, and in such event all the Railway Commission could say would be: "You must use a different style

of poles and you must locate them somewhat differently on the street"; I do not believe the Railway Commission would have the right to say to the company, "You shall not go through that municipality." I do not think there is a gentleman in the House to-night—certainly not those of us who are advocating the amendment as brought forward by the member for Parkdale—who wants a single member to vote in the dark, not knowing what the amendment means. The amendment means that those of us who are supporting it desire the principle incorporated in the Railway Act that no company shall have the right, no matter whether they have special powers or otherwise, to go through the streets of any municipality for the purpose of distributing electricity without the consent of that municipality.

Mr. BURNHAM: That principle no doubt must be conceded. Now then we want to know how you are going to protect the shareholders of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company?

Mr. NICKLE: I will answer the hon. gentleman's question in a moment. Now, in regard to the matter of transmission, the principle is accepted and recognized that a transmission line may be built through a municipality with its consent; but if the municipality is not willing that that transmission line shall be built then there shall be an appeal to the Railway Commission and the decision of the commission shall be final. Now hon. gentlemen ask me why the occasion for the difference? Why do you make one law as to transmission and another law as to distribution? The difference in principle is this: It is absolutely essential

10 p.m.

that a company shall have the right to put a transmission line through a municipality for the purpose of reaching other municipalities, and it would be ridiculous to say that any municipality should have the right to obstruct a great work simply by saying "You shall not put a few poles down the municipal township highway, or down the sideline road." But distribution, that is the selling of power to the people who live in the municipality, is distinct from transmission. Then we ask that the principle that has governed this Parliament since 1899 be made effective; and Parliament says that no municipality, for distribution purposes, shall be compelled to accept the distribution lines of any company without its consent. Now the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) asked a question, and if I understood the question it was this: How do you propose to protect the bondholders of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company?

Mr. BURNHAM: Shareholders.

Mr. NICKLE: Here is my understanding of the situation—I will only give a part of the financial meanderings of the various companies, but sufficient to give the House an understanding of the situation as I see it.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like to direct the hon. member's attention to an argument which was advanced by the Minister of Public Works and which impressed me very much. He said that the Privy Council had decided that this company had the right to go into the streets of Toronto, or the streets of any other city, town, or municipality, and that the company in question had sold millions of dollars of bonds which the minister believed were bought by the purchasers because the Privy Council had declared that the company had that right. If that be a fact how does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nickle) propose to protect the interest of people who in good faith, and relying upon the judgment of the highest court of the British Empire, invested their money in these bonds?

Mr. NICKLE: If what the Minister of Public Works says is a fact—I have no knowledge of it as a fact, and I do not think it is a fact; although not for one moment do I allege that he is stating what is not the fact as he understands it—the contention would be difficult to refute. But my understanding is that the Toronto and Niagara Power Company have issued only $1,500,000 worth of bonds and $700,000 worth of stock, and that all of it was issued about 1903 to the Electrical Development Company—that no bonds or stock were issued by that company after the decision of the Privy Council. I remember that in the Railway Committee—I was only there a few minutes—Mr. McDougall (I think that is the gentleman's name) made the statement that the issue of $1,500,000 worth of bonds and $700,000 worth of stock of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company were sold because the Toronto and Niagara Power Company had contracts with the Toronto Electric Light Company and the Toronto Street Railway Company, and that those contracts were the earning capacity that

warranted the sale of the bonds about 1903, before the Privy Council made the decision to which the Minister of Public Works has directed the attention of the House.

Mr. McMASTER: Does not that go to the very heart of the question? The members of this House are sitting more or less as judges in this matter. If two opposing counsel made the statements which the member for Kingston and the Minister of Public Works have made to-night, would not the judge say, " Gentlemen, please turn up the evidence and show me which of you is right?"

Mr. NICKLE: And I think the counsel would say, " We have not the evidence."

Mr. McMASTER: You should have the evidence.

Mr. NICKLE: I quite admit that the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has directed the attention of the House to a very salient point, and it is a point upon which I have from time to time indirectly attempted to get information. I always wanted to know how many bonds were issued by the Toronto and Niagara Power Company subsequent to the decision of the Privy Council, but I was never able to obtain that information, nor do I know where it can be obtained. I have never seen any prospectus; I do not think that any gentleman present will say that any such evidence was ever produced before the Committee.

The Toronto and Niagara Power Company was incorporated in 1902. In 1903, Messrs. Mackenzie, Nicholls and Pellatt made an agreement with the Ontario Victoria Park Commission for the right to develop a certain number of horse-power. Later the Electrical Development Company was incorporated under an Ontario Act, and subsequently an agreement was made by that company with Messrs. Mackenzie, Nicholls and Pellatt for the assignment by these gentlemen to the Electrical Development Company of the rights and privileges secured from the Park Commission. The Electrical Development Company gave a bond mortgage for $10,000,000. The money was probably used for developing power. The Toronto and Niagara Power Company between 1903 and 1905 issued the $1,500,000 worth of bonds, to which I have just directed the attention of the House, and $700,000 worth of stock, all of which were sold to the Electrical Development Company. The Toronto Power Company was formed in 1908 under the Ontario Companies' Act, and they owned $2,000,000 of the $10,000,000 bonds of the Electrical Development, and $3,000,000 of the capital stock of the Electrical Development Company—all of the voting capital stock.

Then an agreement was made, I understand, by Mackenzie, Nicholls and Pellatt to buy out the Toronto Electric Light Company's stock of $4,000,000, at $135 per share. I would just like to say in passing that the Minister of Public Works in his argument failed to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the city of Toronto offered the Light Company $135 per share for the stock of that company. The Toronto Electric Light Company refused to sell to the city of Toronto, but subsequently sold to the Mackenzie group—and I do not use the word " group " in an offensive sense—who subsequently transferred to the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, and in that way " revived " the Light Company's rights to maintain the poles, if I may use that expression.

I hold no brief for the city of Toronto. I am not a resident of the city. As far as I know the Toronto and Niagara Power Company will never touch the streets of Kingston, in which city I reside and which I have the honour to represent. But I do say, in fairness to the city of Toronto, that attention should be drawn to the fact that the city of Toronto endeavoured to buy the stock of the Toronto Electric Light Company, but were not able to do so, apparently for the reason that the Toronto Electric Light Company—which was under the control of the same group that owned the Electrical Development Company and the Toronto and Niagara Power Company—was desirous of selling these assets to the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, for the purpose of holding in perpetuity a grip on the streets of the city of Toronto; and I think it is only right that this House should give relief to the city of Toronto. The Toronto Electric Light Company's $4,000,000 stock was bought at $135 a share. All the capital stock of the Toronto Power Company is owned by the Toronto Street Railway Company. In other words, the grip on the situation is with the Toronto Street Railway Company, whose charter on the streets of the city of Toronto expires in 1921.

The Minister of Public Works made the statement that Mr. Fleming told him in the Committee that he was quite prepared, speaking on behalf of the various companies he represented, to sell to the city of

Toronto all the assets of the various companies as a going concern. We lawyers know what that means. "As a going concern" means that you would have to value the assets of the Toronto Electric Light Company,—these poles that are on the streets of the city of Toronto as trespass poles, not as poles valued as junk, but as poles with a value which could be computed on the cost of erection. You would not say, "What is the value of pole A?" deducting from that value the cost of removing it from the streets? but you would say, "What is the value of pole A after it has been erected in the street?" You would not deduct from its value the cost of its removal, but you would add to its value the cost of its erection. Of course, Mr. Fleming in speaking to the minister said he was willing to sell those assets in the city of Toronto as a going concern, because he knew that if sold as a going concern there would be increased value in it for somebody. But why should the city of Toronto be asked to buy the poles of the Toronto Electric Light Company and add to their value the cost of their erection when the Toronto Electric Light Company were and are trespassers in having those poles on the streets of the city? Why should the city of Toronto be asked to value and take over the Toronto Street Railway Company as a going concern, when in about two years' time the city will have the right to take it over, not as a going concern, as I understand the agreement—and if I am wrong any hon. gentleman may correct me,—but as a defunct concern at a junk value? It would be madness on the part of the city of Toronto to enter into any such arrangement, and they would be simply throwing away the taxpayers' money.

It may be that the Minister of Public Works is right, but I am differently advised in regard to the underground system. I am advised that while it is quite true that the underground system in the city of Toronto, which is owned by the Mackenzie group, cannot at the present moment be operated without the use of these overhead poles, yet it is not a matter of tremendous expense to connect up that underground system with the transmission lines at the outskirts of the city, and that no such great financial burden would be thrown on the company as the minister represents.

Mr. CARVELL: The evidence before the committee was quite to the contrary. It was that that is practically a commercial impossibility to-day.

[Mr. Nickle.]

Mr. NICKLE: I am furnished by Mr. Geary, solicitor for the city of Toronto, with the following statement:

> Mr. Carvell's statement that the Toronto Electric underground will be cut off is inaccurate. A comparatively short length of underground conduit will be sufficient to make the connection—

Mr. MORPHY: What length?

Mr. NICKLE: "Comparatively short."

> —even if their transmission overhead were cut off, which latter does not seem to be in danger, as a transmission line. Also the whole underground of the Toronto Electric Light is compact and not scattered, with the exception of two small districts.

That was my authority. I am glad that the Minister of Public Works directed my attention to the report; it gave me an opportunity of reading the memorandum.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Geary was present in the Committee when I put the question and he made no such statement as the hon. member has given here to-night.

Mr. NICKLE: Well, I have read a note that just came from Mr. Geary.

Mr. CARVELL: It would have been much better if Mr. Geary had made the statement in the Committee, where he could be contradicted if necessary; but he failed to do so.

Mr. NICKLE: Let us assume that the Minister of Public Works is correct in his contention—I want to be quite frank with the minister. I was in the Committee the day he asked that question, and Mr. Fleming, representing the Toronto interests, gave the answer to which the minister has directed the attention of the Committee to-night. Mr. Fleming did make the statement that it would be a financial impossibility to operate the underground system of the Toronto Electric Light Company without the use of the overhead poles that the city of Toronto are now asking to be removed from the streets.

Mr. BRISTOL: Was it known that these questions were going to be asked of the city, and were they so informed in order that they might have the time and the opportunity to answer such important questions?

Mr. NICKLE: I could not give my hon. friend any information on that point. I

had the misfortune to drop into the Committee—it is hot to-night; therefore I use the word " misfortune"—just while this discussion was taking place. It interested me, and impressed itself on my memory. But there was one other point that impressed me that afternoon, and I want to direct attention to it now. Although I was not on the special committee, I requested leave to ask Mr. Fleming one question. I quote from the evidence:

> Mr. Nickle: Do I understand you to say that your Company is prepared to have your area restricted to those areas in which you are now engaged?
>
> Mr. Fleming: I would like to say—
>
> Mr. Nickle: I desire an answer, yes or no?
>
> Mr. Fleming: No.

Now, what does that mean? That means that the autonomy of every municipality in Canada is jeopardized. That takes this quarrel outside of Toronto, outside the province of Ontario. It means that if the rights asked, and granted by this Act as sent to us from the Senate, are granted by this House, these people have the right to erect a distributing plant in any municipality in Ontario, not only this year, but for the next ten years and so long as time runs—or until an outraged public rise in their might and restrict the rights. I say it is unreasonable to ask Parliament to confer a charter that was obtained, if I might use the expression, by a misapprehension on the part of the members of the rights that were being given—a charter not only in perpetuity, but the application of which extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I do not view this matter as it is viewed by the member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) or the Minister of Public Works. As I view the matter, the question resolves itself to this: Is this Parliament prepared to enunciate the principle that if a charter is obtained by representation of facts or by representation as to the construction of an Act that is not correct in fact, Parliament is forever estopped from rectifying a wrong that was inadvertently done, and that the people must for all time submit to what in the light of the history of this country during the last twelve years so far as legislation of this House goes, is and will be construed as an iniquity?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): I do not like to give a silent vote on this important matter; therefore I would like to say a few words before the vote is taken. This Bill has been before the committee for several weeks—yes, it has been before the House for some three years. It is in the interest of the country that the Bill should go through the House during the present session, and I hope that the House will arrive at some decision which will enable us to pass the Bill. I think every member of the House wishes to do what is fair and right not only with the municipality, but with this company or any other company that has been incorporated by this or any other Parliament. Some hon. members have suggested that if this charter was brought before the House to-day for approval it would not pass; that we would not grant any such conditions as were granted when this charter was given. But Parliament has granted many charters in the past that would not be granted to-day. I can refer to one. A number of years ago the House of Commons granted a charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; if that charter was before the House to-day, there is no doubt that it would not pass now in the form in which it passed then. In connection with the charters which were granted in those times certain vested interests have arisen, and I think we should look at the situation in the light of all the circumstances connected with the charter.

So far as I am concerned, I feel this way. The rights of municipalities should be protected if any danger threatens them. It has been stated by many that the rights of municipalities are in danger in connection with this charter. But I wish to point out that since this charter was granted the Ontario Government has passed an Act which has changed the whole condition of affairs for the municipalities. When the charter was granted the municipalities had, in their own right, the power to allow this or any other company to enter that municipality on the basis of a by-law or agreement. But in 1914 Ontario passed an Act, which has been mentioned this afternoon, taking out of the hands of the municipalities the right that they had at that time to allow this or any other company to enter those municipalities. If the Bill passes there is no doubt that this company or any other company can enter into any municipality without the consent of that municipality.

That may be all right in many other parts of the Dominion, but so far as the province of Ontario is concerned the consent of the Ontario Government has to be obtained. That being the case this company cannot do any business between the city of Toronto and its power plant if a

municipality should refuse to allow it to pass through, and if the company is prevented from transmitting power in that way it must go on the scrap heap. I think it is quite proper to protect the interests of the municipalities, but we should also do something to protect the money that has been invested in this company.

This legislation has been before the House for several years. I will tell the Committee what I think should have been done some years ago, and what should be done yet. The province of Ontario practically decided that power would be supplied to the people of the province by the Ontario Government. That policy has turned out to be a good thing for the people of the province; we all agree that the Hydro-Electric Commission has done good work. But when they decide to supply all the power to the people of the province of Ontario, I think they should take over the power plants in the province of Ontario and not make them junk, which would involve a loss of the money invested in those plants. It would only be fair for the Ontario Government to tell these power companies at Niagara Falls that they were going to take over these plants at a price fixed by arbitration; then get the arbitrators to determine the value, and let the Ontario Government take over the plants and have the power for the people of the province. The Toronto and Niagara Power Company is not the only one at Niagara Falls developing power. There is another company there developing 100,000 horsepower, all of which will be required by the people of the province. Both are up-to-date plants, they have their transmission lines, and I cannot understand why the province of Ontario does not adopt that policy, with respect to the plants not only at Niagara Falls but also at other places where electric plants owned by companies are in operation. I think men could be found to arbitrate on the value of these plants and decide what was a fair price. I am sure the people of the province of Ontario would be willing to do what was fair with regard to this or any other company in the province that might be arbitrated upon.

But that does not seem to be their policy, and therefore we in this House are placed in this position. Here we have been for three long years trying to enact a law that is absolutely necessary in the public interest, which is necessary for the protection of the travelling public and for the lives of the railway employees, and yet we cannot get the Bill through on account of this quarrel between the power companies and other interests in the province of Ontario. I am satisfied that if this amendment is carried it will not pass the Senate, because it has already been before the Senate; it was before the Senate this year, it was before the Senate last year, and the year before that. The Senate have refused to pass an amendment such as has been made by the hon. member for Parkdale, and if the amendment is carried to-night it practically means this Bill must go by the board for the present session. Now I do not think it is right that this Bill should be prevented from passing this session, and I am willing to go a certain length in making a compromise which in my opinion would be a protection not only for the municipalities but for the company as well. I say frankly I would hesitate to give a vote that might have the effect of placing this company on the junk heap, or of forcing them to accept an amount that would not be fair and right. Perhaps the Senate would accept an amendment on the lines proposed by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens. I would make the amendment a little shorter, but it would have the same effect. The words that are not satisfactory to the municipality are these:

> If any municipality complains to the Board that any company whether incorporated by special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada is exercising its powers oppressively or in bad faith the Board may hear such complaint and if it sees fit supervise the exercise of such powers.

Some hon. members who have spoken, including, I think, the hon. member for Parkdale, have argued that the words "oppressively or in bad faith" mean practically nothing. I would suggest that subsection 5 be amended to read as follows:

> (5) Any specific powers inconsistent with the provisions of this section and conferred on any company by any special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada or of any province shall not be affected by the provisions of this section; no such power shall be exercised except in accordance with terms of an order made by the Board after a hearing, at which hearing the municipality shall have the right to be heard: Provided always that whenever any company incorporated by special Act of the Parliament of Canada acquires the assets—

—and so on. That would mean that before this company could enter a municipality it would have to apply to the Board of Railway Commissioners and get permission to enter that municipality. The clause as drafted by the Senate only pro-

vides for the company applying to the board if the municipality thinks it is acting oppressively or in bad faith.

My amendment goes further and says that they must go to the Board of Railway Commissioners and obtain a permit before entering a municipality. I believe that protects every municipality in the Dominion, and it also protects the company who will have to go before the board, which is an independent tribunal, not selected from the province of Ontario particularly, or any other province. When the matter comes before it, the tribunal will decide whether this company must go on the junk heap and the shareholders or bondholders must accept the amount they would receive from the company as a result of the decision of the board; or the municipality, if it acts unfairly, must accept the board's decision. This is a provincial matter and I think Ontario should settle it. I come from that province and desire to do what is right and fair by the province of Ontario. But now that the province has decided to supply power to the people of Ontario—with which policy I am in accord—I do not think it is right for the Ontario Government to pass an Act that will throw into the junk heap private capital that has been invested in any enterprise. Cannot we in this House make some compromise? As has been stated, the company may have larger rights than it was intended that they should have. But we have a tribunal in the Board of Railway Commissioners, in whose hands we should leave the whole matter. Let us trust them to do what is right and fair, and if we find that they do not fulfil that expectation this Parliament meets every year and can remedy any erroneous decisions that they might make in connection with these matters. I appeal to the members of this House to assist me in some way to get the Bill through during the present session. Hon. members can make any amendments they like, but I have suggested what I consider to be a fair compromise. If my suggestion does not meet with approval, then let us have some amendment or compromise that will be fair and just not only to the municipalities, but to the company or companies that may be affected. But let us get the Bill through during this session.

Mr. McKENZIE: The amendment proposed by the minister deals with companies entering municipalities, and I am satisfied with the idea. But does it provide for the extension of the work of the company in a municipality in which it is now operating?

Mr. J. D. REID: The company has the right by its charter to go into any municipality without going to the board. This Parliament gave them that right. Now, if they want to go into some new municipality, which will be new work, they will have to go to the board and obtain its approval of their entry into the municipality.

Mr. McKENZIE: They are now in the city of Toronto doing business. But suppose they wish to extend into areas in the city of Toronto in which they are not now working?

Mr. J. D. REID: According to the amendment of the hon. member for Parkdale as I understand the position, they cannot do any more now in Toronto without the consent of the municipality, and that means the Ontario Government. If my amendment goes through, they will not be able to do any more work or extend their work in Toronto without the permission of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. CAHILL: If I understand the minister, this will not in any way affect the present standing of the companies in Toronto provided they do not wish to extend operations. It will not in any way affect the standing of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company?

Mr. J. D. REID: My amendment does not affect the rights of the companies as they now stand. The bondholders at present have certain rights which are not affected. Nothing can be done to prejudice those rights in any shape or form, but if the company operate in some manner which the city of Toronto might consider contrary to the provisions of their charter an appeal could be made to the Board of Railway Commissioners to prevent the work being carried out. This company, it is claimed, have now the right, independent of any tribunal, to go into any municipality, and I am trying by my amendment to place the company under the jurisdiction of the commissioners in this respect from now on.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister evidently is willing to throw Toronto to the wolves. Provided this amendment that is moved by the hon. member for Parkdale does not apply to Toronto, he would be willing to accept it. As I understand this question, after listening to the debates in the Special Railway Committee, this company in 1902 got a charter from the Parliament of Canada. It was distinctly and well understood

that they had no right to distribute power in any city without the city's consent. There is absolutely no question about that. Hansard shows it. Every member who spoke on the subject, and the minister in charge of the Bill, agreed that they were only getting the same power as other companies had been getting in the last year or two previous to that time. It was not understood that they had any special privileges other than the rights of transmission. If any municipality objected to their going through with their power line they could appeal to the Railway Commission, but there never was any intention on the part of Parliament or any one else concerned that they should have the right to go into any municipality and distribute power at will. There was no thought at that time, nor is there now—and I doubt very much whether you could get a mover and seconder to-day in this Parliament to a resolution for the purpose—to grant a perpetual franchise to a private corporation to go into any city in Canada and operate without the consent of that municipality. It seems preposterous, and undoubtedly it was not the intention of Parliament at the time that they should have these powers. On the strength of the right which they had to develop power at Niagara Falls, transmit it to Toronto and other points, and sell it in Toronto to any one who had the franchise to distribute power, they contracted with the Toronto Light Company to furnish them power in Toronto at a certain price. The Toronto Electric Light Company had right to distribute power in the city for a limited number of years.

On the strength of the limited franchises of the Toronto Electric Light Company and the Toronto Street Railway Company, this company sold stocks and bonds, developed power and delivered it. They delivered it on the distinct understanding that they were selling it to two companies whose franchises would expire. They should therefore—I do not know whether they did or not—have put aside a sufficient amount out of their earnings to have redeemed the bonds at the termination of the franchises of the companies to which they were selling power. If they did not do that they should have done so. If they did not do that and the bondholders suffer any loss by the cancellation of this contract the shareholders who took dividends out of the company should pay them back into the company and that money should revert to the bondholders. The bondholders passed their money over in good faith with the knowledge that this company was selling power to the two Toronto companies each with a franchise which would terminate. There is no question in anybody's mind but that a wrong has been done to the municipality. Every person is willing to right that wrong provided it does not hurt somebody else. We had eminent counsel here from all over the country talking on behalf of the bondholder. The bondholder, it was said, would lose if this amendment should carry. But there was not one of them who said what the bondholder would actually lose. When Mr. Beck was here in the interest of a million dollars worth of bonds, he made a very eloquent speech. When he started I asked him whom he represented and he said the bondholders. When he got through I asked him if he thought the interests of the bondholders were in any danger should this amendment pass and he said that he did not think so but that he was only speaking on the general principles of international investment. The opposition has all been on the ground of vested interests. Vested interests: I have very little respect for them if they do not represent honest investment, and honest service to the community. I have no respect for the vested interest that is represented by the stock of this company. The interest that is represented by the bonds in the company should be protected by the stockholders. I think the bondholder could make the stockholder take out of his pocket and return the dividends that he took out of that company knowing the franchise would expire.

The Minister of Public Works states that the company are not in a position to deliver power to the underground system; yet, my distinct recollection of the statement of the solicitor of the city of Toronto was they had the power to deliver to the underground system but not to distribute on the streets. The whole question resolves itself into this, that the company got a charter from the Dominion Parliament which was construed to mean that they could go upon any street or highway in any municipality in Canada. It was clearly not the intention of Parliament that they should have any such right. On the strength of that, they claimed, they afterwards sold the bonds. I asked some of the gentlemen who appeared before the Committee for the prospectus on which they sold the bonds and my impression is they did not say they were selling bonds on the strength of the decision of the Privy Council. The city of Toronto did make the company an offer but the company refused to accept it.

Mr. CARVELL: Is it not a fact that in the offer made by Toronto to purchase the stock of the Toronto Electric Light Compay there was a clause that the electrical current in the future would not be supplied by the Toronto and Niagara Power Company but by the Hydro-Electric Company?

Mr. CAHILL: I do not know as to that. When they talk of confiscation let me remind the Committee that Toronto offered 135 for the stock of this company and, that being the fact, it seems to me that there is a sufficient asset to take care of the bondholders. I say again that the bondholder is the only man in whom I have any interest. I do not believe we should sacrifice municipal rights even for the bondholders. I do not believe we should sacrifice municipal rights for any number of millions. If a mistake was made by this Parliament, it is the duty of Parliament to right that mistake and to give back to Toronto and all other municipalities the rights which belong to them. What happened is that a certain company had a franchise that had terminated. They had the right to sell electricity to consumers and to light the city streets. When their contract terminated this company stepped in and took over the assets and the terminated contract. The Toronto Electric Light Company must have had sufficiently high rates from Toronto to pay off all their liabilities because they knew that their franchise would only run for ten years. The Privy Council determined that they had no more rights under that contract but this company, with a charter from the Dominion Parliament, steps in, takes over this defunct franchise and we are asked to vote against this amendment in order to give these Toronto interests the right to make this franchise perpetual in the city of Toronto. There is no doubt that if they carry their point here to-night they will be asking for the same right in other places in Canada within a few days. The Minister of Public Works said that if this amendment carried the Ontario Government were going to do something. That seems to me to be anticipating a good deal. I would wait until they do it first. If the Ontario Government undertake to confiscate anybody's property it will be time enough for us to step in and forbid it. In the meantime let us right the wrong this Parliament did, and vote for the amendment.

Mr. SHEARD: A good deal has been said about securing the bondholders and the interests of the Toronto Niagara Power Company. The Toronto Niagara Power Company is essentially a transmission line. The bonds were issued to the world at large on the strength of it being a transmission line and nothing more. It had no right to distribute. At the day that these bonds were sold it had no terminal market in the city of Toronto. True it was coupled up with two main customers. the Toronto Electric Light Company and the Toronto Street Railway Company. The Toronto Electric Light Company was distributing light and power in Toronto and was connected up with it. The Toronto Niagara Power Company was supplying the Toronto Street Railway Company and that was its market for power. Those who bought the bonds in the Toronto Niagara Power Company knew perfectly well that both of these companies held terminable franchises and that when these franchises expired the market of the Toronto Niagara Power Company would be at an end. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) makes the argument that if you cut off one of this trinity of heads the balance would be only junk.

The one end of it never was connected with the company now under discussion; it never belonged to it, but to the transmission company under the conditions under which the bonds were sold, and the bonds stated in the charter were for one million and a half dollars—nothing more. But this company was part of an interlocking directorate—at least the owners of the company were—and this interlocking directorate was a very complicated financial machine. It was one of the creations of Sir William Mackenzie and his colleagues; and I can assure the House that no one in Canada is better able to create an intricate and far-reaching scheme of interlocking directorates, whose tentacles will touch the uttermost parts of this Dominion, than the same gentleman whose interests are being defended upon the floor of this House to-night in the opposition to this amendment. I want to say a word in reference to what this interlocking directorate means. They originally started with a transmission company, which had a capitalization of a million and a half dollars. That was all the power that was given in the original charter, nothing more. But they grafted upon that other companies. They grafted upon it the Electrical Development Company which was to manufacture power at Niagara Falls, and which had a capitalization under its original charter, I believe, of $10,000,000. In addition they

have the Toronto Electric Light Company, the purchase price of which was around $4,000,000 when it became part of this interlocking directorate. They had the old Electric Light Company of the city of Toronto which had a capitalization of about a million; and they had, in addition to that, a new issue of bonds about that time, amounting to something like $6,000,000; which with additional bonds issued by the Toronto Power Company represented an increase from a million and a half up to $25,000,000. The Hon. James Beck, of New York city, probably one of the highest-priced counsel for defending interlocking directorates in the State of New York, and one who is known by every financial institution in the United States, was brought here and addressed the Committee in the company's behalf. I had the pleasure of hearing his magnificent address—because I am very partial to fine speeches. I knew Mr. Beck's capabilities as an after-dinner speaker, and I expected that he would have an electrifying effect upon the Committee, and apparently he did. I listened very attentively to the burden of Mr. Beck's song. He pleaded earnestly, eloquently and hard to save the million and a half of capital, and doubtless had in mind the bondholders of the Toronto interlocking directorate with their capitalization which he stated was something like $35,000,000; but when asked who the bondholders were, and where the bonds were, he was entirely at sea and he knew nothing at all about it; he relied upon the broad, general moral principle which he felt sure would appeal to a nation like Canada, that once a bargain always a bargain, and where vested interests were concerned it should stand immortal. That was pretty much the Hon. James Beck's argument to the Committee. He lost sight of the fact, however, that he was arguing for principally that great financial magnate of Canada, Sir William Mackenzie; but he could not come from New York without knowing the reputation of that gentleman in all the financial centres of the United States at least; and to argue that any repudiation of the obligation in bonds put up by his company was going to menace and threaten the financial standing of this Dominion was utterly and wholly absurd. Because I venture to say that there is not a large financier in the whole of New York State but has been importuned by the same outfit to loan every dollar of funds available for some scheme or other put forward by these same magnates, and we know what the history has been all along the line. We can commence at the Gulf of Mexico and go up almost to the North Pole, and we see a trail of financial misadventure along the whole route. The Mexican Light, Heat and Power Company was floated in the city of Toronto; and I was told by a prominent bond house of the enormous number of millions that had gone into that enterprise. It was only a very few years ago that the revolution broke out in Mexico and the whole thing was on the rocks. We come along up and we know perfectly well where the Brazilian enterprise landed. Why it was the grandest financial success of the age. Men in the street, in the midst of the summer heat, were buying the stock which was advancing by leaps and bounds. All of a sudden there was an interlocking directorate there, there was a fusion of interests; and to the amazement of every body the dividend day was passed. Then when we come farther north we have another great enterprise of this great interlocking directorate—the Winnipeg Street Railway. I remember in the city of Toronto, not many years ago, when this stock was at two hundred and thirty-five. There was a delay in paying dividends, and finally that stock also passed its dividend. When an explanation was asked for, the explanation vouchsafed was that although they had a permanent franchise for light, heat and power, the jitneys had knocked them out in the progressive city of Winnipeg.

11 p.m.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. gentleman seems to forget that Sir William Mackenzie was knighted by His Majesty.

Mr. SHEARD: I do not know who was responsible for that, but I am willing, if I am not out of order, to say that it is no credit to Canada that he was so knighted, in my humble judgment. But to keep to what I am saying, that is the amount of fear and menace there is, in the repudiation of bonds to the amount of a million and a half in one of these enterprises. We come up to the larger conception of this great financial mind—the Canadian Northern Railway, the railway from coast to coast, whose contractors were Mackenzie & Mann, and whose owners were the same, but whose ultimate owners, these men knew perfectly well, would be the Dominion of Canada. They knew that the people would be left with the baby on the step, and as the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) said in this House, what a miser-

able, ill-thrived, almost offensive-smelling baby, it was. Now the tentacles of this corporation have been loosed from the throat of the Dominion, and being thus disengaged for the moment, are going to be wrapped around the neck of every municipality in this country. Make no mistake about it. They know it perfectly well, and when I say "they" I mean the men who are behind this Senate's clause in the proposed Act. The Parliament of 1917 studied this Act, and they introduced such a proviso as is being proposed in the amendment to the present Bill as amended by the Senate. The Bill was sent to the Senate with that proviso but the Senate amended it. The Senate put the joker in the pack and the Bill came back with it, and the intention was for this House to swallow it holus bolus. Oh, it meant much to the interlocking directorates, it meant much to the Mackenzie & Mann interests to get that Act through last session. I came as a young, green member to this House. I thought there was some great power in the independence of Parliament which would uphold and stand for public rights and public interests. The moment I stepped off the train at the station I saw the great financial magnate talking to a crowd. I saw him as I went to put my bag in the Chateau, surrounded by the incoming members, with some of whom he appeared to be on very intimate and friendly terms. I saw his galaxy of legal representatives, whom I knew as coming from Toronto, and many of them I knew personally. They were there from the first day the House opened until the 24th of May, when the House closed. I went home, and they went on the same train. They never let up in the vigilance of their watch. And when the House resumed this year, they were there, and they have been there constantly ever since—and I can name them. They have not been there by ones and twos, they have been there by the dozens—men whose fees would be enormous. They are the men sitting in this gallery to-night listening to these words, men who have been here in the same interests from the first hour this Parliament opened.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would sit in the gallery myself to hear this speech.

Mr. SHEARD: Well, I should hope the hon. member would sit in a different part from that to which my ideas are related just now. The question before the House and the country is: How far is the Parliament of Canada going to stand for public rights of all municipalities? Or is it going to stand for the vested interests which are behind these concerns? The hon. Minister of Public Works has made a strong appeal to the majesty of the law and to the respect which is owing to the Privy Council. I was in the service of the city of Toronto when part of this transaction occurred. The city gave to the Toronto Electric Light Company, which has an underground distribution, a contract to light their streets. That contract was for five years or under, and it gave the company the privilege for that period to put lighting poles on the streets. When the city could make other arrangements they terminated their contract with the company and ordered them to remove their poles. But the company would not obey. So the city of Toronto proceeded through the courts until finally judgment was given in the Privy Council that the company were trespassers, as the hon. member for Kingston has explained. To an ordinary individual, such a judgment would be sufficient. Not so to this company. The Toronto Electric Light Company immediately transferred their assets to the Toronto and Niagara Power Company—whose sensibilities so many of us are defending to-night—and then the Toronto and Niagara Power Company said: "Oh, well, we now own these poles; we have the right to plant them there, and there they will stay." And there they stayed to this day. That is how much the Toronto and Niagara Power Company are prepared to respect a judgment of the Privy Council, set forth by the hon. Minister of Public Works as a thing so to be respected and obeyed.

I do not wish to argue that two wrongs are going to make a right; but I do say that the whole idea—and there is but one idea in it—is to weave into this Railway Act a power for the Mackenzie interests which will give them the right to go into any municipality from the Atlantic to the Pacific and revive any latent charter that may be lingering in the murky pigeon holes of any municipal office and bring it into action as a competitor against any municipal power and lighting scheme, to be operated against such scheme to its detriment, no matter what is the result.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Parkdale. I am going to at least put myself upon the side of those who believe that in voting for

that amendment they are supporting the rights of the people. It is not the city of Toronto's battle; the battle affects every municipality in the Dominion of Canada from ocean to ocean. All along from the Niagara Power plant, we have the company's line passing through the city of St. Catherines, the city of Welland, the city of Hamilton, the town of Oakville, the town of Mimico and the city of Toronto —the whole line there already, and we have the possibilities of these competing distributing plants being extended not only in every municipality in Ontario, but in every municipality in the whole Dominion. The vested interests may talk about the Hydro Electric in Ontario, but that undertaking was the outcome of the oppressive measures of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company hitched up with the Toronto Electric Light Company, because they were in the position where they could supply or deny light and power to any firm they pleased; they could supply one factory with power, and the next factory in opposition to them would have to depend upon steam. Undoubtedly the Toronto and Niagara Power Company looked for a permanent market not only in the Toronto Electric Light Company but in the Toronto Street Railway Company—and that is the real milk in the cocoanut, gentlemen. They expect to compel the city of Toronto to renew the franchise for the Toronto Street Railway. And the argument of the hon. Minister of Public Works will hold good when they come back next year or the year afterwards and say, "Here, you gave them a charter under this Act, you discussed it fully, and you made provision for these powers. What is the use of giving them these powers when you are going to permit the city of Toronto to take over and operate their principal customer, the Toronto Street Railway? You must maintain the rights of the Toronto Electric Light Company and its companion concern, the Toronto Street Railway Company, and you must maintain a market in the city of Toronto in perpetuity"—that is practically the language of the Minister of Public Works—in order to make complete the operation and the carrying out of the trinity linked up in that way.

Mr. CARVELL: Did the hon. gentleman understand me to say that I thought Parliament had any power to interfere with the contract between the Toronto and Niagara Power Company and the street railway or the Toronto Electric Light Company? because I want to tell him that I know too much about the constitution of this country to make such a statement. It is not true.

Mr. SHEARD: I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that the whole thing was coupled up in this way; the producing of power on the banks of the Niagara river, the transmission of that power, and its distribution to the Toronto Electric Light Company and the street railway company.

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly I said that.

Mr. SHEARD: Very well; and that one part of the trinity was useless without the others.

Mr. CARVELL: I said that.

Mr. SHEARD: Now, as one of the great customers, the Street Railway Company is the remaining end of the circle, the selling end. If that is essential to the maintenance and operation as a going concern of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, is it not a fair inference that the suggestion is that they shall still continue to draw their power from that source?

Mr. CARVELL: No; because this Parliament has absolutely no jurisdiction over the matter whatever.

Mr. SHEARD: That is the way the hon. minister put it as justification for giving them this power, as I understood him.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to detain the House at any great length at this hour. From the trend of the discussion one might gather the impression that the city of Toronto was the only municipality in the Dominion interested in this matter. But I can assure the House that I have no particular interest in the city of Toronto. However, I am interested generally in the municipalities throughout the Dominion of Canada. The question at issue is that of dealing with the rights of these municipalities, the jurisdiction which they exercise over their streets, and the power of the Dominion of Canada to invade those rights. It seems to me that we should examine first the attitude of the Federal Government towards municipalities so far as transmission companies are concerned. That has been referred to several times to-night, but I ask the patience of the Committee while I refer to it again in order that we may see exactly what the stand of the Government has been on this question in the past.

There is no doubt that the legislation, from the earliest days down, admitted that the jurisdiction over the streets rested in some body other than the Dominion Government, whether the municipality, the province, or, as in the case of Ontario, the Hydro-Electric Commission. When that is conceded we must look at the attitude of the Dominion Government in its legislation dealing with this question. About the first clause of this kind we find is in an Act passed in 1899. I will read the clause:

> When any company has power by any Act of the Parliament of Canada to construct and maintain lines of telegraph or telephone or lines for the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, such company may with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over any highway, square or other public place, enter thereon for the purpose of exercising the said power, and as often as the company thinks proper may break up or open any highway, etc.

In that year they were required, whether they were corporations for the transmission of power or corporations for the sale and distribution of power in any municipality, to obtain the consent of the municipal council or other authority. That continued to be the law until 1903. The member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) pointed out that the law at that time resolved itself into two branches, one governing the question of the transmission of power and the other governing the question of sale. The transmission of power was subject to the consent of the municipality, and if they refused, to the consent of the Board of Railway Commissioners. But when it came to the question of the sale of power, this Parliament was very jealous of the rights of municipalities and said that no company could go in unless they obtained the consent of the municipality by by-law, which is the most formal manner of obtaining that consent. That provision was subsequently re-enacted and continued down to 1917, when the Railway Act was revised. Now, the intention of Parliament is absolutely clear: That the rights of the municipalities are sacred and should not be encroached upon by any corporation without the consent of the municipality by by-law. In 1902 this company was incorporated. That an error was made is evident from the discussion which took place at that time. I quote from the remarks of Mr. Pringle:—

> I understand that it means just what it expresses. All companies have to obtain the consent of a municipality before passing through it.

There is not the slightest thing in the discussion which took place on that occasion to show that the intention of Parliament was to grant to this corporation any greater rights or any greater benefits than could be enjoyed by any other corporation in Canada. When they seek to establish that Parliament intended to give them greater rights I submit that the burden of proof is on them to show clearly that that was the intention of Parliament. So far as the legislation of this House was concerned, it remained practically in that position until 1917, when the Railway Act was revised by a special committee, passed by the House of Commons and sent to the Senate.

I take issue with the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Carvell), who cast some reflection on the members of Parliament who saw fit to say that these rights should be restored to municipalities. I have the greatest respect for his honour, his integrity and his judgment; I believe that he is absolutely sincere when he says that these rights should not be interfered with. But I assure the hon. gentleman that while I have that high respect for him and that high estimate of him, I have just as great a respect for myself and just as high an estimate of myself and for my judgment and my action in voting in support of the amendment.

Hon. gentlemen talk about vested rights. Well, put it on the ground of vested rights, if you will, for the sake of argument. We will eliminate all question of dispute between the city of Toronto, the Toronto and Niagara Power Company and the Hydro-Electric. Under the Act the vested rights may be in the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, but the first vested rights in regard to the streets of these municipalities was either in the province or the municipality, or, in Ontario, in the Hydro-Electric Commission. I ask the minister, does he stand here and say that it is dishonourable for Parliament to restore to municipalities rights which were deliberately taken from them without their knowledge, without their consent, without any consultation with them? When that Act was passed no doubt Parliament believed that they could exercise jurisdiction if any mistake was made. But I stand broadly on the principle that when the conflict comes between the eight million people in Canada and the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, if there must be sacrifice on the part of either, that sacrifice must be on the part of the corporation, not of the people who own and control the streets in the municipalities of this country.

But, Mr. Chairman, when we put it on that narrow ground of vested rights, I do not believe that we are placing it upon the

ground upon which it should be placed. When we talk of vested rights, about legislating away the rights this corporation got under the Act of 1902, we are overlooking the fundamental principle which should govern our action in this connection. It is not a matter of depriving a company of vested rights; it is not a matter of taking anything away from them. It is a matter of putting them in the class of public utilities in which all these transmission companies must come; and it is then for us to say whether as a Parliament we can exercise jurisdiction by controlling them. It is simply a question of control over a public utility corporation. Those people who argue that these contracts are very sacred must realize that during the last fifteen or twenty years one of the objects of Federal legislation has been to exercise control over public utilities and common carriers. Will any hon. gentlman in this Committee argue that because a railway company received a charter some years ago before any Railway Act was in force, we must not apply the Railway Act to that corporation? It is true that had the Act not been put in force the company might have had the privilege of charging double or treble the rates which are at present fixed by law. But we realized that these corporations, these utilities, are servants of the public, and notwithstanding any great concessions which they may have received in their original Act of incorporation they must be bound by the general laws of the country even though those laws may cut down the rates which they may charge for transportation, even though they may cut down the rates of a telephone company, or telegraph charges, which have already been cut down. We must realize that Parliament is supreme, and that when an injustice is being done to the public by these corporations in the legal exercise of their rights, Parliament must step in and the public must be protected. All we are asking in this case is simply that the Dominion Parliament shall exercise its proper functions, that it shall perform its duty to the public and step in so far as this public utility is concerned, just as it proposes to step in under the other clauses of the Act. All we ask is that Parliament shall say to this company: "Notwithstanding you received your charter in 1902, you must be subject to the general laws of this country. We are going to control your rights to enter streets, but we are not going to take away your rights to sell and distribute power throughout the province of Ontario or the Dominion of Canada." Is there anything in this amendment which takes away from the company any specific rights which were granted to them under their charter? Is there even any suggestion of that in this amendment? Was there any suggestion of it in the Bill which was passed in 1917? I submit that the question to be answered by every man in this Committee, either on one alternative or the other, is, in the first place: Must the vested rights of the municipalities give way to the vested rights of private corporations which have been procured through error or misunderstanding? On the other alternative, you must ask yourself the question: Are we going to except one corporation in this country from control which can be justly exercised over it by Parliament? I think there is not a man in this House who asks himself that question honestly and conscientiously who can do otherwise than come to the conclusion that Parliament is supreme, and that this corporation must submit to the control of Parliament, no matter what the ultimate outcome may be, so long as the public interests are served.

The Minister of Public Works said what a bad lot of people we would be in this House if we passed this amendment, but on looking over the report of the special committee that was appointed in 1917 to consolidate and amend the Railway Act, I find that it was composed as follows: Messieurs Ames (Sir Herbert), Armstrong (Lambton), Bennett (Calgary), Blain, Carvell, Cochrane, Cromwell, Donaldson, Graham, Green, Lapointe (Kamouraska), Lemieux, Macdonell, Meighen, Nesbitt, Oliver, Pugsley, Rainville, Sinclair and Turriff. Was that committee dishonourable? Did they do anything to damage the credit of the Dominion of Canada? Were they disloyal to the trust which was reposed in them by the people when they passed the amendment which was submitted to this House and later went up to the Senate? Was the House of Commons in 1917, when it passed the section which we ask to have inserted in this Bill, dishonourable? I think that they could hold their heads as high, so far as business integrity and business morality is concerned, as this or any other Parliament in the history of Canada.

It is complained that we may have difficulty in getting this Bill through this session unless we very materially consent to the amendment of the Senate. But I submit this proposition: The House of Com-

mons is the elective body representing the people of the Dominion of Canada; the Senate is the body which has been appointed for life; and when it comes to a question of their judging on the morality of the House of Commons, I must say that I think the morality of the House of Commons will compare favourably with theirs. If legislation is being impeded in this coun try, it is not by the House of Commons, but by the autocratic body of the Senate which is not responsible to anybody and which looks better after the interests of private corporations than of the people whom we are elected to represent. I have very strong feelings upon this subject. Those men who passed that Act in 1917 had free and full discussion on it. They realized their duties and their obligations. Are we to pass judgment on them and say "You did something which was immoral so far as business obligations are concerned and you must accept the reprimand which has been delivered to you by the Senate of Canada"? So far as I am concerned I do not care to accept any reprimand which may have been handed by the Senate to the last Parliament. If we pass this amendment, I submit, it is the duty of the Senate to accept the Bill as we pass it, and if they do not accept it, then, I submit, it is the duty of the Government to bring down some restrictive legislation so that the will of the people cannot be thwarted by a body which is not responsible to the people.

Mr. PARDEE: I do not intend at this late hour to go into the legal aspects of the case now before the Committee, as that has already been done very ably by several speakers who have preceded me. There is one thing I should like to say, however, and which I think this Committee ought to keep in mind all the time, and that is with respect to the argument that has been presented in favour of vested rights. We have heard it declaimed both in the Special Committee and in this House time and again that there were certain vested rights in regard to the bondholder. That may be very true; there are certain vested rights there. But I submit that although the bondholders may have vested rights, the first and only thing that we, as representatives of the people, ought to consider are the vested rights of the people. There has been much sympathy expressed for the bondholder. He has been held up time and again as having put his money into this venture, and now, forsooth, because certain things may happen in a legislative way, he may not get back his money. As far as the hondholder is concerned, he has a right to be looked after by this Committee and by this House, if he has not already looked after himself, but the peculiar circumstances of this case must all be taken into consideration.

We have here four companies, all mixed up. They are under different names and under different heads, but, nevertheless, these four companies are under one control. There is not one of them that is not subservient to one set of men. True it is, the Toronto and Niagara Power Company were pioneers, but from what I gathered in the Committee and here, that pioneer work amounted to this: The Toronto and Niagara Power Company issued $1,500,000 worth of bonds, and $700,000 worth of stock, and there they stopped; that was the end of it, so far as the issuing of stock and bonds under that charter was concerned. That charter was granted by this House under certain very exceptional conditions, contions, I believe, which have never obtained in this or any other House before. The Minister of Railways has asked what we would do if the Canadian Pacific or some other company was in the same situation. In answer to that argument, I would say that nobody can read the debate that took place upon the granting of this charter and come to any other conclusion but this:

These men left this House knowing and being absolutely satisfied in their own minds that they were coming under the Railway Act and had no greater rights than that Act gave them. Under these circumstances, what happened? They went on and sold $1,500,000 bonds, and issued $700,000 worth of stock. Some one then, looking over the Act, lawyer-like, I will admit, said there is a flaw; here is a chance where we may go on and carry out our undertaking; that undertaking may be carried out irrespective of the clauses of the Railway Act and consequently irrespective of the rights of the municipalities. The case was taken to the lower court and decided in favour of the company, then to the Court of Appeal who upset the judgment of the lower court. They took it to the Privy Council and again the judgment of the lower court was upheld. The Privy Council held that the company had the right to go on and across the streets of the municipalities. It appears to me to be a most significant thing that during the course of the various states of litigation that took place in the lower court, in the Court of Appeal and in the Privy Council, bonds were sold.

We have been told by the Minister of Public Works that they were sold to the extent of thirty or forty million dollars. Certain it is though, by all the evidence that could be adduced before that committee, that there were certain bonds issued but never sold until after certain decisions were given. I will admit that the bonds were sold, but under what conditions were they sold? They were sold under these conditions—and this is where I say the bondholder is not entitled to one jot or tittle of sympathy. What did he do? No bondholder or set of bondholders will take up several million dollars' worth of bonds without going to the bottom of the whole affair and ascertaining whereon the authority of the company to issue the bonds rests. Very properly they found out, and what did the bondholders say? This conversation occurred as surely as the night follows the day. They said: Show us your charter; show us the proceedings upon which your charter was founded. And they did. They knew of the litigation and knew that there was a doubt whether or not they had the right to exercise the rights that the court upheld. They recognized the fact, as we do here to-night, that the rights given to this company were purely a piece of judicial legislation which has always taken place, and which judicial legislation is nine times out of ten not in the minds of those who pass it. They said: We will take your bonds; but they did not take them without the guarantee of the four companies. They said: We will take these bonds provided the four companies—the Electrical Development Company, the Toronto Street Railway, the Toronto and Niagara Power Company and the Toronto Electric Light Company—guarantee them. And they did. Are the bondholders hurt? The hon. Minister of Public Works said: If you pass this legislation to right a wrong that was never intended by this Parliament these bonds will not be worth fifty cents in the dollar. With the guarantee that these bondholders hold, they are worth dollar for dollar, and the company and the bondholders know it right well. Therefore I think I might ask in all fairness, why should we by our vote give to this company the right to walk into any municipality in the Dominion and say: We may go here, there and everywhere, and the wishes or the rights of this municipality amount to absolutely nothing as against the powers that Parliament gave to us inadvertently, but which we intend to take advantage of. I say, Sir, that if you have not

local autonomy in your Dominion, provincial and municipal affairs, and if we here, the people of the Dominion of Canada in our various spheres, are not allowed to exercise that autonomy in the way that seems best to us as communities, then the sooner we make up our minds to hand over the Dominion of Canada to companies who may desire to do as they please with us without any reference whatever to the will of the people, the better. It is a plain statement of facts. There has been much camouflage, and a great many red herrings have been drawn across the trail, but the matter is plain. And when I listened to the Hon. James Beck the other day in this Chamber I thought that as a speech, and in touching only the high spots, it was an absolute classic. He stood before the members of that committee and I will admit he played upon their feelings, and he played upon mine. But the one burden of that speech, and the sole tune of that song was: Take care, oh do take care of the down-trodden bondholder. There is no down-trodden bondholder, and there is no repudiation of the contract of this Parliament in the slightest degree. That charter was granted on a distinct understanding, the persons who got it well knowing that their powers were confined within certain terms. They went on and completed their works, and as my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) so well said, they were supplying only two customers, and knew that the lives of those two customers were limited. Why, as prudent business men, did they not establish a sinking fund? They did not do so, but traded upon a judicial interpretation of statutes never intended, and consequently find themselves in the cul de sac in which they are to-day. So far as I am personally concerned, I am here representing the people and not the corporations, and I believe that this is one of the times when the House of Commons should stand absolutely by the rights of the people without fear or favour.

Mr. BRISTOL: I do not purpose to speak at any great length on this matter because I think it is unnecessary, but I think it would be well if we got before us clearly what it is that the hon. member for Parkdale asks us to vote upon. It seems to me to be a very simple matter, and I really do not see why it should call for so much argument. The proposition of the hon. member for Parkdale is this: Are you going to put all the electric power companies of Canada under one class of legislation, or are you going to leave one to run at large?

That is the proposition clearly and concisely put. In the interests of the municipalities and of the people of the country, what ever may have been the rights given in 1902 to the Toronto and Niagara Power Company the time has come when there should be one class of legislation governing all companies of this kind. Section 374 provides for electric companies in this country to have through transmission lines for power and transmission. In the case of refusal by the municipality to allow transmission through the municipality, there is provision for application to the Railway Board, and in the case of distribution they must apply to the municipality, and if the municipality refuses, the matter there ends. That is the legislation which it is proposed to apply to all companies at present in existence. It has been suggested by my hon. friend from Vancouver, that there may be other companies in the same line as the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. What I most strongly urge is this:

If there are any such—which I do not believe, because this matter has been under discussion by Parliament for practically three years and it has received a great deal of newspaper notoriety—and if there are any others, we would have heard of them. But assuming that there are, is that not all the more reason for making this legislation apply to every company in this country and not allowing these companies at large to exercise their rights when and wherever they may desire as against the rights of the municipalities? It is suggested that this is not the proper place to deal with this matter but somebody should take it upon himself to apply to Parliament to ask to have the Toronto and Niagara Power Company's charter amended at some other time and on some other occasion. In view of the fact that the Toronto and Niagara Power Company took their charter with, what every member of this House admits, the full knowledge and belief that the Railway Act of that day applied to the charter, we are doing them no harm now, they having been allowed to run free for a few years, and having got rights that they never expected, by putting them under the same legislation as every other power company in this country.

It is suggested by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) that the province of Ontario has passed improper legislation in that regard because it does not allow municipalities to pass bylaws without the consent of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. It does not seen to me it is the duty of this House to sit in review on the legislation of the province of Ontario. That is a matter for the people of Ontario to deal with just as it is a matter for the people of Quebec or for any of the other provinces to deal with matters that come within their jurisdiction. We are not here as a court of review to sit in judgment upon the province of Ontario or any other province but we are here to pass legislation in the interest of the people of Canada and we should leave them to fight out their own provincial rights in their own provinces.

The only other matter that has been raised for our consideration is the question of the rights of bondholders. I fancy that the picture of two of our ministers weeping over the rights of these bondholders will go down in history because I do not believe that the rights of the bondholders will be affected very much. The suggestion made by Mr. Beck was that in so far as he knew no bondholder would be affected. I do not believe there is one particle of doubt that these bonds are all amply secured. We are told that this company has a 250,000 horse-power development at Niagara Falls. We are told that they were the pioneers in electrical development and we are asked to sympathize with their pioneer efforts. The pioneers in the development of electrical power, and the people who spent large sums of money, were the Niagara Falls Power Company. They were at it for ten years on the American side and they spent millions in perfecting the machinery which enabled Niagara's power to be chained up. The next power company was the Ontario Power Company, an American concern. The Toronto Niagara Power Company were the third set of people to go into that line of business and when they began the development of electrical power it was fairly well known and understood. But there was something that was not known in 1902 and that was the extent to which electricity was going to be developed and the vital importance that it was going to be to the people. We had very scant knowledge as to the protection that should be given to the people in connection with a matter of that kind. Every effort was made at that time that reasonably could be made, both by the late Mr. Clarke and Mr. (now Sir Edmund) Osler, to see that proper protection was given to the municipalities. As my hon. friends who support the amendment have said, it is perfectly and obviously clear that the gentlemen who got this

charter, and who are here to-night, knew perfectly well that they received that charter subject to the rights of municipalities in connection with their own interests.

Is Parliament supreme in matters of this kind? What are the rights of franchise holders as compared with the rights of the people? A franchise is merely a part of a public right given by Parliament to certain people to administer. It may be changed and altered. It is not a vested right; it is simply a permission to certain people to exercise definite public powers that belong to Parliament and to that extent these powers must be absolutely subject to the legislative control of Parliament. I am satisfied that hon. members will find that when they go back home to their constituents in the different municipalities, towns and cities, they will find it hard to explain why they voted for alleged vested rights and financial interests as against the rights and interests of the municipalities of their own constituents.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Chairman, this question has been so fully, ably and comprehensively dealt with from the legal standpoint by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) and others that I do not feel called upon to say very much. I have not very much sympathy with the bondholders. They are a class of people who, as was said by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) are well able to take care of themselves, and in this case they evidently did. What has impressed me is that there is not a man here to-night who will say that the legislation which gave this company the powers it enjoys is legislation that would be adopted at the present time. This House made a very serious mistake in 1902 and the effect of that mistake is to deprive the city of Toronto, and all the municipalities concerned, of the control of their streets. That was recognized at the time this legislation was before the House. I remember very distinctly that the Canadian union of municipalities, representing every municipality from the Atlantic to the Pacific, sent their representatives down here to voice their opposition to the measure. They did everything in their power at that time to resist the attempt of this company to get the rights which they sought. In addition to all that has been quoted as to the understanding of Parliament in regard to the application of the general Railway Act to this company, I am informed that the chairman of the Railway Committee of that day, Mr. Mahlon Cowan, wrote a letter to one of the mayors of a western town declaring that the company that was being chartered would come under the general Act. That being the case and the first offence being to deprive the municipalities of their vested rights, that initial fault ought to be corrected by this House to-night. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Parkdale makes that correction and I submit that this Committee ought to adopt that amendment and put all the electrical companies in the same position in regard to the Act.

Mr. BOYS: Mr. Chairman, were it not for the fact that I was a member of the Select Committee I would not at this late hour, and in this sweltering heat, venture to take up any more of the time of this Committee. But I should like, before casting my vote on the amendment of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) to state the position I took in the committee. I could not see my way clear to vote for the Senate amendment because I did not think that amendment afforded the protection or regulation which the municipalities were entitled to. It provides for a remedy in connection with oppression or bad faith but that is more or less of a joker. I do not think that any case of oppression or bad faith could be cited for which a remedy could not be found in the courts without any special legislation. It simply means that this company can go upon the streets of any municipality so long as they do not obstruct private ways or interfere with the course of traffic or do something extreme.

For that reason I could not support it. On the other hand I felt compelled to vote against the amendment moved in committee by the member for Parkdale because I could not see my way clear, by adopting that amendment, to abrogate the powers given to this company in 1902 by the statute, chapter 107, of that year. I notice that last week that position was supported to some extent by a well known publication in the city of Toronto. The Toronto Saturday Night of May 31, places my position in that regard better than I could do it myself. It says:

> The recent attempt to have the Railway Act so amended that it would, in effect, have made the charter of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company valueless, and would, at the same time, have betrayed the investors who, in good faith, placed their money in this undertaking, met with its just deserts, at the hands of a Committee of the House of Commons. Such attempts at confiscatory legislation are not being overlooked in England, whose moneyed

men furnished so much of the capital which went to build up just such enterprises in Canada.

It did seem to me that while the charter of this company should not be taken away, that during the lapse of years some regulation might well be provided by the committee, and I moved in the committee an amendment which accords in many respects with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) and in some respects with the amendment suggested by the Minister of Railways. What I suggested was this, and I must ask the committee to bear with me while we take a glance at the Act as it reaches the House and see what it provides for. Under subsection 2 of section 374, we find:

> The company shall not, except as in this section provided, acquire, construct, maintain or operate any works, machinery, plant, line, pole, tunnel, conduit or other device upon, along, across, or under any highway, square or other public place within the limits of any city, town, village or township, without the consent of the municipality.

That is essential where they want to construct and maintain a transmission line. Subsection 3 then goes on to provide that if that consent cannot be obtained, or cannot be obtained on terms satisfactory to the company, they shall then apply to the Board of Railway Commissioners. Subsection 4 provides that in the case of distribution systems the consent of the municipality must be obtained, and if that consent cannot be obtained nothing further can be done. Now, what I thought would be reasonable would be something along this line, and I do not propose at this moment to move it. I desire that those supporting the amendment of the member for Parkdale should have every opportunity of voting upon that, and upon that alone, so far as I am concerned, and if, perchance, that amendment is defeated it is my intention to move this. I would provide in subsection 2 that the consent of the municipality be first required. If it cannot be got then subsection 3 would read as follows: —

> If the company cannot obtain such consent or cannot obtain such consent otherwise than subject to conditions not acceptable to the company, the company may apply to the Board for leave to exercise its powers upon such highway, square or public place.

Now, this is the new part.

> And upon such application the Board may refuse or grant the same in whole or in part and upon such terms and conditions as the Board may see proper.

I would then amend subsection 5 as it comes to us from the Senate as follows:—

> Any specific powers inconsistent with the provisions of this section and conferred on any company by any special or other Act or authority of the Parliament of Canada, or of any province, shall not be affected by the provisions of the last preceding subsection 4; but any such company shall hereafter be governed by the provisions of subsection 2 and 3 of this section.

In other words, applying it to the company that we have been discussing, and taking the case of Toronto—not that I am arguing for a moment that this is a question which only affects Toronto, although I think it mainly affects that city—the company, if this amendment carried, would have to go to the city of Toronto and ask for consent. If the consent is refused they would then go to the board, which could refuse the application if they saw fit, or grant it upon such terms and conditions as they thought proper. I am not overlooking what the Minister of Public Works has stated. He quoted from the Act respecting corporations operating certain public utilities. Let me read the definition of a " public utility " as mentioned in that Act. Subsection 2 declares:—

> " Public utility " shall mean and include a water works, gas works, electric heat, light power works, telegraph and telephone lines, railways however, operated, street railways and works for the transmission of gas, oil, water, or electrical power or energy, or any similar works supplying the general public with necessaries or conveniences.

Now subsection 4 of the same Act says:

> Notwithstanding anything in any Act contained a municipal corporation shall not hereafter enter into any agreement with any such company or pass any by-law in relation to any Public Utility which has been declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, or which is not within the legislative control of Ontario, until the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has approved of such agreement or by-law, and every agreement entered into and by-law passed in violation of this section shall be utterly void and of no effect.

As I understand the minister, he argued that under that if we obtained consent either by agreement or by-law it would be void. If that argument is sound, I think we would then have to amend other provisions of this Railway Act of ours which have already received consent. If we turn to section 373, which deals with telegraph and telephone lines, both of which are within the definition of public utilities, as I read it from subsection 2 of the Ontario Act, we find these clauses. Subsection 2:

> Notwithstanding anything in any Act of the Parliament of Canada or of the legislature of

any province, or any power or authority heretofore or hereafter conferred thereby or derived therefrom, no telegraph or telephone line, within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, shall, except as hereinafter in this section provided, be constructed, operated or maintained by any company upon, along, or across any highway, square or other public place, without the consent of the municipality having jurisdiction over such highway, square, or public place.

Subsection 3 then provides, exactly as I do in my proposed amendment, that if that consent is withheld the Railway Board shall then decide the terms upon which the permission shall be granted. Now, if the Act, known as the Act Respecting Corporations Operating Certain Public Utilities, makes invalid a by-law or an agreement respecting this power company, it will also make it invalid respecting tele-

12 p.m. graph and telephone companies; yet our Act as drafted at the present time distinctly provides for obtaining the consent of the municipality in that very manner, so if it is good in the one case it ought to be good in the other. As far as I am concerned, I do not think that the Ontario statute would stand in the way. If this company had not a franchise at the present time I quite appreciate that no by-law or agreement made by a municipality could give any company the right to use those streets for a period of more than one year, as I understand the law of Ontario, or for more than five years upon a vote of the people without, at all events, it having the sanction of either an Act of the legislature or the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. But if we say in our Act of this company, which now has the right to use the streets of municipalities: "You must first ask consent, and if you fail to get that consent then go to the Railway Board," surely we can, if we wish, define the manner in which that consent is to be obtained; and so long as it is obtained in accordance with our legislation it seems to me it makes very little difference what the province of Ontario does in that connection. So I think that by an amendment of this kind the company is reasonably protected and so is the municipality.

For my part, I cannot bring myself to think that it is proper, notwithstanding all that has been said, that when this charter has been granted and when over $30,000,000 have been spent in the undertaking—the statement has never been challenged, it was made over and over again in the select committee and nobody challenged it, and I think we may fairly say that it is certain there is in this undertaking over $30,000,000 —that we should jeopardize, or, as has been suggested by the editor of Saturday Night, confiscate that property. I cannot bring myself to do that; at all events not if there is any reasonable way of protecting the municipality and at the same time the company.

Reference has been made to bondholders, and to the million and a half dollars' worth of bonds. It would seem to me that it was hardly necessary to argue that proposition. It is said that this particular company issued bonds to the extent of only $1,500,000. But surely when we understand that it forms an important part of three distinct systems, namely, the generating plant at the Falls, the transmission plant, and the distribution plant, we must realize that to take any one of those away would render the balance worthless. If you say to this company or to any other company, "You cannot enter any municipality without consent, which consent may be withheld without any reason whatever," you surely make useless the whole undertaking. And that is what we are asked to do.

If I was now being called upon to cast a vote as to whether or not I would support a charter such as was granted in 1902, it goes without saying that I would not think of doing so. But the position to-day is very different from the position then. It was only in 1899 that the idea of obtaining consent of the municipalities was first determined upon by Parliament, and the very idea of obtaining consent was fresh in the minds of the members of Parliament in 1902. Therefore if it was thought proper to make this company get the consent of every municipality before proceeding with its undertaking, surely Parliament would have said so in plain English. It seems to me we are casting a serious reflection upon the members of Parliament of 1902 when we quietly sit down to amend their work, because from a word or two that was dropped from three of four members we suggest the other members did not know what they were doing. In 1899 that policy of consent was adopted, it was everybody's mind, and there was no such provision put in the Special Act. In 1903 in the consolidation it was again inserted, but there was no saving clause put in the legislation then, and in the year after this charter went through, and they knew of that mistake, why do we not find in the consolidation some saving clause indicating that so far as this company was concerned the rights obtained by this charter—which

I admit is an omnibus, wide open, perpetual charter—were granted under misapprehension? Why did we not on the first opportunity the year after take occasion to correct the mistake made? It was not done, it was not dealt with in any subsequent consolidations and amendments. It is said that as a matter of fact this was raised as far back as 1912, and that because of the war and of the fact that the Railway Bill did not go through in 1917, the matter has been dragging along ever since. But there is no doubt that this very charter was used in the floatation of some $9,000,000 worth of bonds—at all events, that is the uncontradicted evidence before the Committee—after the decision of the Privy Council, and how any one can argue or suggest that a bondholder would then be purchasing bonds with any doubt as to the position of the company is beyond my comprehension. We had the court of last resort outlining the powers of that company, and there was no chance of varying those powers unless Parliament itself was to abrogate what it did in 1902. Consequently on the strength of that charter $9,000,000 worth further bonds were sold. Are we to abrogate those rights entirely? Surely not.

The suggestion I have to make later, if this amendment is defeated, it seems to me would protect the company and the municipalities; and I do not think that any municipalities outside, we will say, two or three hundred miles of the Niagara plant need have any fear of invasion by this company so far as their streets are concerned. Without a shadow of doubt the company was originally incorporated for the purpose of generating and transmitting electricity from Niagara to Toronto. I have not much doubt that it was formed for the purpose of supplying current to the street railway and the electric light company, which was a convenient way of disposing of the current, much more so than setting up their own poles.

If the company wanted to go along a street where there were already telephone poles, street railway poles, and hydro poles, the board could say to them, "No, if you wish to tap the locality that is reached by this street you must go up to a further cross street where there are no poles and find a way there." In that way I think we would do away with the greatest evil, the placing along the street of endless poles.

Mr. MORPHY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments to put on record something that I do not think has been made very clear in connection with the charter under discussion and the judgment of the Privy Council. Lawyers are probably prone to take a stronger view of the decisions of the higher courts than laymen. In this case I am going to address the Committee upon the amendments that are before the House and to point out that in the first place on the 24th of July, 1912, this case came before the Privy Council. There were present at the hearing the Lord Chancellor, Lord McNaughton, Lord Dunedin, Lord Atkinson, and Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. Judgment was given after the court had considered Chancellor Boyd's decision and the decision of the Court of Appeal of Ontario reversing the Chancellor. The most salient paragraph in the judgment is that dealing with the charter under discussion:

> The Act shows that the Parliament of Canada treated the company,—the works of which were expressly declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, and so brought within section 91 of the British North America Act,—as proper to be entrusted with freedom to interfere with municipal and private rights. For this there may well have been on the balance of advantages good reason, the purpose of the company being to bring electric power from Niagara Falls to parts of Canada, to reach which its lines would have to pass through a series of municipal areas. To make its power of entry subject to the veto of each municipality might mean failure to achieve its purpose. It is therefore not suprising that a pioneer company such as this should have been given large powers.

It is stated authoritatively that this company with its auxiliary companies, the Electrictal Development Company and the Toronto Power Company, have invested $34,000,000 and upwards in the joint enterprise founded upon the powers given in this charter, and that some $9,000,000 was raised by sales of bonds to investors in England, France, Canada and the United States after the judgment of the Privy Council was delivered. The presumption, therefore, Mr. Chairman, is irrebuttable and conclusive that the men who bought those bonds would have put before them the judgment delivered by the Privy Council, for they would seek to know the rights and powers of the company issuing the bonds, and it goes without saying that they would be told, and would let their money go upon the express knowledge, that the highest court in the realm had not only recognized but confirmed the rights of this company and of the auxiliary companies which were attacked. Naturally investors with that full knowledge before them would invest their money in the company's bonds.

The hon. member for Parkdale has brought in a resolution by way of amendment that would, to my mind, as has been stated by others, amount to confiscation of practically fifty per cent at least of the value of this company's assets.

The bonds to that extent would suffer. When we are settling the rights and powers and privileges of this company, I cannot, as a member of this House, having regard to the judgment of the Chancellor of Ontario and of the Privy Council of England, lightly ignore a position of that kind and vote for the confiscation of the money of any body, whether he lives in Canada, England, United States, or France. I am not sure that this House has been serious enough in viewing this question. I might quote in addition to what the member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) quoted, from an article published in Toronto quoting the London Saturday Review:

> The recent attempt to have the Railway Act so amended that it would, in effect, have made the charter of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company valueless, and would, at the same time, have betrayed the investors who, in good faith, placed their money in this undertaking, met with its just deserts at the hands of a Committee of the House of Commons. Such attempts at confiscatory legislation are not being overlooked in England, whose moneyed men furnished so much of the capital which went to build up just such enterprises in Canada. For instance, a recent issue of the London Saturday Review had this to say:
>
> "Canadian and Australian Governments have taken to an ugly and dishonest trick of recent years, which, unless abandoned, will effectually cut off the inflow of British capital. It is this. A syndicate or company of shareholders, as a rule British, are given powers by the local legislature to build and equip some great undertaking, such as a railway, or an electrical power plant. When it has been completed and found to be running at a profit, the Colonial Legislature arms the State with powers to run a rival undertaking, which, owing to Government patronage ruins the private concern. This is practically what the Government of Western Australia has done to the Midland Railway. This is apparently what the Government of Ontario is trying to do to the Electric Development Company of Ontario, which has brought an action against the Attorney-General and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. The Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario has done his best to defeat the Development Company by a legal technicality, which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has very properly disallowed."

Let me ask, is there any truth in what the Privy Council said? Was this Toronto and Niagara Power Company a pioneer? The member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) says they were not. In return, I assert that no company established on the United States side of the Niagara Falls had transmitted electricity any distance beyond the city of Buffalo—a matter of far less than half a hundred miles. At that time the electrical experts of the world were in doubt as to the possibility of the commercial transport of electricity at a profit. Nikola Tesla said one thing and Edison said another. This company had the courage and the nerve which made the Privy Council say it was a pioneer; therefore, it got wide powers. I freely concur in what has been stated here, that on the floor of this House there was a discussion as to whether or not the powers were so wide. But the company interpreted its own statute; the company's solicitors undertook at a certain stage to say what those powers were. Having taken the Act and studied it and found out what their powers were, they, as they had the right to do, went on and issued $9,000,000 worth more bonds. Why, it is said that when this company first got into Toronto, the city was ablaze with glory and joy because a real, splendid new enterprise had been brought to their door and they were going to be flooded with electric light. They were pleased with it and they continued to be pleased with it for many years. Not until the Hydro-Electric, a provincial utility, came into the field, was any objection raised or antipathy shown to this particular company. Now, I am rather inclined to view the Hydro-Electric Commission as one of the greatest public utilities that Ontario has. So much do I think of it that I am inclined to belittle the arguments of hon. gentlemen who fear the competition of this company against the Hydro Electric, which has the public purse, the public pulse and the public generally behind it; which is carrying on business in Ontario not for profit, but for the benefit of the people. When men speak of this small company fighting its way on its own money—borrowed, it is true, most of it—against one of the greatest provinces in this Dominion, with its purse outpouring to the splendid Hydro Electric utility, I say it is rather stretching an argument to assert that the public right is being interfered with. I do not believe that any public right is going to be hurt by this company. The Hydro Electric is in nearly every part of western Ontario to-day; there is no need of another company coming in. In the course of time, when the Hydro Electric is fully developed, it can take up a further field in eastern Ontario. I do not see why they cannot compete with an overflowing purse behind them.

Let it be remembered just here that the Hydro, in spite of all its good and of all its usefulness to the public, has never yet developed a single horsepower; it has bought its power from companies like this, and others. It is not a pioneer, and I decline to accept the argument that to support the law as found by the Chancellor of Ontario and the Privy Council in England is plain treason to the Hydro Electric Commission and to the people of Ontario. I do not believe that the people of Ontario will accept such an argument. They are as fair and as broad-spirited and as equitable and as manly as any people in the Dominion. I do not think that their view is so narrow and restricted as the view represented by some arguments that have been offered here to-day. The Hydro has a splendid body of engineers to regulate it, and they are taking up large developments. It cost $15,000,000 to develop Chippewa creek, I hear a whisper, "$30,000,000"; be careful that it is not $50,000,000. In any case, they are prepared to go into the field, and that any Act of this Parliament should be passed that would operate as confiscation is to say the least, unreasonable. No sensible man can deny that there would be a loss. In two years the Toronto Electric Railway Company goes over to the city of Toronto, and they will use Hydro-Electric, provincial power. There is 40,000 horse-power gone at one swoop. It may be that there are worse things in the world than a little competition, even for a publicly-owned utility. Every one in the country is not buoyed up with the assurance of the final and ultimate success of our National railways under federal ownership, or of Hydro-Electric under provincial ownership. We all hope they will succeed, for the interest and the benefit of the people, but no man knows. Consequently, to put our eggs all in one basket might be the worst thing that ever happened.

Let me point out one thing to the committee. This Toronto and Niagara Power Company has 27,000 customers in Toronto, notwithstanding the fact that it charges more for its service than the Hydro-Electric charges. Their argument is that the people pay more because their system is better and more efficient, and the service consequently better. Charging more against a big corporation like the Hydro, yet holding 27,000 subscribers—that is not competition in the ordinary sense. That is not bidding down to make Hydro go lower. Only last week the Hydro knocked 20 per cent off all municipal charges in the province of Ontario, and they can easily do it. I cannot support the amendment of the hon. member for Parkdale. I believe it would be confiscation. I feel that the temper of the House compels me to support the amendment proposed by the minister, because he has left some remnant of this company intact, as I understand it. If I am wrong, it may be said hereafter that that was the understanding I had. I do not know that it is wise for us to accept what was said in debate in preference to the deliberate judgment of the highest court in the realm. The Act is the thing. It stands there to be scrutinized, and I think we should hesitate before creating a precedent here to-day upon data that is not quite sufficient to warrant the precedent being established. Mention has been made of the hon. Mr. Beck of New York. Hon. gentlemen may not remember everything he said, but one thing that impressed itself very strongly upon me was this sentence: "Canada must be a borrowing public. The United States is a lending public." England may not be a lending public for many years to come, and we may in the future require to raise money on the public credit. To raise money, the public credit must stand high, and the public credit springs from the fount of Parliament here. If this Parliament enacts legislation that goes to foreign lands with the hall mark of shame upon it, so that the credit of Canada is impaired, then if the amendment of the hon. member for Parkdale carries we may regret for many years to come that Parliament took that stand, probably without mature consideration and in the heat of a summer evening.

Mr. NESBITT: As a member of the Special Committee on this Bill I wish to say a few words. I have listened to all the arguments on this question pro and con of the most capable lawyers probably in this country for four times, and they have all amounted to practically the same thing each time. Going back to the granting of the franchise to this company in 1902, we were told this afternoon, and have been told time and again before, that the Railway Committee of that day did not know what they were doing. I do not think we have any right to assume that any more than we have a right to assume that the Railway Committee of this day does not know what it is doing. As a matter of fact, a good deal of reference has been made to some of the objections raised by Mr. Osler and Mr. Clarke at that time, and yet the

Committee passed the Bill in spite of these gentlemen's objections. That looks to me as if the Railway Committee of that day knew exactly what they were doing. I can construe it in no other way. The objections were made, and still the Railway Committee of that day passed the Bill. Furthermore, the mayor of Toronto at that time, Mr. Urquhart, wrote a letter to the Toronto City Council and the Controllers pointing out that the Mackenzie and Mann people had been given exactly the powers which the Privy Council decided had been given to them. There was no objection from the Toronto City Council that we ever heard of in the Railway Committee.

As far as the bonds are concerned, it has been said that $1,500,000 of bonds were issued by the transmission company, which was the first company formed, I understand. These were never sold, but were taken up by the development company. Afterwards, the development company built the transmission line to Toronto. The Committee never heard of any objection to that from any of the municipalities. The lines were built without any trouble until they invaded North Toronto. In the meantime the development company had sold some $7,000,000 of bonds. There was a question before the special committee as to whether value was received for the bonds, but there was no objection made before the special committee by the solicitors for the city of Toronto that the money was not properly expended. Some $34,000,000 or $35,000,000 was expended and $27,000,000 of bonds were issued altogether, I understand. When the trouble did arise there was an appeal to Chancellor Boyd, who was one of the most capable judges in the province of Ontario. He gave a decision in favour of the company. The first bonds had been sold previous to that decision. After that decision more bonds were issued, but they were held over until the appeal had been heard by the Privy Council, and when the Privy Council, the court of last resort in the Empire, gave their decision these bonds that had been issued, $9,000,000 worth, were sold. Nobody can tell me that the solicitors who were engaged to investigate the title that was to be the security for these bonds did not take the franchise as the main security, because anybody who has ever tried to sell public utility bonds know that you cannot sell them unless you have a proper franchise. The two franchises that hon. gentlemen say were the security for these bonds were both limited franchises, and I do not believe that the purchasers of the bonds would have bought them except for the fact that the franchise was behind the bonds. That may be disputed, but I have listened to all the arguments four times now, and I have never heard any reason given to change my mind that that was the main source of credit for the sale of these bonds.

The hon. member for Parkdale this afternoon made an argument I have never heard before on this question. He said that it was a mistake of the law clerk that was responsible for the franchise being granted. I have sat on the Railway Committee since I have been a member of Parliament, and I know that the Committee always look carefully over the Bill to see that the law clerk has drawn it properly before they vote on it.

That has been my experience in any Railway Committee on which I have sat, and I believe that the Railway Committee of that day knew what they were doing just as much as the Railway Committee of this day does. It is said, quite truly, that we would not grant a franchise of that kind to-day, but you must not think of it for to-day. You must go back seventeen years ago when the distribution or the transmission of power was in its infancy. A power company had been established at Niagara Falls before that time, but as my hon. friend from North Perth said, the furthest transmission that had taken place up to that time was to Buffalo, by the International Power Company, which I believe has since changed its name. There is no doubt that, whatever faults there might have been in the franchise at that time, the city council were then glad to get this company to transmit power to Toronto. It has been said that these people have got their poles on the streets of Toronto contrary to the order of the Privy Council that they should be removed. These poles were ordered to be removed, and why has the city of Toronto not enforced that order of the Privy Council? Because, as the member for North Perth says, there are 27,000 people using this power in the city of Toronto, and I do not think they would be in favour of having these poles removed. That must be the reason why the city has not ordered their removal before now. They have stopped this company from lighting the streets of Toronto, but private people of Toronto still patronize the company. I shall not dwell on this phase of the subject further, but what strikes me forcibly is this: These people got the franchise and proceeded to sell bonds, and my experience has been that

if a private individual breaks a contract—at least if any man breaks a contract with me—he is not trusted any more by me. A man may break a contract with me once, but never a second time, because I will not trust him, and I believe that that is the case with businessmen throughout the length and breadth of this land. What has built up the trade of the British Empire more than the fact that the people with whom she traded could depend on the goods which they received being according to representation? If a man lies to me about any particular thing, he may deceive me once, but it is my fault if he deceives me twice. Some one, I think the hon. member for Parkdale, talked this afternoon about our being honest, and I could not help thinking when I heard him whether it was the intention that this Parliament of Canada, the representatives of the people of this country, should be asked to break a solemn contract and discredit us in the eyes of the financial world. There can be no other interpretation than that, no matter how you may camouflage the legal aspect of the case. We have had a considerable lot of legal talk and for four years I have listened to it. But so far as I am personally concerned I look at the matter from one standpoint. If we pass the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Parkdale we practically confiscate these people's interests. There is no question about that. The bonds may or may not be good, but we have no right to confiscate any proper interests that have been built up with the legal endorsation of the Parliament of this country. And if all the lawyers in the United States and Canada were to talk to me about the legal aspects of the question, I could not consider it from any other standpoint than that we have no right to break a contract once it is made, and that we should stand by it even though it costs us something. I am as perfectly willing as any man to protect the municipalities, and I think the amendment suggested by the Minister of Railways fully protects the municipalities where these people have not entered into business; and it fully protects the municipality of Toronto as regards the future. It has been said that this company has Dominion-wide power and that from Halifax to Vancouver they can go into any municipality and occupy the streets. But after all we must give credit to the company for having some common sense. There would be no object in going into any municipality unless the proposition would pay. If the city could not get power for less than they were being supplied by the existing corporation, there is no fear, in my judgment, of this or any other company going into any municipality. I do not know of any municipality that would not welcome any corporation that could sell them power cheaper than they are getting at the present day. That is true of any municipality as it is in the case of individuals. The fact is, no matter with what legal phraseology it is surrounded: These people were granted the franchise and sold bonds. Some one said this afternoon that there was no proof that any of the bonds were sold out of Canada. But suppose that to be the case, is that any reason why we should confiscate the interests of the people of Canada? As a matter of fact, it was stated before the special committee time and again that these bonds were sold in England, France and the United States. The great majority of them were sold there, but even if they were not, is there any justification in our confiscating their value? By all means no. If they were sold in Canada, that is all the more reason why we should protect the interests of the people who hold them. I am perfectly willing to see either the minister's clause inserted to protect the municipalities where these people are not now operating, or to accept the proposed amendment of my hon. friend from South Simcoe. But let us not confiscate the rights of any one and have the people of the world say that they cannot invest money in this country without running the risk of confiscation.

The Committee divided on the amendment of Mr. Mowat.

Amendment agreed to, yeas 56, nays 52.

Mr. J. F. REID: I was paired with the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McMASTER: I should not have voted, Mr. Chairman; I was paired.

Mr. MOWAT: I did not want to make two mouthfulls of this but the next amendment is to the latter part of subclause 5. The Senate understood that this company was to buy out the Toronto Electric Light Company. Now it seems to me that that is not so. I propose to move an amendment to change the latter part of the subclause and this will be subclause 6: I therefore beg to move:

That subsection 5 of section 374 be amended by striking out all the words in the last eleven lines from, and inclusive of, the word "pro-

vided" to the end of the section and substituting the following as a new subsection 6:

(6) If any company heretofore incorporated by Special Act or other authority of the Parliament of Canada has acquired, or shall acquire assets or any part thereof, or the right to the possession or use of the assets or any part thereof, of any company or person operating a system for the distribution of light, heat, power or electricity, in any town, city, village or township, then in every such case the company so acquiring such assets shall carry out with the municipality all the obligations, in respect to the said assets whether arising under contract or in any other manner, of the company from which the said assets have been or shall be acquired.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think that completes all the clauses of the Bill. However, I would like to ask the committee to take up clauses 25 and 27 and make the changes in them that I shall propose. These are two clauses in reference to the employees of the Board of Railway Commissioners who are not now under the Civil Service Act. This will bring them under the Act. I therefore beg to move the reconsideration of section 25.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. D. REID: I beg to move:

That section 25 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

Such other officers, clerks, and employees as are necessary for the proper conduct of the business of the Board may be appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act 1918, and of any Acts in amendment thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. J. D. REID moved the reconsideration of section 27.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. D. REID: I beg to move that section 27 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

27. The officers, clerks and employees attached to the Board may be paid out of such money as may be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

Mr. FIELDING: The minister says "such other officers." That evidently excepts some. Who are those that are excepted?

Mr. J. D. REID: Section 25 excepted all officers employed by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. FIELDING: The amendment says "such other officers," meaning that there are some who will be appointed by the Civil Service Commission and others who will not be?

[Mr. Mowat.]

Mr. J. D. REID: There are some officers such as Mr. Spencer. He is a special officer or inspector. They must all come under the Civil Service Commission, the same as the special officers in any other department.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the Bill?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer again to section 325.

The CHAIRMAN: Before referring to section 325 it will be necessary for the hon. gentleman to have the unanimous consent of the Committee. Is it the unanimous will of the Committee that the hon. member be allowed to revert to section 325 of the Bill?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I can go on with it now or wait until the third reading. It will take me a few minutes to explain it, but if the Committee do not wish me to go on to-night I shall defer what I have to say until the third reading. The amendment to section 325 has the effect of practically wiping out all agreements made between municipalities and the railway companies fixing rates in those municipalities. It also has the effect of wiping out an appeal which is now pending to the Supreme Court. I want to explain these things to the Committee, but if you would prefer me to do it on the third reading I should be glad to postpone what I have to say. It is so late now that I do not like to keep the Committee, but if you wish me to go ahead I am prepared to do so.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have no objection, but I do not like to ask the Committee to remain.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is the way I feel, too.

Mr. J. D. REID: Does the hon. member wish to have the clause opened up again?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID: I would not like to have the clause opened up again. Rather than have the clause opened I would prefer that you bring it up on the third reading.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I will take it up on the third reading, then.

Bill reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 1 a. m. Thursday.

Thursday, June 5, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

CAPTAIN ALBAN LAFERRIERE.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. Has Captain Alban Laferrière been a member of the Canadian Overseas Expeditionary Force? If so, (a) when did he enlist, and in what battalion did he serve; (b) how long was he in service in Canada, England, and in France; (c) when and for what reason was he returned to Canada?

2. Is the said Captain Laferrière at present a member of the Canadian Militia? If so, (a) to what Unit is he attached and what is his military rank; (b) On whose recommendation did he obtain his present military position?

3. Who is the Officer Commanding the 70th Battalion?

4. When did Colonel Allard cease to be the Officer Commanding said Battalion, and for what reasons was he retired?

5. Did Captain Alban Laferrière resign his commission in the Canadian Overseas Expeditionary Force? If so, when, and for what reason?

6. Was the said Captain Laferrière arraigned before a court martial during his service overseas? If so, when, and what was the judgment of the court?

7. Is the Government aware that the said Captain Laferrière is in charge of a canteen established for the accommodation of returned soldiers in the city of Hull? If so, is the said canteen authorized by the Department of Militia, and will the Government order it to be closed?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes. (a) 8th January, 1916—57th Battalion. Served in 57th Battalion, 69th Battalion and 10th Reserve Battalion. (b) In Canada, 8 months; in England, 11 months; in France, 2 weeks (tour of instruction). (c) 12th May, 1917—unfit for General Service.

2. Yes. (a) 70th Regiment—Lieutenant. (b) Lieut.-Colonel W. L. Allard.

3. Lieut.-Colonel W. L. Allard.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. No.

6. No.

7. No, but inquiry is being made.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. Referring to page 381 of the Report of the Ministry Overseas Military Forces of Canada 1918, and to the chapter entitled, "Canadian Army Medical Corps." was Lieutenant-Colonel Jenkins named by Sir Edward Kemp and the Sub. Militia Council, or by either of them, under Order No. 31, to investigate and report upon the financial or other dealings of the Canadian Army Medical Service in Europe?

2. Did the said Lieutenant-Colonel Jenkins make progress reports from time to time? If so, were such progress reports sent to Sir Edward Kemp's London Office?

3. Did the said Jenkins, (a) Make a full and final report to Sir Edward Kemp, and (b) was the said and final report received by the minister in or about the month of November, 1918?

4. If so, after receiving the said final report, did Sir Edward Kemp have an interview with the said Colonel Jenkins at which a copy of the said report was produced, and after discussion retained by Sir Edward Kemp?

5. Did the said report disclose incompetence, neglect, and the wasting of large sums of money in the Canadian Army Medical Service Overseas?

6. Will the said Order No. 31 and the final report of Colonel Jenkins be laid on the table of the House? If so, when?

7. Is there any objection to the said Order or Report being produced? If so, what is the objection?

THE BUDGET.

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

On the Order being called:

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.—The Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the provisions of Rule 17C, when this Order is called on Thursday the Chair is vacated without question put, but by arrangement, and for the convenience of hon. members, it has been found best to submit the motion on Thursday. I make reference to the fact in order that this circumstance may not be construed as a precedent.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said: This motion affords me the opportunity of presenting the Budget for the consideration of the House. It is usual in such presentation to deal with the important topics of the financial position of the Dominion, the condition of our trade, domestic and foreign, the state of our revenues and expenditures for the past and, so far as can be estimated, for the coming year, and to submit the fiscal measures which the Government deems essential having regard to the situation disclosed.

This is the general course along which my remarks of to-day will proceed, but in view of the special circumstances in which Canada in common with the rest of the world finds herself, I hope I may be pardoned if I dwell upon the various subjects

which I have mentioned at somewhat greater length, and in more detail, than has been my custom in previous Budgets which I have had the honour to present to Parliament.

The war is over and all nations are engaged in counting the cost, estimating the condition in which their finance and trade have been left after the fiery tempest which has passed over the world, and devising ways and means to repair the ruin which has been wrought.

It seems to me that what the House and the people of Canada will first desire to learn from the Budget speech will be what has been the cost of the war to Canada, what is our present financial position, what it will be when demobilization has taken place and our war expenditure is completely at an end, and what are the additional annual charges which must be met as the result of the war.

To these topics I shall first address myself. The fiscal year of the Dominion closes on March 31. According to our system some time is required for the completion of the services and bringing into account of all items attributable to the year closed on that date, but a fairly accurate forecast may be given of what the completed accounts will reveal.

With regard to the cost of the war to the Dominion, the books of the Finance Department show as of March 31 last a total principal war expenditure of $1,327,273,848. The portions incurred in respect of the several years during the continuance of the war are as follows:

$ 60,750,476	for	1914-15
$166,197,755	for	1915-16
$306,488,814	for	1916-17
$343,836,801	for	1917-18
$450,000,000	for	1918-19

Over the same fiscal period, namely from April 1, 1914, to March 31, 1919, the total expenditure upon ordinary account, that is to say, the current outlays of the Dominion in respect of its various services aggregated $832,757,589. The expenditure upon capital and other accounts for which by the practice of all our Governments provision might properly be made by borrowing, and for which assets of equivalent value were created for the permanent benefit of the people of Canada, amounted during the five years in question to $180,277,873.

Leaving capital expenditure aside and applying the surplus available from our revenues over and above the amount required to meet current outlays it will appear that we have met the principal cost of the war from taxation to a total aggregate amount of $275,943,977. If we take into account the amount contributed during the five year period for interest upon war debt and for pension charges the total paid from revenue on account of the war to March 31, 1919, is $438,293,248.

Now let us approach the subject from another angle. Aside from the cost of the war and how that cost was met, the vital question before us to-day is what is the amount of the total net national debt of Canada and how does it compare with the net debt at the end of the fiscal year immediately preceding the war.

On March 31, 1914, the net national debt was $335,996,850. On March 31, 1919, the net national debt was $1,584,000,000.

There remains to be considered what further increase in the national debt will be made during the present fiscal year which will end on March 31, 1920.

The war, so far as actual fighting is concerned, was terminated by the armistice of November 11 last; but the expenditures connected with the maintenance of the Canadian Corps in Continental Europe, their gradual return, first to England, and then to Canada, their demobilization here, and the provision made by the Government by way of war gratuity to enable members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force to bridge over the period of their re-absorption into civil life have still continued, and will continue over the greater part of the year.

In reality the present year is, so far as expenditure is concerned, a war year. It is impossible to estimate accurately what our demobilization expenditure for 1919-20 will be, but we may be sure that it will not be materially less than $300,000,000.

There is a further important item of our war expenditure which must be taken into account but which at present it is not possible to estimate with accuracy. I mean the additional cost to Canada of our share of the increased expenditure for ammunition at the front from September 1, 1917, to the close of the war.

Assuming that we shall not be able, in view of the magnitude of our reconstruction programme, to pay any substantial part of our demobilization expenditure from revenue, we may calculate that when demobilization is complete and no further outlays are necessary on what I may call the principal of our war expenditure the total net debt of Canada will stand at not less than $1,950,000,000, or in round figures $2,000,000,000. This contrasts with $335,996,850, the net debt of Canada at the end

of the fiscal year 1914. The increase during the five year war period is thus shown in round figures at $1,614,000,000.

This then is the financial position so far as relates to the national debt. While the amount is large and averages over $220 per head of the population of Canada it will be remembered that Canada was in the war from the first day and that by comparison with the present net national debts of European governments including Great Britain, who were similarly participants in the conflict during its entire length, our position having regard to relation of debt, to number of population, and to national resources must be regarded as distinctly more favourable.

Mr. Speaker, 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 era upon which we are entering. It will constitute a burden upon the people of Canada for generations to come. Fighting for the principles for which we stood we could not and did not count the money cost which is really the least part of our sacrifices in the war. The realization that at the greatest crisis in all history when the fate of world freedom was trembling in the scale of destiny, this gallant country of eight million people put its all to the hazard in the mightiest of conflicts for the cause of truth and justice, will be the lofty inspiration to greater effort which will enable Canada to carry and ultimately extinguish the heavy obligations entailed by the war.

What portion of this indebtedness and of the obligations we have incurred with respect to pensions and other services arising out of the war we shall be able, under the peace settlement, to obtain by way of indemnity from Germany and her Allies I am unable to say, but it would be imprudent to treat expectation in this regard as an asset upon which we may with certainty depend. It is better to face our debt and other war liabilities as they stand and assume that we must be prepared to bear their full burden by our own strength and from our own resources.

In considering the subject of our national debt an important aspect from the viewpoint of its bearing upon our financial standing and credit is whether it is owed to our own people or abroad. While national debt, no matter where owed, is debt, it makes a great difference to national strength whether it is held within the country itself, that is to say, whether the people regarded in the aggregate owe it to individual members of the community holding their own Government's securities, or whether it is owed to citizens of other nations. From the national standpoint a public debt owed to a nation's own people is not nearly so serious an obligation as if owed abroad. The interest paid upon it is disbursed at home and remains part of the national resources. When the principal is paid there is a transfer of wealth from the Government to its own citizens which still remains an asset of the community viewed as a national unit. But if the debt is held abroad, every interest and principal payment diminishes the resources of the debtor nation and increases those of the creditor nation. In this respect and bearing especially in mind the fact that before the war Canada's borrowing for federal, provincial, municipal and business purposes was principally in Britain and the United States and not in Canada, the situation as to our national debt may be regarded with satisfaction.

In round figures the total outstanding securities of the Dominion Government are held as follows: in Great Britain, $326,700,000; in the United States, $150,873,000; in Canada, $1,510,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is another gratifying feature of our finance to which I feel I should refer, and that is the dates of maturity of our outstanding obligations. Disregarding any debt in Britain, which is funded over long periods and will present no difficulty as to renewals, the position of our principal maturities in Canada is as follows:

War Savings Certificates maturing 1920-21..	.. ..	$ 11,604,338
5% Debenture Stock maturing 1st Oct. 1919..	.. ..	896,500
5½% Debenture Stock maturing June 1st, 1919	.. .. $2,133,300	
maturing June 1st, 1920..	 391,700	
maturing June 1st, 1921..	 376,700	
		2,901,700
1st War Loan maturing 1925..	.. ..	43,933,900
2nd War Loan maturing 1931..	.. ..	54,689,900
3rd War Loan maturing 1937..	.. ..	92,652,800
4th War Loan maturing 1922..	.. .. $206,256,250	
" " " 1927..	 65,724,550	
" " " 1937..	 246,413,000	
		518,393,800

5th War Loan maturing 1923	$218,346,000	
" " " 1933	477,400,000	
		695,746,000
3½% bond loan maturing 1925-28	$12,404,678	
4½% bond loan maturing 1925-45	95,207,351	
		107,612,029

From this statement the House will see how necessary it was to issue long date securities even at war rates of interest. If we had to face the maturity of so vast a principal amount as is represented by our war borrowings in Canada within a period of five or ten years after the war, I may frankly say that the solution of such a problem would tax to the utmost the resource of any Minister of Finance. But with the various maturities spread over so long a period of years, ample time is afforded to adopt whatever measures may be needed to meet the redemption of each loan as it matures.

In the United States our maturities are as follows:

August 1st, 1919	$75,000,000
April 1st, 1921	25,000,000
April 1st, 1926	25,000,000
April 1st, 1931	25,000,000
August 1st, 1935	873,000

As of March 31 last other short date Treasury Bills payable in Canada were outstanding with maturities as follows:

October 1, 1919	24,605,000
October 15, 1919	49,215,000

On the same date our financial resources were as follows:

In Canadian banks	$135,000,000
In Bank of Montreal, London	10,000,000
In Bank of Montreal, New York	4,414,047
Amount to be received on account of last Victory Loan	55,000,000
Total	$204,414,047

On account of this being, as respects expenditure, a war year, we shall have to float at least one further loan in Canada for purposes connected with the war and demobilization. Any necessary external financing to meet loans maturing outside of Canada will receive timely attention.

As the aggregate of our war issues exceeds our net war expenditure it is to be pointed out that during the war we were enabled to make advances to Great Britain for her purchases in Canada to a greater extent than we availed ourselves of advances from the Imperial Government to meet our war expenditure in England and on the continent. The result is that there is owing to us by the Imperial Government a balance, after making the necessary set-offs, of about two hundred and thirty million dollars. This is subject to reduction by the unascertained amount which we shall pay in respect of increased charges for ammunition at the front since September 1, 1917. An inquiry is now being made for the purpose of adjusting this charge.

The following information will be of interest to the House as to Dominion note issues at the close of the war:

Total Dominion Notes outstanding March 31, 1919 $298,058,697.67 of which $153,630,697.67 is secured to the amount of $116,014,654.37 in gold reserve and $144,428,000 by securities.

Our gold is thus 38.92 per cent of the total issue of $298,058,697.67, and 75·52 per cent of the $153,630,697.67 against which no securities other than gold are held.

A comparison with the note issues of Great Britain and the other Allies, including United States which was less than two years in the war, is such as to cause satisfaction to Canada with respect to the post-war condition of our currency.

The policy will be to gradually restore our note issue to the statutory condition, which requires us to hold in gold 25 per cent up to fifty million dollars of note issue and dollar for dollar for any further issue. This can be done by buying gold on the one hand, or on the other by retiring outstanding notes from time to time from the proceeds of loans or from revenue. It will be a long time before the currency inflation of the world will be abated.

The figures which I have given show the increase in the national debt of Canada due to the war. Interest must, of course, be paid annually upon this debt, and I have had a careful estimate made as to the yearly burden which this will entail.

Assuming the total debt of Canada on March 31, 1920, to be $1,950,000,000, the estimated annual interest charge will be approximately $115,000,000. This compares with $12,893,504, which was the interest charge upon the national debt as of the fiscal year ended March 31, 1914.

But the added annual burden due to the war does not rest there. There is the further responsibility for pensions to our soldiers and their dependents. For the past fiscal year the amount paid on this account was $17,460,000. For the present fiscal year it may reach $30,000,000. For a generation or more to come we may look forward to providing, say, $35,000,000 to $40,000,000 per

annum for pensions. In addition there will be the annual expense for maintenance of hospitals, convalescent homes, and other services established for the aid and comfort of our soldiers. No national expenditures will, I am sure, be more gladly borne than these by the people of Canada, who will never fail to appreciate the sacrifices made on their behalf by those who fought for Canada in the great war.

Having indicated the extent of the financial burden which the war has imposed upon us, it seems advisable to pause to inquire how that burden is to be met. What are the resources upon which Canada must depend to carry this huge national debt and the annual charge for pensions and other services which I have mentioned? We are to-day a prosperous community of high average productivity. I am not prepared to say that even without extraordinary effort we should not be able to merely carry along the extra financial burden imposed by the war. But its magnitude must not be minimized, and it is for us to consider and put into effect such policies as may be appropriate to counteract the disadvantage under which we shall labour in this regard and to insure the continued prosperity of our people, notwithstanding this great national handicap upon their exertions. In this connection we should undoubtedly have in mind the gradual extinction over a long course of years of the debt by a sinking fund provision to be put into effect as soon as possible after the conclusion of the present year. With this I do not intend to deal further for the present.

What are our resources, actual and potential, from which we can carry the interest, pensions, and other war charges, and gradually extinguish our indebtedness due to the war?

We have a country of almost unlimited natural assets, vast stretches of cultivable lands, magnificent forests, regions abounding in mineral wealth, and fisheries the most valuable in the world. We have a highly intelligent, energetic, enterprising people of great stability of character and ardent aspiration for national and individual success. To develop our natural resources there is required the application of enterprise, capital, and labour. To sell our products we require markets, domestic and foreign.

Let us for a moment consider some of the policies which are essential for the realization of the development I have outlined. Our ability to meet and retire our war obligations will depend upon our power to increase our production of natural and manufactured commodities and to economize individually so as to bring about each year substantial increase in domestic wealth and savings and a more favourable balance in our international trade. In other words, the motto for the future, as it was for the war, must be "Produce and Save."

As evidencing what can be done by Canada in the way of national saving, I can not do better than give the following statistics of deposits, demand and notice, in our chartered banks for the years 1913 to 1919, inclusive:—

Mch. 31.	Demand Deposits	Withdrawable on notice	Total.
1913	$357,756,659	$ 630,434,708	$ 988,191,367
1914	350,884,153	665,994,852	1,016,879,005
1915	406,735,171	714,219,286	1,120,954,457
1916	459,277,454	836,593,269	1,295,870,723
1917	538,869,362	1,008,657,874	1,547,527,236
1918	666,366,359	939,329,271	1,605,695,630
1919	566,797,268	1,037,851,766	1,604,649,034

The bank deposits in Canada almost doubled in the six-year period from 1913 to 1919. In connection with these figures, there should also be taken into account the subscription by the Canadian people to the war loans floated in Canada and paid for by withdrawal of their deposits in our chartered banks and other financial institutions.

To greatly increase our production we need more population and particularly that class which will engage in our basic industries. Our immigration policy is therefore of prime importance. We must fill up our vacant cultivable lands. In the past we have not been sufficiently selective in our immigration. We are so amending our laws as to ensure that the destinies of this country will always be controlled by those who may be depended upon as loyal and patriotic citizens of Canada, ready at all times to take up arms in her defence no matter from what source aggression may come. It is interesting to note that during the war immigration, likely to result in increased production, continued, although on a comparatively small scale. The figures are as follows:

Immigration for	1914-15	144,789
"	" 1915-16	48,537
"	" 1916-17	75,374
"	" 1917-18	79,074
"	" 1918-19	57,702

Since March 31 last immigrants to the number of 12,000 have entered Canada.

As a great food-producing country Canada is bound always to enjoy agricultural prosperity. The war has caused the death of millions of the rural workers of Europe, devastated vast tracts of cultivated lands,

consumed the horses, cattle and other domestic animals, and destroyed the implements of tillage.

It must be many years before Europe is able to recover agriculturally from the effects of the war. In the meantime the hungry millions must be fed and it would seem certain that Canada's agriculture will not lack for profitable markets for all it can produce.

The yearly exportable surplus of the Dominion's grain and foodstuffs should go far towards ensuring most favourable trade balances for the future. For the reconstruction work in Europe our raw materials and their products must also be in demand. Every effort must be made to develop and expand our export trade in manufactured articles as well as in the immediate products of our fields, forests, and mines. The more highly finished the commodity the greater the price which it will bring to the Dominion. Our policy should be directed to ensuring so far as practicable the completion within Canada, in Canadian shops and mills, of manufacturing processes in order that we may obtain the benefit of the greater value of finished products as compared with that of raw materials or partly manufactured articles.

No doubt we shall be subject in this to the keenest international competition, and to succeed we shall require to avail ourselves of every assistance which can be legitimately afforded by the Government in obtaining information respecting, and access to, foreign markets, as well as transportation and financial facilities.

One most important asset which we possess as a result of the war is the increased capability of industrial production which was turned during the war to such remarkable purpose in the manufacture of munitions and other materials. In all departments of our national activity—agricultural, industrial, commercial and financial—the war discovered to the people of Canada a capacity in themselves for achievement which they would not have dreamed they possessed had not the pressure of emergency called forth their latent genius for organization, administration and efficiency. This higher capability among all classes should prove of the greatest value in enabling us to deal with our after-war problems and burdens.

As illustrating the vast strides made by our foreign trade during the war, the following statistical information is submitted.

In 1913 the balance of trade against us was $300,000,000. In 1914 our total international trade was $1,073,000,000, of which $618,000,000 was in imports and $455,000,000 in exports. For 1918 the total was $2,550,000,000, of which $962,000,000 was imports and $1,586,000,000 exports. For 1919 the unrevised figures show a total of $2,169,000,000, of which $916,000,000 was imports and $1,253,000,000 exports. It will thus appear that from an adverse balance of $300,000,000 in 1913 and of $160,000,000 in 1914, we had attained a favourable balance of over $600,000,000 in 1918 and of $340,000,000 for 1919. At the end of the five-year period from 1914 to 1919 our total trade had doubled, while for the year 1918, which marked the highest point, it aggregated 2½ times the trade of 1914.

It must be kept in mind respecting these figures that the higher prices of our grain, foodstuffs and other exports, and of the goods which we imported, is a most important factor for consideration, and further that of our exports for 1918 and 1919 the estimated amount of ammunition, explosives and other war materials aggregated $418,000,000 and $260,000,000 respectively. The cessation of the manufacture of these articles and any fall in the price of commodities generally are bound to make serious changes in our trade aggregates unless offset by increased production. For the information of the House I here place upon Hansard the statistical details of our total trade, also details of our trade with the United Kingdom, with the United States, and of exports (by classes) of Canadian produce for the past six years; also of imports from and to the United Kingdom and the overseas Dominions, and the principal foreign nations with whom we traded for the past two years.

CANADIAN TRADE.

	Merchandise Only		Total Trade.
	Imports for Consumption.	Exports (Domestic and Foreign).	
Fiscal year ended Mar. 31—	$	$	$
1913	670,089,066	377,068,355	1,047,157,421
1914	618,457,144	455,437,224	1,073,894,368
1918	962,543,746	1,586,169,792	2,548,713,538
1919 (unrevised)	916,443,332	1,253,080,170	2,169,523,502

TRADE WITH THE UNITED KINGDOM.

——	Imports for Consumption.	Exports (Canadian Produce).	Total.
Fiscal year ended Mar. 31—	$	$	$
1913	138,741,736	170,161,903	308,903,639
1914	132,070,362	215,253,969	347,324,331
1918	81,302,403	845,480,069	926,782,472
1919 (unrevised)	73,029,215	531,920,977	604,950,192

TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

——	Imports for Consumption.	Exports (Canadian Produce).	Total.
Fiscal year ended Mar. 31—	$	$	$
1913	435,770,081	139,725,953	575,496,034
1914	395,565,328	163,372,825	558,938,153
1918	791,906,125	417,812,807	1,209,718,932
1919 (unrevised)	746,940,654	454,923,170	1,201,863,824

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS BY COUNTRIES.

Countries.	Imports for Consumption (Merchandise only).		Exports (Domestic).	
	Year ended Mar. 31, 1918.	Year ended Mar. 31, 1919.	Year ended Mar. 31, 1918.	Year ended Mar. 31, 1919.
	$	$	$	$
United Kingdom	81,302,403	73,029,215	845,480,069	531,920,977
Australia	2,356,655	4,963,416	8,653,635	14,019,629
British South Africa	553,362	1,300,259	5,065,658	11,992,299
British India	9,355,593	8,395,290	2,995,630	2,905,426
British Guiana	6,716,647	6,747,072	1,978,323	2,646,169
British West Indies	10,550,550	8,082,790	6,838,563	9,829,072
Newfoundland	2,947,527	3,098,834	10,191,564	11,327,074
New Zealand	3,735,559	7,855,436	4,089,823	6,227,509
Other British Empire	10,515,185	10,188,104	3,494,911	5,461,789
Total British Empire	128,033,481	123,660,416	888,788,376	596,329,789
Argentine Republic	984,955	1,139,267	1,203,142	4,603,130
Belgium	12,973	6,270	4,909,453	950,318
Cuba	1,085,547	2,628,031	4,015,940	5,035,975
France	5,274,053	3,641,244	201,053,676	92,103,142
Italy	771,487	555,112	3,336,059	13,181,514
Japan	12,255,319	13,618,122	4,861,244	11,845,439
Netherlands	1,054,176	495,409	2,462,574	198,985
United States	791,906,125	746,940,654	417,812,807	454,923,170
Total Foreign Countries	834,488,366	792,783,016	651,239,412	611,284,017
Grand Totals	962,521,847	916,443,432	1,540,027,788	1,207,613,806

EXPORTS OF CANADA, BY CLASSES.

	Canadian Produce.	
	The Mine.	The Fisheries.
Fiscal year ended Mar. 31—	$	$
1913	57,442,546	16,337,721
1914	59,039,054	20,623,560
1918	73,760,502	32,602,151
1919 (unrevised)	77,439,963	37,137,072

	The Forest.	Animals and their Produce.
Fiscal year ended Mar. 31—	$	$
1913	43,255,060	44,784,593
1914	42,792,137	53,349,119
1918	51,899,704	172,743,081
1919 (unrevised)	70,024,644	197,805,478

	Agricultural Products.	Manufactures.
Fiscal year ended Mar. 31—	$	$
1913	150,145,661	43,692,708
1914	198,220,029	57,443,452
1918	567,713,584	636,602,516
1919 (unrevised)	269,819,833	549,284,268

Estimated amount of cartridges, explosives, ammunition and other war materials exported during the year ended Mar. 31, 1918	$	418,000,000
Estimated amount of cartridges, explosives, ammunition and other war materials exported during the year ended Mar. 31, 1919		260,000,000

During the war the condition of our foreign trade has been greatly changed. The outstanding feature has been the increase in total to which I have referred and the reversal of the unfavourable to a most favourable balance. The trend of our trade for the war period may be observed from the following summary:

United Kingdom.

The imports from the United Kingdom have decreased from the fiscal year 1913-14 to the year 1918-19 from $132,000,000 to $73,000,000 and our exports (domestic produce) have increased from $215,000,000 during the year just preceding the war to $532,000,000 during the year 1918-19.

Other Parts of the British Empire.

Our imports from other parts of the British Empire increased from $22,000,000 during the fiscal year 1913-14 to $50,000,000 during the fiscal year 1918-19, and exports (domestic produce) increased from $23,000,000 to $64,000,000 during the same period.

United States.

The trade with the United States has greatly increased during the war period. The imports from this country in 1913-14 were $395,000,000 and in 1918-19 were nearly $747,000,000, while the exports (domestic) increased from $163,000,000 to $454,000,000.

France.

The imports from France have decreased from $14,000,000 in 1913-14 to $3,600,000 in 1918-19, while the exports increased from $3,600,000 to $92,000,000 during the same period. The exports were largely munitions and other war supplies..

Italy.

The imports from Italy during the war period decreased from $2,000,000 to $550,000 and the exports increased from $500,000 in

1913-14 to over $13,000,000 in 1918-19. In the year 1917-18 the principal exports were asbestos, canned salmon, canned meats, wheat, oats, oatmeal and explosives.

Japan.

The imports from Japan during the year 1913-14 were $2,600,000 and increased to $13,600,000 in the year 1918-19. The principal goods included in the increase would appear to be of a class formerly imported from Germany and Austria-Hungary. Our exports (domestic) to Japan in 1913-14 were $1,500,000 which increased to nearly $12,000,000 in 1918-19.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister state whether our largest customer is Great Britain or the United States?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Our total trade with Great Britain including imports and exports in 1918-19 was $605,000,000. Our total trade with the United States was $1,201,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having dealt with the financial and commercial position of the Dominion, I now proceed to the consideration of the important problem of our estimated expenditure for the present fiscal year 1919-20 and the fiscal proposals which the Government has to make in connection therewith.

It will be advantageous in assisting us to reach a conclusion with respect to these matters if I first briefly review the result of the last fiscal year which ended on March 31, 1919. During that year the expenditure of the Dominion upon account of the ordinary services of the Government amounted to $240,000,000. The outlay upon capital account aggregated $22,000,000. For war, the total expenditure for the year is estimated at $450,000,000 (that is the last fiscal year). On the other side of the account we estimate a total revenue for the year 1918-19 of $310,000,000. As emphasizing the importance of this figure, I may point out that for the fiscal year before the war the total revenue was $163,174,394. For the fiscal year which ended on March 31, 1909, the revenue was only $85,093,404. Of this total of $310,000,000 (the revenue for the last fiscal year), $147,000,000 was received from customs; $30,000,000 from excise; $21,000,000 from post office; $33,000,000 from taxation under the Business Profits War Tax Act; $10,000,000 from the Income War Tax Act; $14,000,000 from other war taxation; and $55,000,000 from other miscellaneous sources, including $38,000,000 from railways.

If we follow the practice which has been hitherto adopted in treating as surplus the amount of revenue received in excess of the ordinary expenditure, it will appear that for the past fiscal year the Government had a surplus of $70,000,000, which was devoted to war expenditure. If, on the other hand, we first appropriated our revenue to the payment of both ordinary and capital expenditure, the surplus which was used for war expenditure was $48,000,000.

I have already stated the estimated war expenditure for the past year to have been $450,000,000. Of this expenditure, therefore, $48,000,000 was paid out of revenue after meeting all other outlays on the part of the Government, including capital expenditure.

In connection with our expenditures during the past year and generally throughout the period of the war, I may observe with respect to both ordinary and capital outlays that they have been kept well in hand, and that the increased expenditure under this heading is attributable principally to interest upon our war debt and pensions.

I now proceed to estimate the revenue and outlay of the present year. Main estimates totalling $437,000,000 have been laid before the House, with Supplementary estimates still to be brought down. Embraced in these estimates are certain considerable amounts representing investments. I refer particularly to the estimate of $25,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of soldiers' land settlement; $35,000,000 loan to Canadian Northern Railway Company; $35,000,000 for railway equipment purposes; and $25,000,000 to be advanced by way of loans to the several Provincial Governments for promoting better housing conditions. The estimate for expenditure on ordinary account for the coming year is $270,000,000. Of this the sum of $102,000,000 represents interest on the national debt. This figure contrasts with $12,893,000 representing interest charges upon the national debt before the war. It includes also the sum of $30,000,000 for estimated pension expenditure for the year. It is these two items of interest and pensions which will particularly constitute the burden of the war upon the taxpayers of the country for a great many years to come; until, in fact, the national debt is materially reduced and pensions gradually run their course. The estimated expenditure on capital account for the year we place at $50,000,000.

This is a war year and it is necessary also to add the estimated expenditure which has been and will be incurred on account of demobilization. This will aggregate the large sum of $300,000,000, including $92,000,000 for

war gratuity. The entire estimated expenditure, therefore, of the year on ordinary account, capital account, and for demobilization will reach the large total of $620,000,000.

Assuming that we maintained, without change, existing fiscal legislation, and that the yield of the various services would be upon the same basis as for 1918-19, our estimate of revenue for the present year would be as follows:

Customs	$145,000,000
Excise	30,000,000
Post Office	18,000,000
Business Profits War Tax	35,000,000
Income Tax	20,000,000
Other War Taxation	14,000,000
Miscellaneous sources	18,000,000
	$280,000,000

In this estimate we have, owing to the change to be made, commencing with this year, in the mode of financial administration of the Intercolonial and other Government railways, omitted $30,000,000 of revenue from that source. That revenue will henceforth be received by the Canadian National Railway Company and applied directly against its working expenditure. In our estimate of ordinary expenditure for the year we have allowed for a corresponding reduction.

While from the statement which I have just made it will appear that our total estimated expenditure, ordinary and capital accounts, and for demobilization, will amount to $620,000,000, our estimated revenue on the present basis will reach only $280,000,000. Putting it another way, our revenue would enable us to pay only our ordinary expenditure and leave a small amount to be applied to other purposes.

The question which now arises is what shall be our policy in the matter of taxation for the present year. It is a year of great industrial instability and business uncertainty. If the war were still continuing it would be necessary to recommend heavily increased taxation in order that we might pay a substantial portion of the principal of our war expenditure. If it were not for special circumstances arising out of this transitional period from war to peace that course should be adopted, notwithstanding the ending of the war, because we shall have this year so heavy a volume of what is really war expenditure, that is to say, our outlay for demobilization and all that it involves. We must, however, bear specially in mind the anxieties and burdens of the general public at a time of dislocation, unrest and high prices, and endeavour to wisely bridge over this troubled period by giving such measure of relief as may be practicable, having regard to the heavy financial obligations devolving upon us and our national credit in the eyes of the outside world.

The cost of living in Canada has, in common with all other countries, gradually increased during the war and is causing hardship to a large portion of our population, especially those of limited means and slender incomes. I am of opinion that for this transitional period we are justified in adopting the policy of meeting only our ordinary expenditure and borrowing for our capital and demobilization expenditure.

In considering the question of reductions and increases in indirect taxation most careful attention must be given to their effect upon established industry and the employment of operatives dependent upon its success for the maintenance of themselves and their families, and upon the domestic trade and commerce which it supports.

Having fully considered all aspects of the subject the Government submits the following proposals:

Under the Customs Tariff War Revenue Act, 1915, a British preferential tariff rate of five per cent and an intermediate and general tariff rate of seven and a half per cent were imposed upon, with certain exceptions, all imported goods.

We propose to wholly repeal this British preferential tariff rate of five per cent. Further, we propose to partially repeal the intermediate and general tariff rate of seven and one-half per cent at present in effect under the Customs Tariff War Revenue Act referred to by making it no longer applicable to the following classes of articles, namely:—

Foodstuffs, linen and cotton clothing, woollen clothing, boots and shoes, fur caps and fur clothing, hats, caps, hoods and bonnets, gloves and mitts, collars and cuffs, hides, skins, leather, harness and saddlery, agricultural implements, petroleum oils, mining machinery, and bituminous coal.

Those classes embrace a very large variety of individual articles which will be disclosed in the resolution.

So much for the reductions from the tariff rates established by the Customs Tariff War Revenue Act, 1915. We have now certain other reductions and modifications to propose in respect of the ordinary tariff rates, that is to say, the tariff rates established under the tariff of 1907 and amendments thereto. I call them, for the purpose of distinguishing them from the special customs

war duties, the ordinary tariff rates. The resolutions presented in this regard will provide for a reduction of five cents per pound in the British preferential, intermediate and general tariff rates on roasted or ground coffee and three cents per pound under the British preferential tariff on British grown teas. This latter reduction gives a substantial Empire preference where no preference at present exists.

We shall provide for the free importation into Canada of wheat, wheat flour and potatoes from countries which do not impose a customs duty on such articles grown or produced in Canada.

We shall also provide for an alteration in the rates on soda ash from five per cent under the British preferential tariff and seven and a half per cent under the general tariff to one-fifth of a cent a pound under the British preferential tariff and three-tenths of a cent per pound under the general tariff.

We shall provide further for specific instead of ad valorem rates of duty upon pig-lead, zinc spelter, and copper in-
4 p.m. gots. On certain products made from these materials there will be an increase in duties.

I come now to the consideration of agricultural implements. I have stated that we propose to take off the Customs war revenue duties. But for an arrangement we have been able to make for the equalization of Canadian freight rates with those enjoyed by American competitors of our industries engaged in the manufacture of these implements, it would not have been practicable to make any reductions in the ordinary tariff schedule covering these articles. Under the ordinary tariff, rates of duty upon manufactured products are closely related to duties upon raw material, coal, machinery, and other equipment used in their manufacture, and any reduction except upon an occasion of general revision when the tariff as a whole can be dealt with would necessarily lead to most serious consequences.

Desirous as we were of providing for as low a duty as might be practicable upon these implements of agricultural production so essential to Canada at this time, the problem before us was how to make it possible to reduce the ordinary tariff rates.

The business of manufacturing agricultural implements is almost wholly confined to Eastern Canada. So far as concerns their great market in the West, Canadian firms and companies engaged in this industry have been handicapped as against their American competitors by higher freight rates. The freights charged by Canadian railway companies upon shipments from eastern points to Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary, Edmonton and other western points have been higher than the rates from Chicago to the same points. This has been caused by the fact that the manufacturing centres of the eastern provinces are separated by great distances from the consuming and distributing centres of the West. The American manufacturer of agricultural implements is not only closer to the American consumer and American distributing points but he is also nearer to the western distributing points of Canada.

In view of these circumstances it appeared to us that we should seek assistance in freight reduction to enable us to reduce the ordinary tariff upon these implements. The plan was not free of difficulty. In so far as railway rates, as such, are concerned, the railway rates in Canada, although recently raised, are certainly not more than sufficient to make a carrying return on the value of the properties used for transportation. Indeed, having regard to railway investment, railway returns, owing to the very great increases in the cost of operation, may well be described as low. In view of this, it is, of course, impossible to expect a reduction in railway rates to be ordered by the Railway Commission.

As a rate-making proposition, reductions at the present time are impossible. We have, however, approached the railway companies with a view of overcoming the difficulty of distance to the greatest extent possible, and of doing so without unduly injuring railway revenues and credits. At the present time railways, which are the largest consumers of bituminous coal, pay a war duty of seven and a half per cent on the value of the imported commodity. As this duty is an addition to the specific tax upon this coal, a heavy resultant charge has been thrown upon the operating railways, whose fuel costs, in view of the advanced price of coal alone, have been greatly increased.

The proposal which we made to the rail carriers was that they should reduce their rates from the eastern manufacturing points of production of agricultural implements, Montreal, and east of the Great Lakes, to prairie points, to the rates charged by the American lines with shorter mileages, from Chicago to the similar western destinations, stating that if the

railway companies could see their way to do this they would be assisted to the extent that relief would be afforded them by the abolition of the seven and a half per cent war duty on bituminous coal.

In the first instance, the railway companies claimed that, in view of their financial obligations, it was entirely impossible for them to sacrifice any revenue whatever, but that their existing revenues were, as a matter of fact, insufficient.

The question, however, was not allowed to stand, but other representations were made to the companies, such as the national necessity of making farming operations in the West more profitable, of increasing the population of the West, and the resultant interest that the companies themselves would have from the traffic which a larger and more prosperous population would afford, and also the fact that such conditions would render more saleable the railway lands owned by companies in the West, an argument which appealed with special force to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which company has perhaps as much interest in the proper development and prosperity of the West as any other interest can possibly have.

I am very glad to be able to say that the railway companies have recognized the large overlying national interest, and have consented to put in tariffs as asked. The new tariffs will give the Chicago rate on agricultural implements from producing centres in the East, west of Montreal and east of the Great Lakes, to prairie points, for carlot movements, loaded to a minimum of 24,000 pounds. This reduction is a substantial concession made by the railways, as the following statement of present rates will indicate:

Movement. From.	To.	Mileage.	Rate.
Toronto-Winnipeg		1,233	82½ cents
Chicago-Winnipeg		876	67½ "
Toronto-Brandon		1,366	95 "
Chicago-Brandon		931	80 "
Toronto-Portage la Prairie		1,288	87½ "
Chicago-Portage la Prairie		873	72½ "
Toronto-Regina		1,590	$1.12½
Chicago-Regina		1,069	1.02½
Toronto-Yorkton		1,512	1.06½
Chicago-Yorkton		1,143	.96½
Chicago-Moose Jaw		1,141	1.07½
Chicago-Moose Jaw		1,141	1.07½
Toronto-Saskatoon		1,713	1.22½
Chicago-Saskatoon		1,241	1.12½
Toronto-Swift Current		1,742	1.24
Chicago-Swift Current		1,222	1.14
Toronto-Medicine Hat		1,889	1.35
Chicago-Medicine Hat		1,369	1.25
Toronto-Lethbridge		1,990	1.41½
Chicago-Lethbridge		1,481	1.31½
Toronto-Calgary		2,056	1.49
Chicago-Calgary		1,536	1.37½

[Sir Thomas White.]

The rates to Edmonton are the same from both points as those to Calgary.

The reduction will be appreciated when it is recognized that, for example, to Regina, the Canadian haul of 1,590 miles equalizes the haul from American territory of 1,069 miles, while to Medicine Hat the Canadian movement is 520 miles longer than the American movement, although the rate will become the same.

It must also be borne in mind that although, as the above schedule indicates, the rates for equivalent distances in the United States are higher than in Canada, notwithstanding a greater density and diversity of traffic, combined with a lower fuel cost, the United States operations, as indicated by the reports made by the United States Railroad Administration, are now being carried on at an operating loss.

The companies made these concessions then, not on any rate basis, nor for any railway advantage, and without regard to rates on other articles or railway returns or necessities—simply to meet a situation of national importance. The companies state that their action thus taken must not in any way be regarded as a measure for profitable transportation, and that it is absolutely impossible that railway revenues can be further affected by any rate reductions on any other commodities.

In view of the arrangement for freight reduction made with the railway companies, we are enabled to make the following proposals for reductions in customs duties upon agricultural implements.

Mr. ROBB: Has the minister any statement as to the difference between the new rate and the Canadian rate in force prior to 1912?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no information before me as to that.

Including the 7½ per cent war duty reduction to which I have already referred, our proposals if adopted by the House will provide for a total reduction under the general tariff from 27½ per cent to 15 per cent on cultivators, harrows, horse-rakes, seed-drills, manure spreaders, and weeders, and complete parts thereof, and from 27½ per cent to 17½ per cent on ploughs and complete parts thereof, windmills and complete parts thereof, portable engines and traction engines for farm purposes, horse powers and threshing machine separators and appliances therefor.

On hay-loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm, road or field rollers,

post-hole diggers, snaiths and other agricultural implements, the resolutions will provide for a total reduction in the rate from 32½ per cent to 20 per cent, and a similar reduction on farm wagons.

In the case of cement, the war customs duty will be repealed and the general tariff rate will be reduced to 8 cents per hundred pounds. This is a reduction of 2 cents from the present general tariff rate.

The total estimated loss in revenue from the tariff reductions which we have proposed aggregates seventeen million dollars. Owing to estimated reduction in the total volume of imports into Canada due to diminished purchasing power during the current year and probable decline in prices as well, we may expect that, including the loss due to the reductions now proposed, we shall sustain a total loss in customs revenue for the present fiscal year of at least twenty-five million dollars. To partially offset this loss and close the gap of the deficit of fifteen million dollars between revenue and current expenditure which it would cause, we propose a heavy increase in income taxation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Under the proposed changes mentioned by the minister a moment ago, does the Order in Council which was passed two years ago concerning wheat, now become permanent? In other words, are we to have free wheat between the United States and Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have had free wheat ever since the Order in Council was passed. I presented to the House the opinion of the Minister of Justice that the provision was on as permanent a basis as if it had been placed in a statute. But if my hon. friend has any doubt on the question, it would now be removed by the fact that we are providing, by the resolution which we shall lay before the House, for placing wheat, wheat flour, and semolina upon the free list to countries which do not impose duties upon those articles coming from Canada.

I was referring to our proposals with regard to income tax. We propose that all corporations shall pay ten per cent on their net income in excess of two thousand dollars. The present tax is six per cent. Shareholders shall be given credit for the normal tax to which they are liable upon dividends received from companies subject to this taxation. That is the same principle as applies to the present income tax.

In the case of individuals, we propose that the normal rate of four per cent shall be levied upon all incomes exceeding one thousand dollars, but not exceeding six thousand dollars, in the case of unmarried persons and widows or widowers without dependent children, and upon all incomes exceeding two thousand dollars but not exceeding six thousand dollars in the case of all other persons.

We propose a normal tax of eight per cent upon all incomes exceeding six thousand dollars.

We propose that the surtax shall commence from five thousand dollars instead of from six thousand dollars as at present, and shall increase by graduation, applying firstly to incomes between five thousand dollars and six thousand dollars, and to every two thousand dollars between six thousand dollars and one hundred thousand dollars.

Upon incomes in excess of one hundred thousand dollars, materially increased rates are levied.

The following compilation shows in detail what is proposed:

In addition to the normal tax rates which I have mentioned payable on incomes in excess of $1,000 in respect to unmarried persons and widows and widowers without dependent children and $2,000 in respect to all other persons a surtax will be payable as follows:

1 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $5,000 and does not exceed $6,000.

2 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $6,000 and does not exceed $8,000.

3 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $8,000 and does not exceed $10,000.

4 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $10,000 and does not exceed $12,000.

5 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $12,000 and does not exceed $14,000.

6 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $14,000 and does not exceed $16,000.

7 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $16,000 and does not exceed $18,000.

8 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $18,000 and does not exceed $20,000.

9 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $20,000 and does not exceed $22,000.

10 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $22,000 and does not exceed $24,000.

11 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $24,000 and does not exceed $26,000.

12 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $26,000 and does not exceed $28,000.

13 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $28,000 and does not exceed $30,000.

14 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $30,000 and does not exceed $32,000.

15 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $32,000 and does not exceed $34,000.

16 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $34,000 and does not exceed $36,000.

17 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $36,000 and does not exceed $38,000.

18 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $38,000 and does not exceed $40,000.

19 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $40,000 and does not exceed $42,000.

20 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $42,000 and does not exceed $44,000.

21 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $44,000 and does not exceed $46,000.

22 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $46,000 and does not exceed $48,000.

23 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $48,000 and does not exceed $50,000.

24 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $50,000 and does not exceed $52,000.

25 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $52,000 and does not exceed $54,000.

26 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $54,000 and does not exceed $56,000.

27 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $56,000 and does not exceed $58,000.

28 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $58,000 and does not exceed $60,000.

29 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $60,000 and does not exceed $62,000.

30 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $62,000 and does not exceed $64,000.

[Sir Thomas White.]

31 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $64,000 and does not exceed $66,000.

32 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $66,000 and does not exceed $68,000.

33 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $68,000 and does not exceed $70,000.

34 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $70,000 and does not exceed $72,000.

35 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $72,000 and does not exceed $74,000.

36 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $74,000 and does not exceed $76,000.

37 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $76,000 and does not exceed $78,000.

38 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $78,000 and does not exceed $80,000.

39 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $80,000 and does not exceed $82,000.

40 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $82,000 and does not exceed $84,000.

41 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $84,000 and does not exceed $86,000.

42 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $86,000 and does not exceed $88,000.

43 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $88,000 and does not exceed $90,000.

44 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $90,000 and does not exceed $92,000.

45 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $92,000 and does not exceed $94,000.

46 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $94,000 and does not exceed $96,000.

47 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $96,000 and does not exceed $98,000.

48 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $98,000 and does not exceed $100,000.

52 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $100,000 and does not exceed $150,000.

56 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $150,000 and does not exceed $200,000.

60 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $200,000 and does not exceed $300,000.

63 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $300,000 and does not exceed $500,000.

64 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $500,000 and does not exceed $1,000,000.

65 per centum of the amount by which the net income exceeds $1,000,000.

The following table furnishes a comparison of present and proposed taxation in respect of incomes ranging from $3,000 to $1,000,000 and over in respect of married persons and widows and widowers having dependent children:

Comparison of Rates.

Income	Present Tax	Proposed Tax
$ 3,000	$ 20	$ 40
4,000	60	80
5,000	100	120
6,000	140	170
8,000	266	370
10,000	392	590
12,000	590	830
14,000	788	1,090
16,000	986	1,370
18,000	1,184	1,670
20,000	1,382	1,990
22,000	1,646	2,330
24,000	1,910	2,690
26,000	2,174	3,070
28,000	2,438	3,470
30,000	2,702	3,890
32,000	3,010	4,330
34,000	3,318	4,790
36,000	3,626	5,270
38,000	3,934	5,770
40,000	4,242	6,290
42,000	4,550	6,830
44,000	4,858	7,390
46,000	5,166	7,970
48,000	5,474	8,570
50,000	5,782	9,190
52,000	6,200	9,830
54,000	6,618	10,490
56,000	7,036	11,170
58,000	7,454	11,870
60,000	7,872	12,590
62,000	8,290	13,330
64,000	8,708	14,090
66,000	9,126	14,870
68,000	9,544	15,670
70,000	9,962	16,490
72,000	10,380	17,330
74,000	10,798	18,190
76,000	11,271	19,070
78,000	11,799	19,970
80,000	12,327	20,890
82,000	12,855	21,830
84,000	13,383	22,790
86,000	13,911	23,770
88,000	14,439	24,770
90,000	14,967	25,790
92,000	15,495	26,830
94,000	16,023	27,890
96,000	16,551	28,970
98,000	17,079	30,070
100,000	17,607	31,190
150,000	34,282	61,190
200,000	50,957	93,190
300,000	96,857	161,190
500,000	195,407	303,190
1,000,000	499,157	663,190

Several amendments which the administration of the Income Tax Act has shown to be desirable will be submitted. The question of double taxation has given considerable difficulty. In view of the time which would be required to make international agreements respecting the matter we have thought it advisable to take the lead and provide for a deduction from the sum payable by a resident of Canada under our income tax legislation of the amount paid by him elsewhere in the British Empire upon income thence derived. We shall also provide for a similar deduction in respect of income derived from a foreign country extending similar exemption upon income derived from Canadian sources.

As this is a war year so far as public expenditures are concerned, and it is most desirable that we should maintain so far as possible our revenues, the Business Profits War Tax Act will be renewed for the current calendar year so as to make it apply to accounting periods ending on or before 31st December, 1919. The rates of the Business Profits War Tax Act which we are thus extending are as follows:

Businesses having a capital of $25,000 and over but less than $50,000, profits in excess of 10 per cent to be taxable—rate 25 per cent thereof.

Businesses having a capital of $50,000 and over (exemption for incorporated companies, 7 per cent; other than incorporated companies, 10 per cent); profits in excess of exemptions but not exceeding 15 per cent, rate of taxation 25 per cent; profits from 15 per cent to 20 per cent inclusive—rate of taxation 50 per cent; profits in excess of 20 per cent, rate of taxation 75 per cent.

In connection with both income and business profits taxation, I feel I should again call the attention of the House to certain considerations to which regard should, I think, be had in the general national interest. Canada is a country inviting immigration for settlement and capital and business enterprise for investment and development. We must be careful that our taxation of income and profits is not such as to place a barrier against either. In some provinces of Canada there are at present three sets of income taxes, municipal, provincial and federal. The result in these provinces is exceedingly heavy taxation upon individuals and business enterprise. Our business profits taxation, unless repealed as soon as war conditions terminate, must have an adverse influence upon the investment of money in business enterprise in Canada. At present there is a widespread tendency throughout the world to severely

tax profits. Within bounds such a policy is not open to criticism, but carried beyond a reasonable point it can only defeat its purpose, with consequences detrimental to capital, labour and the community as a whole.

Tariff Revision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having laid before the House the fiscal proposals which we have to make at this time, I feel the occasion opportune to make a statement respecting the important subject of general tariff revision.

The sound policy in this regard and the one which has been followed by all Administrations in Canada is that at certain periods, separated by intervals of eight or ten years, there should be a deliberate reconsideration and revision of the entire tariff schedules.

Such general revision becomes necessary in the national interest from time to time in order to adjust the tariff to the changed conditions which have arisen. In the intervals between general revisions the policy has been to make as few changes as possible in order that the business of the country which has adapted itself to existing tariff conditions may not be disturbed by sudden and unexpected change which always makes for uncertainty and lack of confidence. In 1897 there was a general tariff revision such as I have mentioned. In 1904 there was a revision of duties relating to a limited list of commodities embracing oils, glass, and woollen goods and provision was made for a special so-called dumping duty. This was not a general but a partial tariff revision. In 1907 there was a general revision, and in 1914 there was a partial revision. Had the war not occurred there would have been a general revision in 1916 or at the latest in 1917. The world-wide disturbance and unsettlement caused by the war and the organization of all production and business generally upon a war basis rendered such general revision out of the question for the time being. For the purpose of increasing the revenues of the Dominion and enabling us to defray in part our heavy war expenditure special war duties of 7½ per cent and 5 per cent were in 1915 added to the general and British preferential tariff rates respectively upon, with certain exceptions, all imports. The revenue received from this special war tariff has been as follows:

1915-16..	$25,256,787.89
1916-17..	37,830,427.39
1917-18..	45,018,562.27
1918-19..	44,726,091.67

[Sir Thomas White.]

When it is considered that for this year we are budgeting to raise barely the amount of our current expenditure and shall be obliged to borrow for our capital and demobilization expenditure, it will be seen how necessary it is to maintain in greater part at least this war tax upon imports.

It would not be practicable at this time to make a sound general revision of the tariff. International trade is most unsettled, still hampered by war restrictions and prohibitions and by exchange conditions, which are and may long continue to be subject to violent fluctuations. Prices are unstable, and labour conditions, internationally speaking, most uncertain. Until peace is restored and the world is upon a more stable basis with respect to capital, labour, prices, markets, and exchange, the tariff cannot be revised intelligently.

It is my hope that within a year conditions will have become so stabilized as to permit of a general revision of the tariff, which is long, but, owing to the war, unavoidably overdue. Preceding such revision there should be a thorough inquiry conducted by the Minister of Finance and two or more of his colleagues representing the different geographical sections of Canada. Such inquiry should afford all interests, agricultural, industrial, fishing, lumbering, mining, commercial, and financial, producers and consumers alike, an opportunity of expressing their views and opinions and urging their particular needs and requirements. The result of such inquiry should be a body of information which will enable the Government to effect a general revision of the tariff fair to all parts of the community, and effectually promoting the national welfare of Canada. This inquiry should proceed with its work just as soon as conditions are sufficiently stabilized to permit. My own view is that it might well be commenced about autumn of this year.

Before closing my remarks I feel I should make some general observations as to economic conditions prevailing in Canada today. An outstanding feature of the business situation is the fact that a great part of our business activity is due to the continued heavy expenditure of public money.

The policy of the Government for the so-called reconstruction period of transition from war to peace basis as illustrated in its programme with respect to shipbuilding, better housing, railway betterments and extensions, public works, and other national undertakings, together with its contribution

of war gratuities to soldiers and the creation of credits for the promotion of our external trade with Britain and other European countries is a vital factor in maintaining our commerce, domestic and foreign, keeping the wheels of Canadian industry turning and affording employment to hundreds of thousands of our people. The funds from which these activities and credits are financed and which aggregate many hundreds of millions of dollars are borrowed money. This being a war year—a year of dislocation and of readjustment, of business and industrial uncertainty, of general unrest and of high prices for the necessities of life, of demobilization and of re-absorption into civil life and occupation of our army, the Government is undoubtedly justified in the policy which it has adopted. To have pursued a timid or hesitating course with respect to making provision so far as possible for employment and for the promotion through public finance of our export trade in agricultural and manufactured products would have invited most serious conditions throughout Canada. During the unsettled period following the war Governments must do many things outside their function in ordinary times, which private enterprise through lack of resource or from apprehension as to the risk involved is not able or willing to undertake. It must, however, be pointed out that the continuation of such a policy is subject to strict limitation and that we must look forward and prepare for a time when the artificial support of employment and public financing of trade must be greatly reduced or discontinued and the industry and business of the country be re-established upon the normal basis of peace conditions. The sooner this can be accomplished the better it will be for the community as a whole.

In the meantime while the Government is, through the instrumentality of the public credit and otherwise, using every endeavour to alleviate conditions which have inevitably arisen out of the war and overcome the effects of the sudden cessation of the activities which it created it is the clear duty of all citizens to earnestly co-operate with the Government and with one another to the end that with the exercise of patience, goodwill, and high patriotic spirit we may tide over successfully this most trying and critical period in the national life of the Dominion.

I shall now read the resolutions:

RESOLVED that it is expedient to amend Schedule A to the Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by Chapter 15 of the Acts of 1913, by Chapter 3 of the Acts of 1915, by Chapter 7 of the Acts of 1916, by Chapter 17 of the Acts of 1918, and by Orders in Council, and to strike thereout tariff items:—24, 25, 25a, 26, 27, 28, 28a, 29, 60, 61, 83, 84, 210, 267a, 290, 329a, 337, 343, 345, 348, 350, 351, 356, 384, 446, 447, 448, 591, the several enumerations of goods respectively, and the several rates of duties of Customs, if any, set opposite each of the said items, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duties be inserted in said Schedule A:—

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff.
24	Chicory, raw or green.....per pound.	2¼ cents.	3 cents.	3 cents.
25	Chicory, kiln-dried, roasted or ground.....per pound.	3 cents.	5 cents.	5 cents.
25a	Coffee, extract of n.o.p., and substitutes thereof of all kinds. .....per pound.	5 cents.	7 cents.	7 cents.
26	Coffee, roasted or ground, and all imitations thereof and substitutes therefor, including acorn nuts, n.o.p...per pound.	3 cents.	5 cents.	5 cents.
27	Coffee, roasted or ground, when not imported direct from the country of growth and production.....per pound.	3 cents and 7½ p.c.	5 cents and 10 p.c.	5 cents and 10 p.c.
28	Coffee, green, imported direct from the country of growth and production, and green coffee purchasedin bond in the United Kingdom.....per pound.	2¼ cents.	3 cents.	3 cents.
28a	Tea imported direct from the country of growth and production, and tea purchased in bond in the United Kingdom.....per pound.	7 cents.	10 cents.	10 cents.
	When in wrappings, cartons or other packages weighing five pounds or less, the weight of the wrappings, cartons or other packages to be included in the weight for duty.			

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
29	Coffee, green, n.o.p.....per pound.	2¼ cents and 7½ p.c.	3 cents and 10 p.c.	3 cents and 10 p.c.
60	Wheat, n.o.p.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
60a	Wheat when imported from a country which imposes a Customs duty on wheat grown in Canada.....per bushel.	8 cents.	12 cents.	12 cents.
61	Wheat flour, n.o.p.; semolina, n.o.p.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
61a	Wheat flour and semolina when imported from a country which imposes a Customs duty on wheat flour or semolina manufactured in Canada.....per barrel.	30 cents.	50 cents.	50 cents.
83	Potatoes, n.o.p., and potatoes dried, desiccated or otherwise prepared, n.o.p.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
83a	Potatoes when imported from a country which imposes a Customs duty on potatoes grown in Canada.....per bushel.	12½ cents.	20 cents.	20 cents.
84	Potatoes dried, desiccated or otherwise prepared when imported from a country which imposes a Customs duty on such articles produced in Canada.....	15 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
210	Peroxide of soda; soda, sulphate of, crude, known as salt cake; silicate of soda in crystals or in solution; bichromate of soda; nitrate of soda or cubic nitre; sal soda; sulphide of sodium; nitrite of soda; arseniate, binarseniate, chlorate, bisulphite and stannate of soda; prussiate of soda and sulphite of soda..	Free.	Free.	Free.
210b	Barilla or soda ash.....per pound.	1/5 cent.	3/10 cent.	3/10 cent.
267a	Crude petroleum in its natural state, ·7900 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature, when imported by oil refiners to be refined in their own factories.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
290	Cement, Portland, and hydraulic or water lime, in barrels, bags, or casks, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.....per one hundred pounds	5 cents.	8 cents.	8 cents.
329a	Iron ore.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
337	Lead, old, scrap, pig and block.....per pound.	¾ cent.	1 cent.	1 cent.
343	Tin, in blocks, pigs or bars; tin strip waste, and tin foil.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
345	Zinc dust, sheets and plates; sal ammoniac skimmings; and seamless drawn tubing of zinc.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
345a	Zinc spelter and zinc in blocks, pigs, bars or rods.....per pound.	¾ cent.	1 cent.	1 cent.
348	Copper in blocks, ingots and pigs.....per pound.	1 cent.	1½ cents.	1½ cents.
348b	Brass and copper scrap.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
348c	Brass in blocks, ingots or pigs; copper in bars or rods, not less than six feet in length, unmanufactured, n.o.p.; copper in strips, sheets or plates, not polished, planished or coated; brass or copper tubing, in lengths not less than six feet, and not polished, bent or otherwise manufactured.....	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
348d	Copper in bars or rods when imported by manufacturers of trolley, telegraph and telephone wires, electric wires and electric cables for use only in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
356	Nickel in bars and rods, strips, sheets or plates.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
356a	Nickel silver and German silver in bars, rods, strips, sheets, plates or anodes.....	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
384	Rolled iron or steel sheets and strips, polished or not, number fourteen gauge and thinner, n.o.p.; Canada plates; Russia iron; terne plates and rolled sheets of iron or steel, coated with zinc, spelter or other metal, of all widths or thicknesses, n.o.p.; and rolled iron or steel hoop, band, scroll or strip, number fourteen gauge and thinner, galvanized, or coated with other metal, or not, n.o.p	7½ p.c.	12½ p.c.	12½ p.c.
384a	Rolled iron or steel hoop, band, scroll or strip, number fourteen gauge and thinner, and rolled iron or steel sheet, when imported by manufacturers for use only in their own factories in the manufacture of galvanized iron or steel hoop, bands, croll, strip or sheet	Free.	Free.	Free.
446	Cultivators, harrows, horse-rakes, seed-drills, manure spreaders and weeders and complete parts thereof	10 p.c.	15 p.c.	15 p.c.
446b	Ploughs and complete parts thereof	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	17½ p.c.
446c	Windmills and complete parts thereof, not including shafting	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	17½ p.c.
447	Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horse-powers and traction engines for farm purposes; windstackers, and threshing machine separators, including baggers, weighers and self-feeders therefor, and complete parts of all articles specified in this tariff item	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	17½ p.c.
448	Hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm, road or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaiths; and other agricultural implements, n.o.p	12½ p.c.	20 p.c.	20 p.c.
591	Farm wagons and complete parts thereof	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	20 p.c.
591a	Freight wagons, drays and sleighs, and complete parts thereof	17½ p.c.	25 p.c.	25 p.c.
705a	Settlers' effects, viz.:—Machines, vehicles and implements for agricultural purposes, moved by mechanical power, if actually owned abroad by the settler for at least six months before his removal to Canada, and subject to regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.
	Provided that the said machines, vehicles and implements may not be so entered unless brought by the settler on his first arrival, and shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of without payment of duty until after twelve months' actual use in Canada.			

2. RESOLVED that it is expedient to amend Chapter 3 of the Acts of 1915 by striking out in subsections 1 and 2 of section 3 the rate of duty " 5 p.c." under the words " British Preferential Tariff" and substituting therefor the word " nil " in each subsection.

3. RESOLVED that it is expedient to provide that the following goods shall be exempt from the provisions of section 3 of Chapter 3 of the Acts of 1915:
   (r) materials imported to be used in the manufacture of goods enumerated in tariff items 446, 446b, 446c, 447, 448, 449, 450 and 591;
   (s) olive oil and peanut oil for canning fish;
   (t) materials imported prior to the first day of September, 1920, to be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine as described in The Dairy Industry Act, 1914, and amendments thereto;
   (u) linen or cotton clothing, n.o.p.;
   (v) goods enumerated in the following tariff items in Schedule A:
   5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 25a, 26, 27, 28, 28a, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 39a, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 46a, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 60a, 61, 61a, 62, 63, 63a, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 69a, 70, 71, 71a, 72, 73, 74, 76, 81, 82, 83, 83a, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 97a, 98, 99, 99a, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 113a, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 133, 136, 136a, 137, 138, 140, 140a, 141, 152, 152a, 155, 170, 210b, 227, 267a, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 276a, 277, 277a, 279, 281, 290, 329a, 337, 343, 345a, 348, 384, 384a, 387a, 411, 444, 446, 446b, 446c, 447, 448, 449, 450, 456, 459, 460, 461, 461a, 462, 462a, 469, 472, 475, 520, 521, 522, 523, 533a, 551, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 563, 565, 566, 567, 568, 568a, 569, 587, 588, 591, 599, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 611, 611a, 612, 617, 625, 626, 627, 631, 638, 638a, 639, 641, 642 and 705a.

4. RESOLVED that Schedule B to the Customs Tariff, 1907, be amended by providing that the following items, enumerations, and rates of drawback of customs duties be inserted in said Schedule:

Item No.	Goods.	When subject to Drawback.	—
1025	Materials, not including machinery.	When used prior to first day of September, 1920, in the manufacture of oleomargarine as described in The Dairy Industry Act, 1914, and amendments thereto.....	99 p.c.
1026	Materials.....	When used in the manufacture of goods enumerated in tariff items 446, 446b, 447, 448 and 591.....	30 p.c.

Business Profits War Tax.

Resolved,

1. That it is expedient to amend The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, as amended by chapter six of the statutes of 1917 and by chapter ten of the statutes of 1918, and to provide that the provisions of Section three of the said Act shall not continue in force after the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen;

2. That with respect to every business liable to taxation under the said Act the period for which the returns shall be made and during which it shall be liable for assessment shall be at least sixty months, commencing with the beginning of the first accounting period ending after the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, or for such less period as the business may have been carried on from the beginning of the said accounting period to the end of the period for which the said tax may be levied under this Act;

3. That the word "commencing" be replaced by the word "ending" in the proviso to section twenty-six as enacted by chapter ten of the statutes of 1918.

Income Tax.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the provisions of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, as amended by chapter 25 of the statutes of 1918, and to provide,—

1. That income liable to taxation shall include the salaries, indemnities or other remuneration of members of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada and officers thereof, of members of Provincial Legislative Councils and Assemblies, of Municipal Councils, Commissions and Boards of Management, of any Judge of any Dominion or Provincial Court appointed after the passing of this Act, and of all other persons, including those whose salaries, indemnities or other remuneration are paid by His Majesty in respect of His Government of the Dominion of Canada, or of any Province; excepting therefrom the income of the Governor General of Canada.

2. That the exemptions and deductions allowed from taxable income by paragraph (a) of subsection one of section three of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, be amended to provide for such reasonable allowance as may be granted by the minister, in his absolute discretion for depreciation; by striking out the exemption for any expenditure of a capital nature for renewals or for the development of a business;

[Sir Thomas White.]

and by adding the provision that the minister when determining the income derived from timber limits shall make an allowance for their exhaustion.

3. That the allowance of two hundred dollars for each child under sixteen years of age who is dependent upon the taxpayer for support as enacted in paragraph (b) of subsection one of section three of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, as amended by chapter 25 of the statutes of 1918 be allowed for the purposes of the normal tax only.

4. That in lieu of the provisions of paragraph (d) of subsection one of section three of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, it be enacted that dividends received by or credited to shareholders of a corporation which is liable to taxation under the provisions of the said Act shall not be liable to normal tax in the hands of the shareholders but shall be liable to the supertax and surtax provisions of the said Act and to the surtax provisions of these resolutions. The amount of the exemption from normal tax to the shareholders shall not exceed the net amount of such dividends after the deduction of the interest or carrying charges, if any, in respect of such dividends. Provided, however,

(a) that in determining the income no deduction shall be allowed in respect of personal and living expenses, and in cases in which personal and living expenses form part of the profit, gain or remuneration of the taxpayer, the same shall be assessed as income for the purposes of this Act;

(b) that deficits or losses sustained in transactions entered into for profit but not connected with the chief business, trade, profession or occupation of the taxpayer may not be deducted from income derived from the chief business, trade, profession or occupation of the taxpayer in determining his taxable income.

5. That it be enacted in lieu of the provisions of subsection four of section three of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, that the share of a taxpayer in the undivided or undistributed gains and profits of a corporation shall not be deemed to be taxable income of the taxpayer unless the minister is of opinion that the accumulation of such undivided and undistributed gains and profits is made for the purpose of evading the tax and is in excess of what is reasonably required for the purposes of the business.

6. That dividends or shareholders' bonuses paid or credited to its shareholders by a corpo-

ration on or after January 1st, 1917, shall be taxable as income of the shareholder in the year in which the same are received or credited unless paid exclusively out of a surplus or accumulated profits on hand prior to the 1st January, 1917. No dividend or shareholders' bonus shall be deemed to be paid or credited out of surplus or accumulated profits on hand prior to the 1st January, 1917, if the earnings of the corporation since the beginning of the accounting period which ended in 1917 are sufficient to provide for the said dividend and other taxable dividends paid or credited since the said date.

(a) Income of a beneficiary of an estate shall be deemed to include the amount accruing during each taxation year to which he, his heirs or assigns are entitled from the income of the estate whether distributed or not.

(b) Any part of the remuneration of a taxpayer retained by his employer in connection with insurance, sick benefit superannuation, pension fund or plan shall be allowed as an exemption or deduction from the income of the taxpayer for income tax purposes, and any payment to an employee out of such fund or plan shall be included as taxable income of the employee.

7. That there shall be assessed, levied and paid upon the income during the preceding year of every person residing or ordinarily resident in Canada or employed in Canada or carrying on any business in Canada except corporations and joint stock companies, the following taxes:

(a) Four per centum upon all income exceeding one thousand dollars but not exceeding six thousand dollars in the case of unmarried persons and widows or widowers without dependent children, and exceeding two thousand dollars but not exceeding six thousand dollars in the case of all other persons;

Eight per centum upon all income exceeding six thousand dollars in the case of all persons.

And in addition thereto the following surtax:

(b) One per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds five thousand dollars and does not exceed six thousand dollars;

Two per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds six thousand dollars and does not exceed eight thousand dollars;

Three per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds eight thousand dollars and does not exceed ten thousand dollars;

Four per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds ten thousand dollars and does not exceed twelve thousand dollars;

Five per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds twelve thousand dollars and does not exceed fourteen thousand dollars;

Six per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds fourteen thousand dollars and does not exceed sixteen thousand dollars;

Seven per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds sixteen thousand dollars and does not exceed eighteen thousand dollars;

Eight per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds eighteen thousand dollars and does not exceed twenty thousand dollars;

Nine per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds twenty thousand dollars and does not exceed twenty-two thousand dollars;

Ten per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds twenty-two thousand dollars and does not exceed twenty-four thousand dollars;

Eleven per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds twenty-four thousand dollars and does not exceed twenty-six thousand dollars;

Twelve per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds twenty-six thousand dollars and does not exceed twenty-eight thousand dollars;

Thirteen per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds twenty-eight thousand dollars and does not exceed thirty thousand dollars;

Fourteen per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds thirty thousand dollars and does not exceed thirty-two thousand dollars;

Fifteen per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds thirty-two thousand dollars and does not exceed thirty-four thousand dollars;

Sixteen per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds thirty-four thousand dollars and does not exceed thirty-six thousand dollars;

Seventeen per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds thirty-six thousand dollars and does not exceed thirty-eight thousand dollars;

Eighteen per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds thirty-eight thousand dollars and does not exceed forty thousand dollars;

Nineteen per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds forty thousand dollars and does not exceed forty-two thousand dollars;

Twenty per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds forty-two thousand dollars and does not exceed forty-four thousand dollars;

Twenty-one per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds forty-four thousand dollars and does not exceed forty-six thousand dollars;

Twenty-two per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds forty-six thousand dollars and does not exceed forty-eight thousand dollars;

Twenty-three per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds forty-eight thousand dollars and does not exceed fifty thousand dollars;

Twenty-four per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds fifty thousand dollars and does not exceed fifty-two thousand dollars;

Twenty-five per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds fifty-two thousand dollars and does not exceed fifty-four thousand dollars;

Twenty-six per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds fifty-four thousand dollars and does not exceed fifty-six thousand dollars;

Twenty-seven per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds fifty-six thousand dollars and does not exceed fifty-eight thousand dollars;

Twenty-eight per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds fifty-eight thousand dollars and does not exceed sixty thousand dollars;

Twenty-nine per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds sixty thousand dollars and does not exceed six-two thousand dollars;

Thirty per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds sixty-two thousand dollars and does not exceed sixty-four thousand dollars;

Thirty-one per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds sixty-four thousand dollars and does not exceed sixty-six thousand dollars;

Thirty-two per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds sixty-six thousand dollars and does not exceed sixty-eight thousand dollars;

Thirty-three per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds sixty-eight thousand dollars and does not exceed seventy thousand dollars;

Thirty-four per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds seventy thousand dollars and does not exceed seventy-two thousand dollars;

Thirty-five per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds seventy-two thousand dollars and does not exceed seventy-four thousand dollars;

Thirty-six per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds seventy-four thousand dollars and does not exceed seventy-six thousand dollars;

Thirty-seven per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds seventy-six thousand dollars and does not exceed seventy-eight thousand dollars;

Thirty-eight per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds seventy-eight thousand dollars and does not exceed eighty thousand dollars;

Thirty-nine per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds eighty thousand dollars and does not exceed eighty-two thousand dollars;

Forty per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds eighty-two thousand dollars and does not exceed eighty-four thousand dollars;

Forty-one per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds eighty-four thousand dollars and does not exceed eighty-six thousand dollars;

Forty-two per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds eighty-six thousand dollars and does not exceed eighty-eight thousand dollars;

Forty-three per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds eighty-eight thousand dollars and does not exceed ninety thousand dollars;

Forty-four per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds ninety thousand dollars and does not exceed ninety-two thousand dollars;

Forty-five per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds ninety-two thousand dollars and does not exceed ninety-four thousand dollars;

Forty-six per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds ninety-four thousand dollars and does not exceed ninety-six thousand dollars;

Forty-seven per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds ninety-six thousand dollars and does not exceed ninety-eight thousand dollars;

Forty-eight per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds ninety-eight thousand dollars and does not exceed one hundred thousand dollars;

Fifty-two per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds one hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed one hundred and fifty thousand dollars;

Fifty-six per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds one hundred and fifty thousand dollars and does not exceed two hundred thousand dollars;

Sixty per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds two hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed three hundred thousand dollars;

Sixty-three per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds three hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed five hundred thousand dollars;

Sixty-four per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds five hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed one million dollars.

Sixty-five per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds one million dollars.

8. That in lieu of the provisions of subsection two of section four of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, as amended by section three of chapter 25 of the statutes of 1918, it be enacted that corporations and joint stock companies, no matter how created or organized, shall pay ten per centum upon income exceeding two thousand dollars, but shall not be liable to pay the surtax; any corporation or joint stock company the fiscal year of which is not the calendar year shall make a return and have the tax payable by it computed upon its income for its fiscal year ending within the calendar year for which the return is being made.

9. That any persons carrying on business in partnership shall be liable for the income tax only in their individual capacity. Provided, however, that a husband and wife carrying on business together shall be deemed to be partners for any purpose under The Income War Tax Act. 1917.

10. That a member of a partnership or proprietor of a business whose fiscal year is other than the calendar year shall make a return of his income from the business, and his tax shall be computed upon the basis of his income from the business for the fiscal period ending within the calendar year for which the return is being made.

11. That it be enacted in lieu of the provisions of subsection five of section four of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, that taxpayers shall be entitled to the following deductions from the amount that would otherwise be payable by them for taxes under the provisions of the said Act:—

(a) The amount paid by such taxpayer under the provisions of Part 1 of The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and any amendments thereto or The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and any amendments thereto: Provided that in computing the taxable income hereunder, the taxpayer shall not include any taxes paid under the said Acts in the expenses of his business, and the minister shall have power to determine any questions that may arise in consequence of any difference in the several periods for which the taxes under the said Acts and under the proposed legislation respectively are payable, and the decision of the minister thereon shall be final and conclusive. In the case of a partnership each partner shall be entitled to deduct such portion of the tax paid by the partnership under The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and any amendments thereto as may correspond to his interest in the income of the partnership, provided that such deduction shall not affect the liability of the taxpayer to

tax hereunder in respect of any income which does not form part of the profits assessed under The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, but such incomes shall be assessed for income tax purposes, in the same manner as if it were the only income of the taxpayer.

(b) The amount paid to Great Britain or any of its self-governing colonies or dependencies for income tax in respect of the income of the taxpayer derived from sources therein and the amount paid to any foreign country for income tax in respect of the income of the taxpayer derived from sources therein, if, and only if, such foreign country in imposing such tax allows a similar credit to persons in receipt of income derived from sources within Canada; provided, that such deduction shall not at any time exceed the amount of tax which would otherwise be payable under the provisions of section three of chapter 25 of the statutes of 1918, or these resolutions, in respect of the said income derived from sources within Great Britain or any of its self-governing colonies or dependencies or any foreign country; and further provided, that the said deduction shall be allowed only if the taxpayer furnishes evidence satisfactory to the minister showing the amount and other particulars of income derived from sources within Great Britain or any of its self-governing colonies or dependencies or any foreign country.

12. That in lieu of the provisions of paragraph (i) of section five of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, it be enacted that the net income derived from any bonds or other securities of the Dominion of Canada, issued exempt from any income tax imposed in pursuance of any legislation by the Parliament of Canada, after the deduction of the interest or carrying charges, if any, an respect of such income, shall not be liable to taxation thereunder.

13. That every person required to make a return of his income under subsection one of section seven of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, who fails to make a return within the time limited therefor shall be subject to a penalty of twenty-five per centum of the amount of the tax payable, and every other person who is required to make a return under the provisions of the said section who fails to do so within the time limited therefor will be subject to a penalty of ten dollars for each day during which the default continues, and all such penalties shall be assessed and collected from the person liable to make the return in the same manner in which taxes are assessed and collected. Provided that the minister may on application extend the time for making a return in such circumstances as he may approve.

14. That the date of assessment fixed by subsection one of section ten be changed from the thirtieth day of April to the thirty-first day of October, and in default payment within one month from the date of the mailing of the assessment notice, a penalty of five per centum of the amount of such tax shall be added thereto, and thereafter a further penalty of one per centum per month shall be added for each additional month or portion thereof during which the said tax and penalty remain unpaid.

15. That the minister may refund any tax or penalty wrongfully or illegally assessed and collected but no refund shall be allowed because of any alleged error in the assessment unless application therefor is made within twelve months of the date of the payment of the tax or penalty.

16. That any chartered bank of Canada shall receive for deposit without any charge for discount or commission any cheque made payable to the Receiver General of Canada in payment of tax or penalty imposed by this proposed legislation, whether drawn on the bank receiving the cheque or on any other chartered bank in Canada.

17. That excepting such provisions as are applicable to income tax returns and assessments of income for the year 1919, and accounting periods ending in 1919 and subsequently, and as are applicable to income tax return and assessments of income for the year 1918, and accounting periods ending in 1918, and subsequently, all other provisions of the proposed legislation shall, for the purpose of administration, be deemed and construed as having force and effect as from the date on which The Income War Tax Act, 1917, came into force.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the House consent that the hon. gentleman shall have permission to withdraw his motion?

Mr. McMASTER: I am quite willing to withdraw the motion in order to give hon. gentlemen an opportunity of asking questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being objection I must put the motion.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 19 to consolidate and amend the Railway Act.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

PILOTAGE AND HARBOUR MASTERS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne Bill No. 122 to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Pilotage and Harbour Masters) was read the second time and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. M. Douglas in the Chair.

On section 1—Minister may be appointed pilotage authority by Governor in Council:

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When the resolution was before the Committee some days ago I explained the object of this Bill. First, it is to enable the Governor in Council to take over the pilotage system in accordance with the recommendation made by

the Royal Commission appointed about a year ago. I refer to the ports of Halifax, Sydney, St. John, N.B., Victoria, Vancouver and Nanaimo. The object of the introduction of this Bill is to very much increase the efficiency of the pilotage system, something that is greatly needed at the present time. Secondly, it is to increase the dues on ships of over 1,000 registered tons from $5 to $7, in order that the harbour masters in certain ports instead of only being able to draw a maximum of $600 a year, providing that the fees reach that amount, will be enabled to draw $1,200, provided the fees reach that amount.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that not the same Bill that came up the other day?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, this is a different Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there a modification?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Bill that the hon. member refers to dealt with the case of the harbour masters at the port of Halifax. This applies to the harbour masters of other ports.

Mr. VIEN: Do I understand the minister to say that this clause, 432, will authorize the minister to supersede the pilotage corporations in various districts?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, it does not do that. The pilotage systems of Quebec and Montreal have been under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for twelve or thirteen years. It in no way interferes with the local pilotage authorities. It simply takes jurisdiction out of the local pilotage commissions at the ports I name and vests that authority in the Governor in Council, or with reference to these ports, in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the same as it is in regard to the ports of Quebec and Montreal.

On section 3—Harbour masters' salaries increased from $600 to $1,200:

Mr. McKENZIE: In the harbour of Sydney there are no dues or charges against ships coming in. Does this Act provide for a new schedule of charges against ships coming into that port?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At North Sydney the dues levied against ships in the year 1918 amounted to $839.50. The harbour-master there draws a remuneration of $600. If the dues on ships amount to $1,000 his salary will be $1,000, but in any event it will not exceed the maximum amount of $1,200. The object of this Bill is to increase the tonnage dues on ships over 1,000 tons from $5 to $7 in order that these underpaid harbour-masters may draw a maximum salary of $1,200 each providing the dues reach that amount.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has the minister appointed a harbour-master at the port of Canso yet?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I cannot answer the hon. gentleman now, but I shall inquire. I noticed his question on the Order Paper and I hope to be able to give him the information in the course of a day or so.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The harbour-master at Canso died some months ago, and I was informed that the Civil Service Commission was to make the appointment. I have not heard that an appointment has been made. I would like to know if the appointment has been made and who the officer is.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to look into that and let the hon. member know at the earliest possible moment. Unfortunately, I was ill for four months, and I was not able to keep up to date with all these things that transpired during my absence.

On the preamble:

Mr. VIEN: Might I ask the minister what he understands by the provision that he shall supersede the existing pilotage authority?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Outside of the ports of Montreal and Quebec they have local pilotage commissions and they give their services voluntarily. The object of this Bill is to do away with the local pilotage commissions, and to invest the Minister of Marine with the same authority that he now enjoys as regards the ports of Quebec and Montreal—we want to put all the ports of Canada on the same footing.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any general provision under this Act for the pensioning of pilots? I understand that in the case of the river St. Lawrence pilots there is an arrangement under which a retiring pilot

receives a pension. The minister will find, after administering the pilotage branch of his department for a short time, that there will be a great deal of dissatisfaction unless a uniform system of pensions for pilots is adopted. Is there any provision whereby the same practice which prevails in regard to the St. Lawrence pilots will be applied to the pilots of Halifax, Sydney, and other ports, which the minister is bringing under the control of the department?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. gentleman's point is very well taken. Unless we have uniformity as regards pensions there certainly will not be satisfaction in the case of the pilotage systems throughout Canada that are now coming under the control of the Minister of Marine. The only pilots that receive a pension at the present time are those in the Quebec district. In 1906, when the Hon. Mr. Brodeur was Minister of Marine, there were one hundred and sixteen pilots in that district, which was deemed too many, and in order to reduce the number to seventy-five—there are only sixty-one at present—it was agreed by Order in Council at that time that when a Quebec pilot reached the age of sixty-five he should be retired on a pension of $300. The amount required for paying the Quebec pensions has to be voted by Parliament each year, but the hon. gentleman is quite right in his statement that the pension should not be restricted to Quebec pilots. Therefore I hope, providing it meets with the approval of the Government, to introduce legislation at the next session of Parliament, to either discontinue the pensions to the Quebec pilots, or to grant a reasonable pension to the pilots generally. I am very much in favour of the latter course, because the pilotage examination is now very strict. I have in mind one pilot in the Quebec district, a young man of only thirty-eight years of age, who was not able to pass the eyesight test this year. When pilots have to go through a long apprenticeship and serve a number of years as branch pilots, and then fail to pass the necessary examination, which is a strict one and takes place annually, there should be some provision made for them in the way of a pension.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand the earnings of the Quebec pilots are pooled, and the amount divided at the end of the year, each pilot receiving the same sum. Am I correct in that? If so, what were the average earnings of those pilots last year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: All the pilots in the Quebec district do not receive the pension of $300 annually voted by Parliament, but only those who were in the service at the time the Order in Council referred to was passed. When those pilots reach the age of sixty-five they are retired on a pension of $300—the pilots that entered the service subsequent to the passing of that Order in Council do not receive a pension from Parliament, but draw a pension from the pilotage pension fund, to which the hon. gentleman has just referred. The gross earnings of the Quebec pilotage district amounted last year to $125,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How much did that yield to each pilot?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I understand the pilots have a very large fund amounting to something like $90,000, and they give each pilot $300 a year, but the fund is administered by the pilots themselves.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister does not mean that the total earnings of a pilot for a year would only amount to $300?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I want to ascertain how much each pilot earned during the year out of the business?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That would depend a great deal upon the number of trips that each pilot would make. Some pilots earn $1,200 a year, the maximum earnings being about $1,800. The steamship companies sometimes prefer to have a certain pilot always pilot their boats, and therefore some favoured pilots make more money than others.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am not certain that I correctly apprehend the situation with respect to pensions from the statement of the minister. I understood from the discussion which took place the other evening, that pensions were paid to retired pilots, but were not paid to pilots in active service. Am I correct in that understanding? I can see no ground why a pilot earning from $1,200 to $1,800 should get any pension from the Government, but there is very good reason for pensioning a pilot who has spent his life in the service and be-

comes incapacitated for duty if there is a pension system for that purpose. Do I understand that the active pilots who earn a certain amount each year also receive a pension?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Two systems of pensions apply to the Quebec pilots. Under the one, pilots that were in the service in 1906 are retired when they reach the age of sixty-five and are given a pension of $300, which is annually voted by Parliament. Under the other system, pilots that might not possibly pass the pilotage examination, from poor eyesight or other causes, receive a pension from the Pilots' Pension Fund.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Then some pilots that were in the service in 1906, and are still pursuing their calling and earning a certain amount every year, also receive a pension?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They will not receive a pension while they are in the service, but when they attain the age of sixty-five years they will be retired on a pension of $300 a year. The Order in Council passed in 1906 is very specific in its terms that the pilots referred to are to receive such pension, and I felt that we could not ignore its provisions. However, at the next session of Parliament I think it would be well to adopt a pension system, as the leader of the Opposition has suggested, applicable to all the pilots throughout Canada, and not merely to those in the Quebec district.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the Government provide boats for the pilots?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What does that cost the country?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That would depend upon the port to which the hon. gentleman has reference. I have not got the details of the information here, but the department does provide pilot boat at all the leading ports.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand that the pilots of Halifax, St. John and other ports along the Atlantic coast, supply their own boats. When they go out to meet steamships they do so in their own boats and pay the expenses of those boats. In the case of the St. Lawrence pilots, however, it seems that the Government furnishes them with boats. My question is: How many boats is the Government operating at Quebec or Rimouski, and what is the annual cost of maintenance?

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have only one steamer. I am sorry I did not anticipate that question being asked. I will certainly try to get the information for the hon. member. In as far as the ports of Halifax and St. John are concerned, they did provide their own boats, and if we took over those pilotage systems I think it would be only right that we should provide boats for the pilots. All the pilots ought to be treated in the same way.

Mr. PELLETIER: For the information of the hon. member for Guysborough, I may say that the only boat furnished by the Government is at Father Point. At the time the Government made the change from Bic to Father Point the pilots had their own schooner to go from the wharf to the steamers coming up there. The change involved an added distance of 18 miles, and it was understood then that the department would supply the pilots with a boat. They have only one boat at Father Point to take the pilots from the wharf to the steamers and from the steamers to the wharf.

Mr. McKENZIE: The pilots of the harbour of Sydney have an Act of incorporation and have been conducting their business entirely under their own control. They have officials of the organization and also of the pilotage commission. The dues are collected, I think, at the customs house at North Sydney and Sydney and then passed over to the secretary of the association, who divides the money among the pilots. Now I understand some new machinery will be created by which the pilotage business will be conducted under the control of the department. I mentioned to the minister the other day that there are some officials connected with that work who will likely be put out of office altogether, and I would like to know if he has anything in contemplation as to what he is going to do with them. It is pretty hard lines to deprive men altogether of their means of livelihood. The secretary of the pilotage commission and the chairman are on salary, and also the secretary-treasurer of the association. I think it is rather the custom of the Government, when a radical change of this kind takes place, to look after, in some degree at all events, the old officials,

as no doubt the changes are made in the general advantage of the country. It was no doubt for that reason that the pension system was adopted by the department in 1906 in connection with the change made in the St. Lawrence pilotage system. Now that this change is taking place I would like to know if the minister has any well defined policy as to what he is going to substitute for the machinery that is now looking after the pilotage systems in such places as St. John, Halifax and Sydney Harbour, and also on the Pacific coast, where there must be some pilotage companies of the same class and character.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not our intention to interfere with any of the permanent officials. There is at Sydney a secretary by the name of Mr. Kimber, and it is not our intention, so far as I know, to replace him. Of course the local pilotage commissions will disappear. I understand there are four pilotage commissioners there drawing a very small remuneration, but as a rule these commissioners give their services gratuitously. That will be the only change, with the exception that we will appoint a local superintendent of pilots there who has had seafaring experience and holds a master mariner's certificate. In all other respects the pilotage system will remain the same, except that the regulations will be carried out a little more strictly, and, I hope, a little more efficiently.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the minister determined what kind of a man he wants as superintendent of pilots? I notice that there is an age limit as to the pilots themselves. Has the minister thought of any age limit or any particular qualifications for the superintendent that he proposes to appoint?

5 p.m.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not set any particular age, but I would like to get a man somewhere around forty or forty-five, or in any event not older than fifty,—a seafaring man who holds a master mariner's certificate and thoroughly understands navigation, in order that he can keep the pilotage system under his charge in the highest possible state of efficiency. We have not definitely fixed what his remuneration will be, but we hope to make it fair and reasonable. Such appointments would have to be made by the Civil Service Commission on the recommendation of the Department of Marine.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand the minister to say that there is to be no change of officials that are really necessary for the carrying on of the work now. At the present time there are two men in connection with the pilotage commission in Sydney, a treasurer and paymaster and a secretary. The latter is Mr. Kimber; I forget the name of the paymaster. I understand that those officials are to be continued, and that the same system of collecting dues from the ships will obtain just as it does now.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will qualify my answer by stating that it is not our intention to disturb the local conditions at all. The dues will be levied and collected in the usual way, and we hope to retain all of the officials there. But if the local superintendent should report to the department that it will not be necessary to have a secretary and also a treasurer—I do not know that he will so report—some action might have to be taken. It is hard to anticipate what recommendations will be made; but generally speaking it is not my intention or that of the department to interfere in any way with those old efficient officials.

Mr. McKENZIE: Under present conditions the pilotage commissioners meet twice a year to receive applications for the positions of pilots and pilot apprentices. If a pilot dies or gets too old, some one must be appointed to take his place. How is that class of work to be carried on now, and how are apprentices to be obtained and appointed? How are pilots to be appointed, say, in Sydney harbour?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If a vacancy occurred in the pilotage system at Sydney or if apprentice pilots were required, the local superintendent of pilots would make the necessary recommendation to the general superintendent of pilots whom I hope to have at Ottawa in charge of all local superintendents. In that way we get the necessary information. We are guided very largely by the advice of the local pilotage man and of the general superintendent of pilots here.

Mr. McKENZIE: The shipping at Sydney Harbour is very large indeed; it must rank third among the shipping lists of Canada. The maintaining of the pilotage system there at a first-class standard is very important to shipowners and to the good name

of the port. I fear that the minister will find it difficult to maintain an efficient system by depending entirely upon some one individual who has exclusive jurisdiction in the selection of apprentices and pilots. I understood the minister to say the other day that some form of examination would be prescribed for these pilots. Will this examination be held at local points? It would be inconvenient for men at St. John, Halifax or Sydney to be obliged to go to Ottawa for examination. Moreover, persons concerned in these examinations would like to know as soon as possible what kind of examination they will have to pass.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Quebec district has 62 pilots and 10 apprentice pilots; the Montreal district has 51 pilots; Sydney has 33 pilots and 7 apprentice pilots. We have found the system under the Minister of Marine and a competent local superintendent to work admirably in the Montreal and Quebec districts. The examinations would, of course, be held locally. Here is just a line or two from the recommendations of the Royal Commission which was appointed to inquire into the conditions in these pilotage districts:

> That the tests for the eyesight and hearing of the pilots, and present apprentices, be conducted on a standard basis, the same system applying in the various districts.

The basis for examination will be the same in all the ports. They go on to say:

> That such tests should be held annually in the cases of pilots and apprentices under the age of 65, and semi-annually in the case of pilots between the ages of 65 and 70.

They further recommend that pilots and apprentice pilots undergo each year an examination as regards eyesight, colour-blindness and hearing, before a medical officer and an officer of the Department of Marine, both selected by the minister; and that sight tests shall be the same as those passed by candidates for masters' and mates' examinations. I assure hon. members that my only object in asking the Committee to pass this Bill is that of improving the standard of the pilotage system of Canada. The shipping people are asking for this legislation; the Royal Commission strongly recommends it. Our experience in Montreal and Quebec districts has been so eminently satisfactory that I have no hesitation in recommending the adoption of the Bill.

Preamble agreed to.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RED CROSS SOCIETY INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister), Bill No. 130, to amend an Act to incorporate The Canadian Red Cross Society, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. J. M. Douglas in the Chair.

On section 1—Purposes of the society extended to include work in times of peace.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The section which is proposed to be amended, section 2 of chapter 68 of the statutes of 1909, reads as follows:—

> The purposes of the society shall be,—
> 1. To furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war, in accordance with the spirit and conditions of the conference of Geneva of October, 1863, and also of the treaty of the Red Cross or the treaty of Geneva of August twenty-second, 1864, to which Great Britain has given its adhesion;
> 2. To perform all the duties devolved upon a national society by each nation which has acceded to said treaty, but in affiliation with the said British Red Cross Society;
> 3. To succeed to and take over al the rights and property heretofore or now held and enjoyed by, and all the duties heretofore performed by, the unincorporated association known as the Canadian Red Cross Society.

It is proposed by this Bill to add to that section as subsection 4, the following:—

> "(4) In time of peace to carry on and assist in work for the improvement of health, the prevention of disease and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world."

When the Bill was introduced, I explained that there had been held at Geneva a convention at which a number of the Red Cross societies of the world were represented, and at which a conclusion was reached that the Red Cross societies should undertake work of this kind in time of peace. The idea impressed itself very much upon the representatives of the different nations assembled at the Peace Conference at Paris, and when the Covenant of the League of Nations was finally presented and accepted, it included this clause:

> The members of the League agree to encourage and promote the establishment and co-operation of duly authorized voluntary national Red Cross organizations having as purposes the improvement of health, the prevention of disease and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

President Wilson when he presented the final draft of the League of Nations' Coven-

ant at a plenary session of the Peace Conference held on the 28th April, last, spoke of this article as follows:

> Article XXV specifically mentions the Red Cross as one of the international organizations which are to connect and work with the work of the League.

The purpose of this Bill is merely to empower the Canadian Red Cross Society, in connection with other societies of a similar character throughout the world, to continue to carry on its work in time of peace as well as in time of war.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: Representatives of the Red Cross organization, the St. John Ambulance Association, the St. John Ambulance Brigade and the Victorian Order of Nurses met in Ottawa about two or three months ago with the idea and for the purpose of uniting these four organizations into one organization for work in Canada. At that meeting it was generally understood that an amalgamation of these four organizations would take place. Later on something happened whereby the Red Cross Society changed its attitude towards the suggested movement. I might say, in explanation, that the Red Cross Society has up to this time been an organization which functions only during times of war. The St. John Ambulance Association has been functioning during times of peace and carrying on a rather extensive teaching programme which has resulted in turning out first aid assistants to physicians and others in need of that kind of work. The St. John Ambulance Brigade is an organization which employed these trained students and administered that particular part of the work. The Victorian Order of Nurses, as every hon. member knows, is a nurses' organization, the ramifications of which pretty well cover Canada. It seemed to the representatives of these four organizations that, to prevent over-lapping and also to prevent these different organizations from so-to-speak, ploughing the same field for funds to carry on their work, it would be a good thing to combine them. I was, therefore, somewhat surprised the other day to find the Prime Minister bringing in this amendment to the Act to incorporate the Canadian Red Cross Society. I am not yet quite sure as to why the Red Cross Society, a war organization, is now desirous of carrying on the same work in times of peace, in view of the fact that there are in this country other organizations already organized for that work, including a teaching staff to turn out these voluntary aid nurses, an organization to administer them and the Victorian Order of Nurses as well. I am not particularly criticising this amendment; I am speaking rather with the idea of getting a little more information upon the policy of the Red Cross Society now since it intends entering an entirely new field, that is to say, to function during times of peace.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know that I can give my hon. friend very much more information than I have given already. I did not know anything about the meeting to which he alludes, and I think it would be most desirable that there should be a working arrangement between the organizations in question. But I should like to point out to him that there cannot be this working arrangement until this society receives the power which it is asking for now, and I should not imagine there would be any possible objection to giving to a society which has done such wonderful work in every country throughout the world during the war an opportunity of continuing and extending its usefulness during times of peace. It is to be hoped that those who are entrusted with the management of the different organizations in question will not be led astray by any feeling of jealously or rivalry, but that they will unite in a common and concerted action and co-operation for the purpose of doing the most good that they can. But it is quite impossible for this society to engage in any work of the kind until it receives the power which by this amendment it is proposed to give it.

Mr. COWAN: I am very much pleased to hear the words of the Prime Minister, because they are words with which I thoroughly agree. I was present at the meeting referred to by the hon. member (Mr. A. Thompson), and I know the attitude that was taken there. The purpose was not to amalgamate all these organizations; the purpose was to have a working arrangement between them. It would be most undesirable at the present time to have two or more large bodies, well recognized and all holding good positions in the life of our people, engaged in similar work. We want to prevent everything in the shape of overlapping, so that the interest of the people will be best served at the least possible cost. For that reason we are desirous of having a working arrangement between all these organizations, and I hope the Prime

Minister will render all assistance possible in seeing that that arrangement is brought about.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I certainly shall use all my influence towards that end, because I entirely agree with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) has said. In speaking of the excellent service that has been given by the Red Cross, I hope I shall not be understood as lacking in appreciation of the splendid work done by all the other organizations which have been spoken of this afternoon.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE $10,000,000 FOR THE PROVINCES IN AID OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

On motion of Hon. J. A. Calder (Minister of Immigration) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. J. M. Douglas (Strathcona) in the Chair:

1. To bring in a measure for the promotion of Technical Education in Canada.

2. That for the purpose of promoting and assisting technical education in Canada, the following sums, aggregating ten million dollars, shall be appropriated and made available for payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, during each fiscal year for the period of ten years beginning with the year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty, namely:—

(a) During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty, the sum of seven hundred thousand dollars;

(b) During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, the sum of eight hundred thousand dollars;

(c) During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, the sum of nine hundred thousand dollars;

(d) During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, the sum of one million dollars;

(e) During the fiscal year ending he thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four, the sum of one million, one hundred thousand dallars;

and the like sum of one million, one hundred thousand dollars during each of the succeeding fiscal years until the expiration of the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine.

Such sums, subject to the conditions of the proposed legislation, shall be allotted and shall be paid quarterly as grants to the governments of the several provinces in proportion to the population of the said provinces respectively as determined by the last federal census.

[Mr. Cowan.]

3. That the grant payable to any province in any year shall not exceed the amount provided for each province by the foregoing resolutions, nor shall it exceed an amount equivalent to that which the Provincial Government shall expend on technical education within such year.

4. That in determining the grant payable to any province annually, no acount shall be taken of any liability or expenditure incurred by the province for the acquiring of land, the erection or improvement of any buildings, or the supplying of furnishings or equipment for any technical education institution established in the province prior to the first day of April, 1919.

5. That the payment of the grants hereinbefore authorized shall be made subject to the following terms and conditions:—

(a) All payments shall be applied and used for technical education in the manner agreed upon by the minister and the government of each province; every such agreement shall be approved by the Governor in Council;

(b) No portion of any grant shall be used in whole or in part in meeting any liability or expenditure of any kind whatsoever incurred in any province prior to the first day of July, 1919, for lands, buildings, furnishings, or equipment secured or provided for technical education purposes;

(c) Not more than twenty-five per centum of the annual grant payable to any province shall be applied for acquiring land, erecting, extending or improving buildings or supplying furnishings and equipment;

(d) There shall be forwarded to the minister annually by each province taking advantage of the provisions of the proposed legislation a report setting forth the work done in such province in promoting technical education, containing such details and information as may be prescribed by the minister;

(e) The minister shall be the sole judge of all questions and differences that may arise under the proposed legislation or under any agreement made in pursuance of the proposed legislation;

(f) Every province receiving a grant shall furnish the minister with such evidence as he may require to show that the grants paid hereunder are expended for technical education as provided by the proposed legislation.

6. That any portion of any appropriation authorized under this proposed legislation which may remain unexpended at the expiration of any of the said fiscal years, shall be carried forward and remain available according to its apportionment for the purposes of this proposed legislation during any one or more of the succeeding years; provided that not more than twenty-five per centum of any annual appropriation shall be so carried forward and remain available without the approval of the minister.

7. This proposed legislation shall not apply to any province until the Government thereof has by Order in Council approved its provisions and signified its desire to take advantage thereof.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister please explain the principle of the resolution?

Mr. CALDER: Probably a brief general statement from me at the present time will expedite the work of the Committee before we get down to consideration of the clauses

in detail. It will not be necessary for me at this stage to make any extended remarks with reference to the desirability of providing for technical education throughout Canada. That is a matter that has been discussed in the House time and again in the course of the past ten years, and as I understand the situation, there has practically been unanimity in the view that some action in this regard should be taken. If I mistake not, the last time the subject was before the House was in 1915, on a motion introduced by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), and there was at that time a very full discussion of the whole subject. At the conclusion of the debate the Hon. Mr. Rogers, then Minister of Public Works, intimated to the House that it might be expected that the Federal Government would at an early session bring down a measure providing for federal assistance to the cause of technical education.

The resolution before the Committee sets forth the conditions under which the Federal Government now purposes to give assistance to the provinces in the carrying on of technical education work. It will be remembered that in 1910 a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate this whole subject. The commission consisted of seven members, with Dr. James Robertson as chairman. The commissioners were gentlemen eminently qualified to carry on that investigation, and a very large number of meetings were held throughout Canada in about a hundred different places. Considerable evidence was taken, some 1,400 or 1,500 witnesses having been called.

The whole situation in Canada was very carefully and exhaustively reviewed, and in addition to their work in the Dominion the commission went abroad, conducting investigations in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States, with a view to ascertaining what these countries had done in the way of providing for vocational and technical education. As a result of all these inquiries held in Canada and abroad, the commission prepared an exhaustive and elaborate report, which was submitted to Parliament in 1913. Any member of the Committee who desires to make himself thoroughly acquainted with conditions that existed at that time in Canada and in the foreign countries which the commission visited will find that report a veritable storehouse of useful and interesting information. Indeed, the report of that commission is regarded as one of the best treatises that can be found anywhere on the subject of technical education, and any member interested in the questions involved in the subject will find a perusal of the report profitable. The report recommended that the Parliament of Canada should set aside annually a sum of $3,350,000 for a period of ten years to assist the provinces in carrying on vocational work and technical education. The Government has not seen its way clear to adopt the recommendations of the commissioners in that respect. The investigations and report were made prior to the war, the report having been submitted in 1913, and every member of the Committee will realize that conditions in Canada to-day are not what they were in 1913.

The statement made to-day by the hon. Minister of Finance clearly indicates the obligations that have been cast upon the Dominion Government as a result of the war. I have no hesitation in saying that in my judgment the provinces are at present in equally as good a financial position as the Dominion, if not better, and consequently there is not the necessity now for rendering assistance to the provinces to the same extent as there was in 1913 or prior to that date. At any rate, the Government, after a careful consideration of the entire situation, has come to the conclusion that for the present at least we should not attempt to provide the amount of federal assistance that was suggested by the commission. The purpose of this resolution is to provide for this work, covering a period of ten years, grants aggregating $10,000,000 for distribution among the provinces, the grants to begin this year at $700,000 and to be increased annually by $100,000, until a maximum total appropriation of $1,100,000 is made available; and that to continue until the end of the ten-year period. In adopting this scale we have followed the plan that was adopted in the case of grants under the Agricultural Aids Act passed by parliament some years ago. In other words, the grants under the proposed Bill for technical education will be on all fours with those that are payable under the Agricultural Aids Act, and the distribution in the main is along practically the same lines, although there is a slight variation which I do not think is necessary in this case. I think probably it might save time if I should leave the details of the scheme for consideration when we come to each clause.

Broadly speaking, it is proposed that we should, by agreement with the provinces, undertake to expend for technical educa-

tion purposes a sum beginning with $700,000 to be increased gradually up to $1,100,000, the whole to be spread over a period of ten years, and the total amount expended at the end of that time to be $10,000,000. Last year this subject was brought up at the Provincial Conference held in Ottawa,—the largest conference, I think, that has ever been held here. The subject was very fully discussed and at the conclusion there was practically a unanimity of opinion that there would be no difficulty in carrying out a plan of this kind. In previous debates in this House a good deal of attention was given to the question of jurisdiction. In the debate which occured in 1916 on the motion of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, probably the greater portion of the discussion centered around this question, and while that point may be to a certain extent at issue, we were assured at the conference held last fall by all the provinces that they did not anticipate any serious difficulty in this direction. It was rightly pointed out that under the Agricultural Aids Act they have experienced very little if any difficulty. The Minister of Agriculture here, and the Ministers of Agriculture in the provincial Governments, have readily been able to arrive at an agreement whereby the moneys provided by that Act should be expended.

All the provincial prime ministers who were present at the conference held last fall assured the Federal Government that they did not anticipate the slightest difficulty in that regard. They also assured us that, to make certain that these moneys were properly and legitimately expended they would not put any difficulty in the way of the Federal Government going into these institutions and seeing that the money was expended for the purpose for which it had been provided. If the measure is approved by the Committee and the House I think we may anticipate no trouble in that connection.

It seems to me that it is not necessary at this time to say anything as to the advisability of having work of this kind done. While many of our provinces have established technical educational institutions, while they are carrying on vocational training in its various branches, and while many are conducting industrial night schools, I think we will all agree that the amount of work of that kind which is being done in Canada is not as extensive as it should be. There is an actual need for an advance in this respect. We all know what the condition is throughout the world. There is going to be keen competition in the industrial field and, if Canada is going to play her part in the struggle that we must expect for some years to come, it seems to me that it is absolutely necessary that we should take a forward step in the direction of fitting the workmen engaged in our industries, and also in training the youth of the land, so that we may become supreme in our various industries. Work has been done in this direction in most of the provinces and every credit must be given for what has been accomplished in that direction. We have some splendid technical institutions in Canada now. The number is not as large as it should be. These institutions are very costly as regards capital expenditure and maintenance. I think all will agree with me that everything that can be done by the Federal Government in rendering assistance in order that this work may be extended throughout Canada will be very generously approved not only by Parliament, but by the people of Canada as well.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we entirely agree with the minister in the statement that he has made that no argumentative persuasion is necessary to convince this Committee that technical education is a prime necessity in this country. That is one of the subjects upon which we are all agreed. It was in 1910 that the commission, with Dr. Robertson at its head, was appointed in connection with technical education. I had the pleasure of attending some of the sittings in different parts of the country, and I was pleased to see that they were going so thoroughly into the subject. Although I never had the opportunity of reading their report, I believe it is a first-class accumulation of useful information and direction along the lines for which the commission was appointed. I also agree with the minister that at this stage in the life of Canada, when it is so absolutely necessary that we should take a first position in all productive efforts, it is essential that our manufactures should be of the first order and that everything that is turned out in competition with keen producers in other parts of the world should be of the finest quality and the best workmanship. When we consider all these things it is to be understood at once how necessary it is for us that our workmen and women should have the proper training and education to compete with producers all over the world.

We have in Nova Scotia a very excellent technical college. That college was estab-

lished at a great deal of expense, possibly an amount of money that might be regarded as a little beyond the capacity of the province at the time. Nevertheless, the people have approved of the expenditure and many of our young people have received more benefit from it perhaps than from the expenditure on any other educational institution in the province. There is a working arrangement between the different universities and the college by which two years of training in any one of the universities counts for attendance at college, and in two years more students can get their degrees in the particular lines in which they seek to graduate, such as engineering or whatever else they might set out to study. It is well to make this technical education as practical, and to bring it as close to the people, as possible. In Nova Scotia we get the benefit of the larger training and the wider knowledge that is acquired at that college through several smaller schools all over the province principally in connection with our coal mines. We have small branches established here and there in which classes are trained so as to enable them to pass for the different grades of officers in connection with the coal mines. They take the courses for underground manager, manager, and other positions, all of which call for an examination, and candidates have succeeded in passing most creditable examinations by attending these schools, which are usually night schools. I would suggest that, in co-operation with the local authorities all over the Dominion, the minister should encourage the improvement of these local schools. They are now working under disabilities. The teacher can only be given a small salary and he is usually a man who has to work for his living during the day, giving perhaps three or four nights in the week to the work of teaching in these schools. The schools have done excellent work in encouraging our young men. It is to be stated with pride that, whereas twenty or thirty years ago we have very few of our own young men acting as mine managers in Nova Scotia, and we had to get managers from Scotland, England and Wales, the condition is entirely reversed now. Although we have ten times as many managers now as then, we have scarcely any person in charge of our works except our own men who have received their education in our own schools and colleges. I hope the minister will find it convenient and possible to extend this line of education to all the industries in the country.

In large manufacturing centres it is highly desirable that technical education should be introduced among the workmen, and matters so arranged that it would be an advantage to any person engaged in any class of manufacturing in this country that he or she shall have passed a course of training in some one of these schools.

I wish to point out to the minister on thing in connection with shipbuilding in Canada. Some forty years ago Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island carried on a great deal of shipbuilding, largely wooden ships, but it had rather gone out of vogue and comparatively very few people were paying any attention to it. Since the war there has been a revival in shipbuilding on our Pacific and Atlantic coasts, but the sad part of it is that in many cases it was extremely difficult to find anybody who knew anything about the building of a ship. I know of an instance in my own county where men grouped themselves together, formed a company, and started to build ships, but they found it very difficult indeed to acquire the services of an experienced shipbuilder. I think they ultimately found in Newfoundland a man who possessed the necessary qualifications. Now seeing that wooden shipbuilding and iron and steel building are pretty much along the same lines, I would suggest to the minister that broader fields of this kind should be considered and the expenditure of this money should not be confined to any narrow limits. Rather the greatest possible expansion should be given to our ideas in this direction, and thus put Canada on the highway to prosperity in all the lines of commercial enterprise, productiveness, and development generally, for which we are so well fitted and which the resources of the country render us so capable of undertaking.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I must congratulate the minister on taking this step and I am very pleased indeed that something is now being done to promote the spread of technical education. I have been a member of this House for some fifteen years and the subject has been discussed on several occasions, but we have been very slow in the matter of accomplishment. If there is a criticism to make it is that the resolution does not apply to the current year.

Mr. CALDER: It applies to the current year.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Then I withdrew my criticism in that regard. Another point I wish to make is that the Federal Government should not tie up the provinces in matters affecting technical education where the business can better be conducted by a Provincial Government and the whole responsibility thrown upon it. The present administration seems to be working out a policy by which the local legislatures will be tied up to the Federal authority. That would appear to be evident in connection with the housing and road-building policies and the present technical education scheme. I think it would be more in the interest of the country if, when there is money that can be spared for local purposes, that money should be given at once in the form of a subsidy to the local Government and the responsibility thrown upon it of making the expenditure in the best interest of the province.

In regard to the proposal which we are now considering, a good deal will depend upon the administration. In the province from which I come domestic science and manual training are taught in the main public schools; and in the mining districts as my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has said, we have had for a good many years schools for training miners in the technical part of their education. Then in the industrial centres there are night schools and other schools where boys can take a course in technical education. The question I want to raise is whether the money expended in various directions on technical schools by a province will be counted in the total estimate of the amount to be contributed by it? Do I understand that the proposition we are considering means that if $100,000 is contributed by the Federal Government to a province, the latter must put up an equal amount? If I am correct in that, then, for example, in the province of Nova Scotia, where some of the schools giving instruction in manual training, domestic science, and so forth, are supported by the town or municipality, will the money so furnished be counted in the $100,000 that will be contributed by the province? As I say a good deal depends on the administration, and if the minister insists that the money contributed by the province shall be devoted entirely to what is called in a narrow sense technical education, it will make a great difference in the administration of the Act.

Mr. CALDER: It will be noticed from the resolution that in determining the grant payable to any province no account shall be taken of any liabilities or expenditure incurred by the province for the acquiring of land, the erection or improvement of any buildings or the supplying of furnishings or equipment for any technical educational institution established in the province prior to the first of April, 1919. That is, no account shall be taken of capital expenditures heretofore incurred by the province.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am not referring to capital expenditures.

Mr. CALDER: I am just coming to the point which was raised by the hon. gentleman. In so far as the scheme generally is concerned it is not proposed that the Federal Government should grant any assistance to the provinces for carrying on domestic science, vocational training, nature study, manual training, or any of that class of work in our elementary schools. Courses in such subjects are now given by the various provinces of Canada in all the elementary schools; that instruction is going on throughout the country. For example, in the rural schools of Saskatchewan they are now teaching cooking and sewing, and the farm boys are taught manual training and kindred subjects. Some reports were furnished me the other day by one of our inspectors who looks after certain foreign-speaking districts in the province, and the class of work that is carried on even amongst our foreign-born people in the rural portions of Saskatchewan, and the success which has been achieved, is really amazing. Practically the the same sort of instruction is being carried on in all the urban centres of Canada; and the provinces have come to recognize their responsibility for these new forms of elementary school work. So it is not intended, under this resolution, or under the Bill to be founded upon it, to take into account at all whatever expenditures are made by the provinces in that direction.

I am speaking of the education that is given to the boys and girls in the ordinary elementary schools, or even in the ordinary high schools, because certain phases of that work are carried on in the high schools as well.

There is another branch of what is referred to by the leader of the Opposition; that is, certain industrial classes that are held not for teaching youths or children, but young men who are actually working in industries, and some of the provinces

have embarked on a very large programme in that regard. This Bill will be administered by the Minister of Labour. I have had a good many conversations with him, and he has in mind that that is one of the most important features of the work to be done. While we must have our technical educational institutions, that is, the large institutions thoroughly equipped in order to give the technical training associated with those institutions, we cannot bring that type of institution to everybody, and his idea is that wherever it is possible to give workmen who are in their ordinary employment the benefit of technical education by bringing instructors to them in order to increase their efficiency, that should be done. Because, after all, the results that can be secured under measures of this kind are not entirely attributable to large buildings and costly equipment. More, in my judgment, depends upon the instructor than upon anything else, and as far as possible the moneys provided by means of these grants should be used for the purpose of securing proper instructors and training them. In the United States —where they have given a great deal of attention to the subject, more so than we have here, and where they have made far greater advances than we have—under, I think, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, they provide for a co-operative scheme with the States, and the grants are payable entirely for the purpose of providing salaries for instructors and for training them, because they realize, as I am sure we realize more and more every day, that that is really the heart of the whole situation. We must have the men who can give proper instruction in the various classes of subjects to be taught. I do not know whether I have met the hon. gentleman's point or not.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: With regard to the mixed system which we have in our province, part of the money that supports those technical schools is contributed by the provincial governmeent and part by the towns. Will that money count in the total for the province? I see no reason why it should not.

Mr. CALDER: It is not proposed that any contribution made by a municipality for the establishment or maintenance of one of these institutions shall be taken into account. That is a matter of arrangement betweeen the provincial Government and the local authorities. It is proposed that our grant shall equal the amount that is expended by the province. What arrangement it cares to make with the municipality is a matter of its own concern.

Mr. FIELDING: I would ask the minister whether the exact terms of these resolutions have been the subject of discussion with the provincial governments; and, if so, whether they are acceptable to those governments. Of course, I know the scheme can only apply to any province after the Governor in Council has approved of the agreement entered into with the province. But sometimes we may propose something, which, however good its intention, the provincial governments may not be able to take advantage of. I am afraid there is something of that in our efforts to aid highways. But in this case my question is whether the provincial governments have been made aware of these resolutions and have intimated that they will be satisfactory.

I would like to emphasize the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair). I was about to ask the same question—whether the department here would insist upon limiting the expenditure to the sum paid by the Government of the province directly, or whether it might be expended under the educational system of the province, perhaps not by the provincial government but by the municipalities. The mere fact that the work is done by the municipalities does not condemn it if it is technical education. I suppose when we have the Bill before us my hon. friend will give us a better definition of what he considers is technical education under the Act, and perhaps until the Bill is brought down it will be just as well to reserve criticism. But it will be necessary to have a definite understanding on these two points: first, as to what is the technical education to which this money may be applied; and, second, if technical education is carried on in any province by arrangement between the provincial government and the municipalities why should not that count in. I only ask my hon. friend to give it consideration in framing the Bill. I have in mind the mining schools in Nova Scotia to which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition referred. They have been doing good work in that province and they are strictly technical institutions. I have no doubt that it will be possible to adapt this measure to the conditions existing in the different provinces.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. O. TURGEON: Mr. Chairman, it has long been expected that some action would be taken in the matter dealt with by this resolution. Some time ago a commission of inquiry went fully into the subject of technical education and industrial training, and the report which it submitted received the admiration of all countries. At last the recommendations of this report are being put into effect. In New Brunswick we have been very much in need of technical education in all its branches, and I have no doubt that the Provincial Government will co-operate in every possible way to make this measure a success.

Such matters as technical education, highways, and so on may be dealt with by the Dominion Government in such a way as to constitute an infringement of provincial rights. I have always been an advocate of provincial rights, and I believe that there is no stronger or more sincere advocate of provincial rights than the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) who presents this resolution. I remember that in 1913, when a Highways Bill was proposed which would have curtailed provincial rights, no Provincial Government was more pronounced in its opposition to that proposed infringement of provincial rights than the Government of which my hon. friend was a member at that time. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Sifton) was also a strong advocate of provincial rights. The provinces of Canada are all examples of just and progressive administration of provincial affairs. Nova Scotia has certainly been a worthy example of the proper administration of provincial matters. Quebec is noted all over the Dominion as a province which is strong in its administration of local affairs. Ontario is also strong and determined in its provincial administration, and the provinces of the West have been properly administering the matters which come under their jurisdiction. I have always contended that the subsidies paid to the provinces by the Dominion are insufficient. Last autumn when the provincial Premiers met in conference at Ottawa a demand was made for an increase of the subsidies paid to the provinces. I would have been pleased had that increase been granted, and the provinces thus been put in a better position to look after such things as housing and highways and technical education. The provinces have not been able to make progress in these matters because of the lack of means. Some of the provinces have taken these matters up, however, and have dealt with them to the extent of their ability to do so. In Quebec there are a great many technical institutions which are a credit to the province and would be a credit to any province.

I congratulate the minister upon bringing forward such a measure as this; he has done one good thing in this Government, if he has done nothing else. I hope that with the knowledge that he has of the ability of the provinces to conduct their own affairs; with the confidence that he has in the men administering the affairs of the provinces, and with his solicitude for the maintenance of provincial rights, he will be able to impose his will upon his colleagues in the same direction in the future. I hope that the Government will not bring forward any further measure which may have a tendency to infringe upon provincial rights. Had the provinces the means to do so, they would deal with these matters according to their own judgment and with all the ardour which they have displayed in other matters. It is time the attention of the Government was directed to the tendency of the Federal authority to encroach upon provincial rights. The Minister of Immigration, as I have said, was certainly a great "provincial righter" when he was in the Provincial Government, and his transfer to the Federal Government certainly has not changed his principles in that regard.

Mr. CALDER: The question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turgeon) has just raised is a very large one; it goes very much beyond the provisions of this resolution or of the Bill to be founded upon it. I thoroughly concur in the view that he expresses. It is very unfortunate that the relationship between the Federal Government and the provinces has not been so established that the provinces can carry on the work assigned to them under our constitution. For many years they have been pleading lack of funds, and in my judgment there is a great deal to be said in favour of that plea. As to matters of education, highways, and things of that character, there is no doubt in my mind that the provinces should be left to carry on the work which, under the British North America Act, they were evidently intended to carry on. However, the question of the adjustment of the subsidies paid to the provinces is a very large one; probably it

will be some years before it is definitely settled. One or two slight adjustments have been made since Confederation. I think all the provinces to-day take the ground that the arrangement is a very unsatisfactory one from their point of view, having regard to the many changes that have taken place since 1867.

The hon. member is not quite right when he says that at the conference of provincial premiers and representatives last autumn, a general request was made for enlarged provincial subsidies. At that conference the question of the transfer to the Western Provinces of their natural resources came up for consideration, and in connection with that matter it was suggested that if the Western Provinces received their natural resources, the other provinces should receive increased subsidies.

I am not going to debate the question now, but generally speaking, I thoroughly concur in the view set forth by my hon. friend that if an arrangement could be made whereby the provinces could receive larger subsidies it would be an advantage if they were allowed to carry on and administer those local matters which it was intended by the British North America Act they should carry on. But I think it will be some time before an agreement is reached between the federal and the provincial authorities on this subject.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have listened with a great deal of interest to my hon. friend, and I think his remarks are quite timely. Yet I do not believe, as the minister has stated, that in the resolution there is any infringement of provincial rights. As I have on two occasions moved resolutions praying the Government to give effect to the report published by the commissioners on technical education, without, however, carrying conviction, I am rather pleased to see that to-day the Government is giving effect in part to that very able report. Of course, when the subject of education is brought before the federal House grave problems are found to be involved. But in those debates to which I have referred I endeavoured to draw a distinction between technical education as such and education in the sense in which it is understood generally and which makes between this Parliament and the local legislatures such a cleavage of opinion. Constitutionally, of course, the Federal Parliament cannot deal with matters of education.

As regards technical education, it would be playing on words to suggest that the question as it presents itself constitutes an infringement on the provincial powers with regard to the larger issue of education, because we have already in this Parliament provided, for instance, by the erection of the military college at Kingston, education in connection with military matters, which are under Dominion jurisdiction. We have in another sense provided education in matters of agriculture, which is a question which comes concurrently under both provincial and Dominion jurisdiction. I was always of opinion that in connection with trade and industry this Parliament was justified in promoting the cause of technical education. Although some of the provinces have, during the last twenty-five or thirty years, taken quite a lead, yet all credit must be given to the little province by the sea, Nova Scotia, which many years ago was the pioneer in matters of technical education. That is the reason why the men from Nova Scotia have so distinguished themselves not only in the political field, but in the industrial and educational lines throughout the Dominion. It is because in that little province, there is a thorough and most effective system of education, and technical education is not the least feature of the larger system. I am proud to say that Ontario has gone pretty far in matters of technical education, and of late the province from which I come has accomplished considerably in that field. We have in Quebec at present what I consider the banner institution as regards technical education. Those who have visited in Montreal the technical school on Sherbrooke street will not hesitate to say that it is the finest institution of the kind in Canada and one of the finest in America. I have not the statistics at hand, but I know from the report of the Provincial Secretary that the establishment of that school in our province has produced very satisfactory results.

I will give only a solitary instance of what has been accomplished by that school. Four years ago I met at Drummondville a farmer's son who had just received his degree at the Technical Institute at Montreal. It was at the time when young men were asked to help towards the production of munitions, and technical experts were needed in various establishments to promote that production. That young French Canadian, having received a letter of introduction from your humble servant, went to one of the munition manufacturers in Montreal, and inside of six weeks he was at the head of that establishment. He was

not more than twenty-one years old and was already receiving a very large salary. There I had a concrete example of what technical education can accomplish.

I know that, as a rule, speaking for my province, while the men of Quebec have an ingrained intelligence for industrial work, they have lacked that last finishing touch which technical education will develop. In the last five years there has been quite a change in this connection, and our young men have become leaders of industry. I have that from no less an authority than Lord Shaughnessy himself. The Canadian Pacific, as hon. members are aware, employs a large number of technical experts in its shops throughout Canada, and I know that in the district of Montreal, the young men who have passed through the technical school are now getting large salaries and steady employment from our railway companies and large industrial firms. Therefore, I see with pleasure the determination of the Government to do something practical towards promoting the cause of technical education throughout Canada. We all know that the success of Germany notably, and also of the United States, and of the Mother Country, in industrial fields, is due chiefly to the high technical education which has been spread throughout the industrial districts of those countries.

Now that this unfortunate war is over, and now that, as we were told this afternoon, our country must produce not only in the field of agriculture, which is the basic industry of Canada, but also in the industrial lines, the more we spend wisely on technical education the greater will be the part that our production will play in the commerce of the world.

There is only one thing I regret, and it is the fact that this legislation comes so late. In connection with this matter and others too, the Government should have started its programme during the war. Its present measure seems to be rather tardy. However, "better late than never," and I shall vote with pleasure to carry on this policy. I said a moment ago that I appreciated the remarks made by my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) in regard to provincial autonomy. But I believe that there are safeguards in the legislation which is being promoted by the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization. Subsection (f) of the resolution provides that every province receiving a grant shall furnish the minister with the necessary evidence to show that the grants paid are expended for technical education as provided by the proposed legislation. This is a safeguard for both the province and the Dominion. The Dominion Government has the right to see that such moneys as are advanced are spent for the object intended, and that object alone the same as in the case of the moneys given to the provinces for the promotion of agriculture. A grant is made yearly to the various provinces and the Federal authorities exercise a moderate control of the same nature as that now proposed. I am quite sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Calder), knowing the several provinces as he does, will have no difficulty in coming to an understanding with the provincial authorities, and that there will be between the Provincial Governments and the Dominion Government an entente cordiale on this particular subject. As I said a moment ago, I do not wish to delay the Committee, but I desire to express my sincere approval of this policy of promoting technical education in the various provinces of the Dominion. The report of the commission appointed in 1910 to investigate the question, and which was tabled many sessions ago, is a most interesting one. Indeed, it is creditable to Canada that such a report should have been published. The report itself is too bulky to be properly read with any expedition. It needs to be studied and inwardly digested, and to do it adequate justice would take time. But Professor Robertson has prepared a synopsis which ought to be read by every member of the Committee. He goes much further than the question of technical education in industrial and trade matters. He wants technical institutes for the fishermen and the farmers, and I suppose the day will come when the Government will give effect to the views expressed by Professor Robertson and thus implement the conclusions arrived at by the Commissioners who prepared that highly interesting report.

Mr. CALDER: The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) said he thought there would be no difficulty in coming to an agreement with the several provinces. When the Bill is before the House it will be seen that it is so worded as to be quite elastic in that respect, and I think that is only proper. In a country such as Canada, where varying conditions exist and with the many industries that we have, it was felt that the law should not be too rigid, and that the question as to the manner in which these moneys should be used should

largely be made the subject of an agreement between the federal and the provincial authorities. Personally, I think that principle is a sound one and I have not the slightest doubt, from the discussions that took place at the conference last fall, that there will be no difficulty whatever in coming to a proper working arrangement with each of the provinces. We shall have an opportunity of considering all the details of the Bill in Committee, and unless there is some other matter in connection with this resolution requiring explanation, I would suggest that the resolution be allowed to go through, with the opportunity for further discussion in view.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the resolution is passed, I would call the attention of the minister to the system of distribution of this money as here set forth. Before six o'clock, when I was speaking on the matter, I had not an opportunity of carefully reading the resolution. Since then I have read it, and I submit to the minister that the method by which he proposes to distribute the money to the provinces is not in harmony with the system of free school education which has been established in nearly every province. In the old days poor children could not be educated because their fathers could not pay for their education. We largely surmounted that difficulty by establishing free schools, and perhaps our own province was the pioneer in this respect. There is in the smaller and perhaps poorer provinces just as much talent, ingenuity and ambition among the young people as in the larger and more wealthy and populous provinces. Now, if there is a poor province that cannot put up money for technical education it will receive none of this grant, and in any case it will not get any more than dollar for dollar on what it contributes. I ask the minister seriously to consider the question of making some proper provision in this respect. The idea is to help the genius of our people in the way of technical education, and there should be nothing to prevent the minister from distributing this money in such a manner as will effect that purpose. If a province has no money and cannot contribute for technical education $10,000, $20,000 or $30,000, or whatever amount may be sufficient to inaugurate the system, its people will not be helped at all. That was not the method in connection with the road grants. Twenty million dollars is supposed to be distributed to the provinces for good roads. I understand that a lump sum is granted each province and the balance of the vote is divided among the provinces according to population. In that case the small province benefits fairly well with others that are more wealthy and populous.

In this case, the province will not get more than it puts up. Take a small province like Prince Edward Island with its very excellent talent. There is no province in Canada that has better men along technical, industrial and educational lines than the little province of Prince Edward Island. But when it comes to putting up thousands of dollars for the purpose of education, I am afraid it has not the revenue. The same thing to a great extent is true of the newer provinces such as British Columbia, and the result is that the bulk of this money will go to the two big, wealthy provinces of Ontario and Quebec. They are very much better off and better equipped for carrying out technical education without any help than the smaller provinces. I wish seriously to remind the minister and the Government of this particular part of the scheme and to urge them to see that nothing is allowed to happen that will defeat the purpose of the vote.

Mr. CALDER: If this resolution is adopted I think we might take it for granted that the principle that the hon. gentleman has referred to might be left for further consideration. Both in regards to agricultural aid and highways there is a provision whereby some of the provinces get a special grant. That is not done in this case but it is worth considering whether or not the same principle should be applied here. If the resolution is agreed to I think we could have an understanding that when the Bill is before us that principle is still open for discussion.

Mr. LEMIEUX That is, that a minimum will be fixed?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I hope the minister will not forget the suggestion I made in relation to industrial towns. There are industrial towns that are very anxious to have technical schools and they have levied a tax of a certain amount to establish and maintain these schools. If the province is not in a position to furnish the money, I see no reason why the towns should not be allowed to assess themselves to assist the province in establishing techni-

cal schools or why the money contributed should not count in the amount contributed by the province.

Mr. CALDER: I will bear that point in mind. I think it is well worth consideration. Let me put it in concrete form. In the city of Peterborough, for instance, they are desirous of establishing a technical school. They are prepared to put up the necessary building, provide the equipment, and so on. The provincial government may not feel justified in giving a grant towards this institution but the local people are prepared to put up the money to take care of the capital expenditure and maintenance. Under the law, no grant would be available for that institution unless the province contributed to it. It is worth while to consider whether or not this grant should be made available if the municipalities, instead of the province, are prepared to assist a scheme of this kind.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: To my mind there is a possibility of this money being practically all consumed by large cities like Toronto and Hamilton and that towns even as large as Peterborough will not participate in it to any great degree. Technical education, like education of any kind, is something that should be scattered broadcast throughout the country and it should be made possible for boys and girls in every part of the province to attend these schools if they so desire. It does not seem to me that there are any arrangements made whereby that can be worked out.

Mr. CALDER: The question as to where these institutions shall be established and what money shall be expended in connection with them is all a matter of agreement between the provincial government and the Minister of Labour.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I quite understand that but the point I desired to make was that under the present provincial system that is practically what happens. When the Dominion Government is stepping into the field and giving $10,000,000, I think there should be some guarantee that this money shall not be concentrated in the large cities, because they only supply a small percentage of the people.

Mr. PEDLOW: What are the reasons for the provisions in paragraph 4 and paragraph 5, subsections (b) and (c)? If the Dominion is prepared to make the grant that is provided for by this resolution it will be well to consider carefully the provisions that these paragraphs seem to make. Take a municipality like the town of Renfrew. They are considering the advisability of erecting a new collegiate institute in conjunction with which there is to be a technical school. They have arrived at a difficult point in their consideration of the proposal. The difficulty is that, whereas the municipality pays the entire cost of constructing the building, the pupils coming from outside the municipality pay nothing towards the cost. Over 55 per cent of the pupils come from outside the municipality, and it is considered very unfair that the municipality should provide the building and equipment for the education of pupils who come from the outside. Therefore, it is contended they should receive assistance towards the building and equipment of the institution that provides education facilities for children who are not in the municipality. They have made application to the Provincial Government for assistance towards the erection of that building. I would like to know if it is the intention of this Government to allow a part of the grant, if this resolution is carried, for a specific case of that kind or must it be used only for the maintenance of the institution, no part of the money to be provided being used for the erection of the building?

Mr. CALDER: Under clause 3 of section 5 provision is made to the effect that not more than 25 per cent of the grant payable to any province may be used for capital expenditure. Just where and how these moneys shall be used for capital expenditure will be a matter of agreement between the province and the Federal Government.

Mr. PEDLOW: Why make an exception in applying a part of the grant to institutions which are already in existence? For instance, I understand, there is in Montreal a splendid institution in operation and doing excellent work. Why not provide in section 4 that part of this money shall be applied towards the improvement or extension of that institution? As I read the section in its present form that cannot be done.

Mr. CALDER: As I explained this afternoon, the purpose of this grant is to provide for new work, not to take care of old expenditure. The whole amount would be eaten up by past expenditures if we were to adopt the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

What we want to do is to provide for new technical institutions and not take care of expenditures which have been already made.

Mr. PEDLOW: But suppose in the case of the institution referred to it is desired to extend the building?

Mr. CALDER: There is nothing here that will prevent a grant being made providing it is to be applied to an extension. This provision only prohibits using these grants for past expenditures and does not relate to new outlays.

Mr. PEDLOW: Then the Bill to be founded on this resolution will make provision for that?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and concurred in.

Mr. Calder thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill 131, for the promotion of Technical Education in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration) moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 52, to amend the Immigration Act, be now considered, and that Rule No. 29 in relation thereto be suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion, of course, can only be entertained by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on the amendment, Mr. J. M. Douglas in the Chair.

Mr. CALDER: Section 2, paragraph (II) of the Bill as it left the House provides that:

> Canadian domicile is lost, for the purposes of this Act, by a person voluntarily residing out of Canada not for a mere special or temporary purpose, but with the present intention of making his permanent home out of Canada.

The Senate proposes that these words be added to the paragraph:

> That his Canadian domicile be lost of a person temporarily residing out of Canada, or by any person belonging to the prohibited or undesirable classes within the meaning of section 41 of this Act. Section 41 enumerates the prohibited classes, and the paragraph in question is so amended that any person belonging to these prohibited classes shall not be considered as obtaining Canadian domicile.

Motion agreed to.

Senate amendment reported and concurred in.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. J. M. Douglas in the Chair.

Department of Railways and Canals.

> Compassionate allowance to Mrs. G. Peterkin, mother of late Herve Bazinet, who was drowned in discharge of his duty while in the employ of this Department on the Lachine Canal, on May 9, 1918, $2,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I draw the minister's attention to an accident which took place about the month of June last on the Intercolonial between St. Pacôme and Rivière Ouelle, as a result of which one man was killed. I think the cause was a collision between two engines. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and myself happened to be on the spot and saw the victim of the accident. Compassionate allowances have been given to the relatives of other victims, and I do not see why the same provision should not be made in this case.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Does the hon. gentleman know whether the victim was an employee of the Government or not?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes, he was an employee of the Government.

Mr. J. D. REID: Then he would come under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The hon. member will recollect that we passed a Workmen's Compensation Act last session under which in cases of accident or death the employee or his representative is compensated.

> Canals—Staff and Repairs and Statistical Officers, $1,842,500.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is the same amount as last year, with the exception of the increase for the permanent staff.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What are the increases covered by the $200,000?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is the increases to the lock men and the repair men on the canals.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister find that he has any applications from returned soldiers for the positions of lock men?

Mr. J. D. REID: All appointments of employees on these canals are made by the Civil Service Commission, and so far as I know only returned soldiers are appointed. I have insisted that in every case where returned soldiers are available, and can fill the positions, they are to be appointed. Up to the present time there has been no trouble in filling these positions with returned soldiers. The positions are suitable for returned men who have been wounded and are only capable of light outside work. It is only when a vessel locks through the canals that the men really are employed, and it is not hard work. So far the men have appreciated it.

Mr. McKENZIE: In the case of three or four applicants for one vacancy, is there any system by which the department makes its selections from returned men?

Mr. J. D. REID: The chief engineer makes application and the appointments are made by the Civil Service Commission. I have never interfered. But I did suggest to the engineer—at least, I have asked for it in my own constituency, and I think it is a good policy to follow—that he select men in this way: The man that should have the first opportunity of taking the position should be a wounded man who is married and has a family; the second choice should be a married man who has served overseas for a certain length of time and has not been wounded; the next a single man who has been wounded at the front; the fourth a single man who has fought at the front and has not been wounded. The Commission have been able to find men who have families, and I think a man who left his family of small children and went overseas and then returns wounded should have the first choice of any position we can give him.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the system of selection set forth by the minister is fair. If there is no other way of selection, I would even suggest that the length of service should count. In the case of two men one with three years' service at the front in the trenches and another with only a year's service, all other things being equal, I would give the preference to the man with the longer service. In this part of the country where the canals are close to the department I suppose there is closer supervision than is possible in remote districts. In the case of the St. Peter's canal—the only canal we have, as far as I remember, in the Maritime Provinces—I have heard complaints that the selection of men to fill vacancies was made by the lockmaster rather in a partisan way, and of course that is not the intention of the minister—

9 p.m.

Mr. J. D. REID: Oh, no.

Mr. McKENZIE:—nor of the department. I have received letters from that part of the country saying that the lockmaster was prevailed upon to make appointments which were not consistent with the merits of the applicants.

Mr. J. D. REID: I understand that the Civil Service Commission advertise in almost every case. Possibly they may have asked the lockmaster for information as to the qualifications of applicants. I do not know what means they take for obtaining such information. The main point I wish to emphasize is that I asked the chief engineer when he is making the applications, that if there are men in that particular locality who have been at the front and have been wounded and probably are not able to do any hard work, such men should get the preference. It is not a question of politics; I would not stand for that for one minute. A man might be overseas for four years and not get wounded, while another man might be over for only two years and come back wounded and incapable of doing other work. In that case I would feel that the man who is really unable to perform other work, but would be able to fill one of these positions, should be appointed. I have had them hold positions open in my own constituency until the men came back. I remember a case of a returned man with a wife and three children who was shot through the arm, rendering the limb stiff so that he could not do any hard work, but he was quite qualified for one of these canal positions. Of course, in a case like that he would get the preference over returned men who were not wounded, and were capable of undertaking any kind of work.

At all events, we are employing only returned soldiers. If others have slipped in, it is without my knowledge. Further, we have been making places for returned soldiers by letting out men who have other means and are able to get along without doing this work.

Mr. McKENZIE: What I meant was that, other things being equal, there being no other means of differentiating between two men who were applying, I suppose the question of military service would come in.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member will understand that we do not know anything about the man who has the position until he comes with his certificate from the Civil Service Commission. There was a case in my own county where a married man with a family and a single man were applicants for a position, and the single man got the certificate. All we can do in a case of that kind is to bring the matter to the attention of the Civil Service Commission, in which case the commission might reconsider it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I must say that I have heard no complaint in this regard except the one I have mentioned. I suggest that the minister cause an inquiry to be made as to how many men were put on the St. Peter's canal, and how they were selected, or by whom they were recomended.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How is a returned soldier to apply for a position, say, on the Intercolonial railway? Suppose he wants to be a cleaner in a roundhouse, or a brakeman, to whom is he to make application?

Mr. J. D. REID: To the superintendent of the division. As my hon. friend knows, the Government railways do not come under the Civil Service Commission. The President, Mr. Hanna, thoroughly understands the policy to be followed in that regard; returned soldiers must have the preference in all cases where they can be obtained. Of course, the selections must be made a little more carefully for a railway than, perhaps, for other branches of the public service. The position to be filled might be one of responsibility, where life was at stake. But now that the soldiers are practically all home you can get a returned man for almost any position. So far, I have been able to do so.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understood that there was a mechanical officer at Moncton who looked after all applications for positions in the mechanical department in the whole of the eastern division.

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course, the superintendent may hand the application over to the head of the particular department in which the man wishes to be employed, and there his application would be considered. Many applications come to me from persons who do not understand that the department has nothing to do with these appointments. These applications are forwarded to Mr. Hanna, who has them sent to the proper officials.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I have been asked whether returned soldiers take precedence in the matter of appointments to others holding temporary positions on the railway, and I could not give a definite answer. Let us assume that in one of the roundhouses, or on a particular section of the road, a number of men are temporarily employed and a returned soldier is anxious to get one of these positions; is it the policy of the Government to make room for the returned soldier by letting one of those men off?

Mr. J. D. REID: The policy is this: Wherever a new man is taken on a returned soldier must have the preference. But the brotherhoods insist upon their men being promoted; they will not allow a man to be dismissed to make room for some one else.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Then you make a distinction between permanent employees and temporary employees in that matter?

Mr. J. D. REID: Well, I could not say as to that; I would have to take that up with the officials. But all men must be employed temporarily at first, no matter what the positions are. The hon. member probably refers to men who are taken on for a month or two months. In all cases, whether the position is one to be filled for a day, a week, or two or three weeks, the returned soldier has the preference. But if there is a vacancy in a roundhouse, and if there is a man below who belongs to the union, he would be promoted to the position vacated, and his position would, in turn, be filled by a returned soldier. But you have to follow out the rules of the union; you cannot deprive a man of his promotion.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Then I understand that if there are some temporary employees in a roundhouse and a returned soldier asks for one of the positions, if those men desire to stay there the minister will not interfere with them, but when there is a vacancy a position may be given to the returned soldier? That is not doing very much for the soldier.

Mr. PEDLOW: Part of this item is $42,500 for statistical officers. I understood that when the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was organized the collection of statistics by the different departments was to be abandoned. If I am correct in that, why the provision for these statistical officers?

Mr. J. D. REID: That item has been there for a good many years. The statistics are forwarded to the Board of Railway Commissioners and to the Bureau of Statistics, which is under the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Some years ago these men used to be called collectors of canal tolls, and now that canal tolls are abolished, the men are called statistical officers. On the Rideau canal, for instance, we have a man here who issues passes for vessels going from Ottawa to Kingston, and there is another man at Kingston. Vessels have to have passes to go through the canals. In getting a pass the captain of a vessel has to give these men a report as to the cargo, whether it is light or heavy, the name of the vessel, and other information. This appropriation is to pay these men and others. Our statistics branch has practically disappeared, there remaining only four or five of the officials, and no more statistics will be printed and circulated by the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. PEDLOW: The same amount of money was appropriated last year for the same purpose, and I understood then that, if not all, at least a major portion of the work would be done by this new Bureau of Statistics. Such work as the minister has referred to should be done by the local men at the port of entry. These men should be capable of doing the work as well as the collecting, thus dispensing with the appointment of statistical officers for that particular work. The work cannot be very exacting, and any man of ordinary business capacity should be able to keep a record of vessels going through the canals, the tonnage and so forth, and forward it to the Bureau of Statistics,

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member is hardly right. In some cases the lockmaster does that work. For instance, at Kingston, St. Peters, and on the Trent canal, the lockmaster does that work; but in Montreal, where vessels are passing all the time, the lockmaster has to be on hand to watch the lock gates, to see that the lock work is carried on properly, because vessels entering the locks on the Lachine canal in many instances require almost the full capacity of the lock, there being scarcely six inches to spare. While a vessel like that is being locked through, the lockmaster watches the whole performance, and the purser or clerk of the vessel goes into the canal office where the statistical officer is, and it generally takes the whole time the vessel is going through to get the pass made out and the statistics recorded in detail. Then the hydraulic rents have to be collected and so on. The only place where anything will be saved as regards statistics is in Ottawa, where formerly every department had a statistical branch, whereas now they are all organized under the Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. PEDLOW: How many officers are employed in this service; what salary is paid each man and at what points are they employed?

Mr. J. D. REID: There are four on the St. Lawrence canal, four on the Rideau canal, seven on the Trent canal, eight on the Welland canal, eleven on the Lachine canal, eight of them being at Montreal and two at Lachine; four on the Chambly canal, two at Chambly and two at St. John. The salaries range as follows: At St. Peters, the salary is $200 a year. At Cornwall, one man has $1,200 a year with a bonus of $100. Another man has $840, and another one $100. At Ottawa the officer has a salary of $1,500, with $100 of a bonus. Then we have an officer at $360 on the Rideau.

Mr. PEDLOW: There are two men at Smiths Falls.

Mr. J. D. REID: At Smiths Falls there is only one, Mr. J. H. Foster, at $400 a year. At Kingston the lockmaster has a salary of $400 a year. On the Trent canal one man has a salary of $200 and one has $120. The highest salaries seem to be paid on the Lachine canal. One man has $2,100, another $1,200, another $1 200, and another $1,100.

Mr. PEDLOW: One man on the Lachine canal gets $2,100?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: The other night we were discussing the Estimates of Marine and Fisheries, and it was stated that the harbourmaster at Halifax was getting only $1,800 a year. Does it seem reasonable that a man on the Lachine canal should get

$2,100 and the harbourmaster at Halifax only $1,800?

Mr. J. D. REID: The man on the Lachine canal collects $200,000 to $250,000 a year, and a salary of $2,100 is not unreasonable for a man holding such a responsible position and living in Montreal.

Mr. GAUVREAU: It is not enough.

Mr. PEDLOW: If $2,100 is not enough for the work on the Lachine canal how can it be argued that $1,800 is enough for the harbourmaster at Halifax, handling the enormous business that passes in and out of that city?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not know anything about Halifax. It strikes me that the salaries at Montreal are not unreasonable, considering the high cost of living.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand that the man on the St. Peter's canal is paid only $200?

Mr. J. D. REID: He is a lock master and gets that in addition to his salary.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is his fixed salary?

Mr. J. D. REID: He received $65 a month as lock master and $200 extra.

Mr. McKENZIE: And how are the men paid who work under him?

Mr. J. D. REID: They get about the same. Of course, they get the bonus as well. The lock master works the year round and the others only in the season.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understand that a number of men are employed on the Montreal end of the Lachine canal. What is the total amount of salaries paid these men for the collection of the $250,000? The man in charge who gets $2,100 plus $100 is not doing all the work?

Mr. J. D. REID: He has quite a staff, for the reason that there must be a day staff and a night staff, just as there are lock masters and lock labourers on the Lachine canal where vessels pass night and day. On the Rideau canal they have only a day staff.

Mr. PEDLOW: The cost of collection is about 5 per cent.

Welland Ship Canal, construction, $3,500,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: There were some serious requests for information in regard to the new colony which has been established on the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID: Where?

Mr. McKENZIE: On the Welland canal. It is said that the work was started for the purpose of giving employment to men on the peninsula, and it was contended that they were mostly foreigners. I think the minister was supposed to give us some idea as to who really are the people employed there and where they come from.

Mr. J. D. REID: I was asked about returned soldiers employed there. Take the four sections on which contracts were started in order to give employment to returned men. First, the engineering staff. Of 63 appointed the total number of returned soldiers was 57, or 90 per cent. The staff has since been increased by a large addition of returned soldiers. Contractors' employees of all classes of labour total 1,109. The number of returned soldiers was 228 or 19 per cent. There is a lot of this labour which returned soldiers would not undertake. In regard to skilled labour, contractors' employees number 681, of whom 219 are returned soldiers, or 32 per cent. All the contractors report that it is impossible to obtain returned soldiers to work as labourers although every effort was made to that end.

Mr. PEDLOW: Has the minister the particulars as to the nationalities of these labourers employed on the canal?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not that information.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are only about 67 technical officers engaged?

Mr. J. D. REID: This statement was prepared up to 2nd May, early in the work. Since then the number of employees has been increased, practically all being returned soldiers.

Mr. McKENZIE: I quite understand what the minister means. He gives us the percentage of departmental officials in this work, but I am not quite clear as to the number of returned soldiers employed altogether.

Mr. J. D. REID: Perhaps I have not made myself quite clear. The Government has a certain staff of office men and engineers numbering 63 to see that the work is carried out. Of this number 57 are returned soldiers. On May 2 there were employed—a great many more having been engaged since—1,109 men of all classes of labour. Of this number, 228 were returned soldiers. Of the 1,109, 681 were skilled labourers, and of that 681, 219 were returned soldiers. It will be seen therefore that only nine returned soldiers are doing the work of labourers.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was reading somewhere the other day of an inquiry in which a former member of this House, Mr. German, I think, gave his opinion as to the enlargement of this canal.

I do not know whether the minister saw the interview or statement it was to the effect that the money expended upon the enlargement of this canal to a capacity much greater than the navigable capacity at each end of the canal was really money expended to no purpose, that the department is now deepening the canal to 22 feet on the sills, that for miles and miles at either end there is only sufficient depth of water to accommodate a vessel with a draught of 8 or 9 feet at the outside, and that it may be many years before there can be any return to the country for this large expenditure upon a certain section in the middle of the system. This is like a man who forges a chain 100 feet in length; he makes a certain section of the links very strong and stout and the rest of the links very weak. The old saying is that the strength of the chain is the strength of the weakest link. Will the minister explain what good purpose that enlarged section serves when the rest of the waterway from Montreal to Kingston is not sufficiently deep to carry a vessel of the size for which he is providing in the enlargement of the Welland canal?

Mr. J. D. REID: I did not see the interview with Mr. German but perhaps I might explain what I think he refers to. In the first place, in order to construct this canal from lake Ontario to lake Erie, it was divided into eight sections. For four of them the contract was given out some years ago. These are right in the middle of the canal. They are lock work. The building of the locks will take twice as long as the other work. The intention was to commence the other sections when this work was about half through so that all would be completed at the same time. Probably Mr. German was expressing the view that when this work in the middle of the canal was completed it would be no use because the ends had not been completed. If the work at the ends were going on now all the work would be completed at the same time, so that a vessel could go right through to Montreal. The other work to be done is more like dredging, and it will have to be completed when times get normal and when we get down to prices which are fairly reasonable. The prices of material and labour are so high that I think we should go as slowly as possible. It is only to give employment to people who are out of work that we are proceeding with this work at the present time. There is another point that the hon. member may have referred to. Perhaps Mr. German said that we were making this 30 feet in depth when probably the waterway above has a less depth of water. I do not know whether that is the fact or not but I want to point out that in constructing this canal we are making the depth greater than that of the St. Lawrence canals at the present time. We are making it 25 or 30 feet so that a vessel can go to Kingston or Prescott. She could not go on to Montreal because there is only a depth of 14 feet on the sills in the St. Lawrence canals. Still people may say that you would not want a greater depth for many years. When the Welland canal was built first it was a 9-foot canal and the reports of the department said that they expected it would last for thirty years. Just about the time the work was completed they were in the same position as when they started out, for larger vessels had been constructed. They then deepened the canal to 12 feet. The records of the department will show that Mr. Page, who was then the chief engineer of the department, stated that a 12-foot canal was good for thirty years. Before they got through with that 12-foot canal they found they were in about the same position as before,—ten-thousand-ton vessels are operating on these western lakes. In the early days the vessels that ran between Chicago, Kingston and Montreal were vessels of 1,000 or 1,500 tons. Then they got up to 2,500 or 3,000 tons, and they have been increasing until now the vessels that operate from Lake Superior down to Buffalo are 10,000 or 12,000-ton vessels, capable of carrying 400,000 bushels of wheat. The intention is that these same vessels shall go through the canal and on to Kingston at least. Port Colborne, which is at the head of the Welland canal, is only

a few miles from Buffalo. These vessels operate from Lake Superior to Buffalo. There is no reason why they should not go through this canal and on to Kingston. If the canalizing of the St. Lawrence river to Montreal should be proceeded with, and completed, 10,000 or 12,000-ton vessels can go from Port Arthur to Montreal and—yes, —right across the ocean.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister explain what depth of water we have now from Montreal to the eastern end of the Welland canal?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have 14 feet of water in the canal and, of course, that is what we must go by. A vessel plying between the Welland canal and Montreal can load from the Welland canal to Kingston or to Prescott to a 30-foot draught, but it can only have a 14-foot draught from Prescott on. With the damming of the St. Lawrence, which will really be the canalizing of it, a vessel can load to any draught. A 10,000-ton vessel could go right down to Montreal without any trouble whatever, and it would only have to pass through five or six locks instead of 28 or 30.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The ground is taken by a number of people who are well posted on this matter that the Welland canal should not be proceeded with. The minister has not dealt with that question. I do not know what amount of money has been spent up to date, But by the time the work is completed it will have cost at least $50,000,000. If that is an improvident expenditure it should be decided at once whether we will go on with the work or not. I was very much impressed with the speech of the Finance Minister this afternoon regarding the financial condition of the country, which everybody admits is very serious. We are now proposing to undertake a new work, which is estimated to cost $50,000,000, and prominent men in the vicinity who have studied the question are of the opinion that it should not be proceeded with at all, but that the present equipment will sufficiently satisfy present needs. But the minister has not dealt with that phase of it at all. I suppose the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) in his remarks was referring to a circular letter a copy of which I have received, and which left a great impression on my mind. This letter is from a gentleman named Charles B. Watts. I do not know him, but having made inquiry I find he is the secretary of the Dominion Millers' Association, that he is a very substantial man, that he is interested in transportation on the Great Lakes, and that he should know as much about this subject as any man in that vicinity. I will read an extract from Mr. Watts' letter, so as to put the minister in possession of the facts as they appear to that gentleman. The letter is addressed from the Royal Bank building, Toronto, is dated May 28, 1919, and in it Mr. Watts says:

Mr. German Says "Spending $50,000,000 on Welland Canal Wasteful." The interest Alone Would Carry Grain Free, Fort William To Montreal.

Dear Sir:

The postponing of the completion of the Welland Canal, under present conditions, should not be treated as a party question, involving as it does, an expenditure of over $50,000,000, and with the labourers striking for higher pay, probably over $60,000,000, from which no revenue will be derived but the yearly cost of operation and maintenance will have to be provided by Canada.

All parties should combine to conserve Canada's resources.

Wasteful Expenditure: Mr. German, ex-M.P. for Welland, stated before the Associated Boards of Trade, in Toronto, a few weeks ago, "that vessel men themselves, would consider the spending of $50,000,000 on the Welland Canal, a wasteful expenditure, unless Canada's system was carried through to tidewater."

This, he estimated, would cost over $300,000,000 additional.

Mr. German said "that he had been told that big freighters would prefer to discharge cargoes at Port Colborne (as now) than to discharge at Prescott or Brockville" as they could get return cargoes just across the lake.

This means only the smaller boats would run through the enlarged canal till the St. Lawrence Canals were also deepened as above.

Joint Development: The Greater Waterways Deputation to Washington, a short time ago, advocated the U.S. paying half the cost of opening a deep water channel from the Great Lakes to the ocean.

The Minister of Railways is negotiating with the U.S. for international development of water power on the St. Lawrence for electrical purposes.

The deepening of the waterways should also be done jointly.

Canada cannot find capital under present conditions to provide waterways free for U.S. traffic and maintain and operate the same. Over half the traffic through the present canal is U.S. tonnage and no tolls are charged.

Carry Grain Free: The interest on less than $50,000,000 would pay more than the whole freight from Fort William to Montreal at rates prevailing in 1914 and 1915, on all the Canadian grain which passed through the Welland Canal to Montreal in 1914, which was the largest quantity ever shipped through the Welland Canal to Montreal.

See Canal Statistics for 1916, pages 19, 20 and 48.

By ceasing expenditure, as it will no doubt take over $50,000,000 to complete the canal under present conditions, Canada would save the whole capital expenditure and if desirable to use the interest, could pay the whole of the freight as above and thus have the grain carried for nothing from Fort William to Montreal.

If this statement is true it is extraordinary that we should go headlong into an expenditure of $50,000,000, with the prospect of spending $300,000,000 more before we can reach tide-water at Montreal; and it looks to me as if the minister would have to make out a stronger case than he has yet shown for this very large expenditure. If I understand the statement made by this gentleman, the canal is not absolutely required at the present time; and he says that if it were discontinued the interest will pay the whole charges on the grain to be shipped through the canal in any one year. We should have our $50,000,000 in the treasury, and the interest that would accrue from that amount let out at interest would give the grain men of the West free transportation for their products from Fort William to Montreal. It would be a fine thing to have free grain from Fort William to Montreal; and I would ask the minister to answer this gentleman's statement and tell the committee, if he can, how he justifies this enormous expenditure.

Mr. J. D. REID: I would be surprised to learn that Mr. German ever made any such statement as that which is attributed to him in the circular which has been just read. Let me say that we are not starting a new work; the sum of $16,000,000 has already been expended on the project. It was commenced several years ago, but operations were suspended owing to the war. The enlargement of the Welland canal is not a new undertaking; the commencement of the canal dates back to fifty or sixty years ago, beginning first with a depth of nine feet, then twelve feet, and now an even deeper waterway is proposed. Reference has been made to the amount of grain that passed through the canal in the course of a year. We are not dealing with a canal capable merely of carrying the quantity of grain that passes through it in one year; this canal is being constructed to take care of the grain and the products originating in the West for many years to come. The grain from Western Canada that is transported to Liverpool to-day goes in large 10,000-ton vessels, by the American route to Buffalo, then through the Erie canal to New York. That is the route our grain is taking instead of through Canadian channels to Canadian ports. Even by the United States routes the cost per bushel is more than it would be if the canals now under way were constructed through to Montreal. I venture to say that when that is done the cost of the grain carried to Montreal will be so much less that the farmers and grain growers of the Western Provinces will receive more for their products; in fact, the saving in a few years would probably pay for the cost of the Welland canal. There is no question about it, a very large saving in transportation charges will be effected by the improvement of our system of canals. When the Welland canal is enlarged it will be possible for the large 10,000-ton steamers to go to Kingston and discharge grain there.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: In place of Port Colborne?

Mr. J. D. REID: In place of Port Colborne.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the advantage of that?

Mr. J. D. REID: The 10,000-ton vessel will carry grain from Port Arthur or Fort William to Kingston for practically the same amount as to Buffalo; there will be a very small margin of difference. The trip is probably twenty-four hours longer from Port Colborne to Kingston, and they may charge a small amount for that extra day's operation of the steamer. At Kingston they are within about fifteen or eighteen hours of Montreal, and they carry large cargoes to Montreal. The 10,000-ton vessels will come to Kingston, but if they can go no further than to Port Colborne, as at the present, then vessels carrying only about 60,000 or 65,000 bushels would continue to operate between Port Colborne and Montreal, a distance of probably four hundred miles.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How far is it from Port Colborne to Kingston?

Mr. J. D. REID: Probably 300 miles. The traffic for that 300 miles would be carried in 10,000-ton vessels; that is the difference. As to the canalizing of the St. Lawrence river, that is a big question and has not yet been brought before this House. But the American Government are deeply in-

terested in it and are taking it up with great energy with a view of routing their traffic to Montreal or to the Atlantic instead of having to transhipit at Buffalo for conveyance to New York. The advantage to the American side of the river, if they canalize the St. Lawrence, would be that these 10,000-ton or 8,000-ton vessels—and the latter is quite a large tonnage now—crossing the Atlantic will load at Liverpool or at any other port and return straight to Chicago, Duluth or Buffalo. That is why the Western States are urging that this work be undertaken, and, of course, the American Government recognize the great advantages that would accrue, no matter what the cost might be. The hon. member's figures are very much higher in every way than those of our own engineers. But the American Government realize that if they do take part in this work they will have an interest in the power on account of its being international water, and if 300,000 to 600,000 horsepower were generated they would be entitled to their share—quite an asset.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: They are not getting that?

Mr. J. D. REID: No; it is only on the canalizing of the St. Lawrence that this water-power would be developed. At present the St. Lawrence river canals are built along the shore just where the rapids are. This proposal would mean that at the particular rapids a dam would be thrown across the whole river—I think there are some five rapids between Prescott and Montreal—and there would be a tremendous water-power at each one of those dams.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The benefit would accrue to the big freighters; there would be no benefit to the small freighters, because the present accommodation is sufficient for them. The statement is made by this gentleman, who knows the grain trade intimately, that the big freighters prefer to discharge their cargo at Port Col-
10 p.m. borne because they can get a return cargo. How is the minister going to get over that? If he cannot get the big freighters to come down to Kingston, then his big canal will be no good to any body.

Mr. J. D. REID: Here is another advantage of boats coming to Kingston instead of Port Colborne. When the Soo canal was constructed on the same lines as the Welland and other canals—as it originally was—a vessel carrying about 65,000 bushels was the largest that could proceed from Port Arthur or Fort William to Buffalo, and the rate was about five cents a bushel. Immediately the Soo canal became available for boats of 10,000 tons, the rates were cut down to one and-a-half to two cents a bushel. That was a great advantage to those who were selling their grain in the West. The same thing applies on a vessel now from Port Colborne to Montreal. A vessel would probably get two or three cents a bushel between those points, whereas the rate from Kingston to Montreal is one and-a-half cents—they would probably charge three and-a-half cents a bushel; whereas the large freighter of 10,000 tons would probably bring that cargo from Port Colborne to Kingston at half a cent a bushel on account of the large quantity and the time taken—only one day. The hon. member has stated that the advantage to the large freighters at Port Colborne is that they get a return cargo. But when the vessels come to Kingston the return cargo they get ninety-nine times out of a hundred is a cargo of coal. They do not get it at Port Colborne; they have to run over to Ashtabula for the coal, and then they take it up to Fort William. The only difference in the case of Kingston is that they get the cargo exactly the same, but they run from Kingston up to Ashtabula likewise, and they can afford to do that having received freight down to Kingston. I think there is no doubt that if we want to hold our traffic for our own ports through our own country, the only possible water route is through the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence river. Then again, if we want to give to the people of the West the advantages of getting cheap transportation between Port Arthur or Fort William and Montreal so that they will get that much more for their grain, the only way is through the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence river to Montreal. I have always lived on the St. Lawrence and know everything in connection with the water route between Port Arthur and Montreal, and I understand thoroughly what I am talking about when I discuss this matter.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I have no doubt of that. But at the same time I make a proposition to the minister by which the Western grain men would get their grain to Montreal absolutely free. If he would save this $50,000,000 and put it out at 5 per

cent he would have two and a half million dollars a year, and that would pay all the freight on grain from Fort William to Montreal, and we would keep our $50,000,000 for future investment. That is the proposition made to the minister, and I do not think he has met it.

Mr. J. D. REID: Does my hon. friend mean that the grain would be shipped by rail from Port Arthur to Montreal?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: No, by water. I understand this gentleman to mean that the freight on the grain shipped by water from Fort William to Montreal could be paid with the interest on this money that we are spending on the building of canals.

Mr. J. D. REID: That may be all right if the hon. member argues the point on the basis of the same amount of grain being carried after this canal is constructed as was carried two or three years ago. But we would not have proceeded with this work if that was all the grain we expected over that route. I hope, and I think every member of the Committee believes, that our great Northwest will be filled up in the years to come, and we want facilities to carry the grain between these points at the cheapest possible rates. The hon. member knows the quantity of Canadian grain that goes through via Buffalo and New York, because he put a question in the House with regard to that matter. That grain went via Buffalo and New York because the waterway between those points has been enlarged, and the rate is so much cheaper than it is between Port Colburne and Montreal. As soon as we get the water route between Port Colborne and Montreal in the same condition as the route between Buffalo and New York so that larger quantities of grain may be carried, then even the American grain will go to Montreal, because we can carry it cheaper from Port Colborne to Montreal than it can be carried from Buffalo to New York, and in a shorter time. If we had the new Welland canal constructed and the St. Lawrence route improved you could go from Port Colborne to Montreal in twenty-four hours, whereas you could not go from Buffalo to New York in less than three days. That is an advantage that I think is worthy of consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not, in principle, opposed to the deepening of the Welland canal, although this vast expenditure was entered upon at a time when it was said to be good policy to forego the construction of a real, national waterway, the Georgian Bay canal. All the western legislatures and all the western interests favoured the Georgian Bay canal, but for a reason which I shall not disclose it was thought better to enter upon the expenditure which is now confronting us. This Dominion has launched into many important ventures during the last twenty-five or thirty years. We sunk millions in the Trent Valley canal, and got very little return. However, the Trent Valley canal is completed. And now we are undertaking this vast expenditure on the Welland canal, without any policy, so to speak. The explanations given by the minister are very vague and not to the point of the able memorandum that has been distributed broadcast by the secretary of the Dominion Millers' Association. But whether the deepening of the Welland canal is good policy or not does not matter at the present moment. Having regard to the revelations made this afternoon by the Minister of Finance, the Government ought to be very chary about involving the Dominion in this expenditure of $3,500,000 and perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars in the future. Sensible as the project may be, good as it may be, does my hon. friend believe that it should be entered upon now? In view of our enormous commitments—the interest charges on our war debt, the pension charges, and so on—does not he consider that it would be wise to drop even very valuable and very sensible projects? The Minister of Finance this afternoon advised Parliament to practise very strict economy. Well, is this practising economy? In view of our financial situation; in view of the fact that we shall have to make new borrowings during the present fiscal year in order to make both ends meet, is it sound and wise policy to go on with an expenditure which might well wait for a few years? When normal conditions come in a few years, Canada, being a progressive country, will not begrudge the expenditure of such amounts as are being asked this evening. But under present circumstances, with the unrest that prevails, with the fear that financial authorities have as to the future, and with the appalling debt that is staring us in the face surely my hon. friend should postpone this work. The section of Ontario that is most interested in this work is too patriotic, too intelligent, not to realize that sacrifices

have to be made. The West has made the sacrifice as regards the Georgian Bay canal. I remember some years ago reading in the House resolutions adopted unanimously by the Grain Growers' Associations of the West urging upon the Government the necessity of commencing work on the Georgian Bay canal. The West has made that sacrifice. We have made it in our own province, although for many years the construction of that work has been promised. This enormous expenditure will affect seriously the credit of our country. As was stated this afternoon by the Minister of Finance the credit of Canada must be maintained unimpaired for the commitments of the future. The minister does not treat this matter with his usual sagacity. Parliament is already committed to very large expenditure in connection with our railway problem. By the way, the Government is expressing itself strongly in favour of Government ownership.

The other day in the other branch of this Parliament the Government, represented there by my good friend Sir James Lougheed, was not going as far as his colleagues are in this Chamber. But that is not the question and this is only an aside. What I am aiming at is this: The Government will have to spend millions and millions, not much less than $50,000,000 on the National railways for equipment to provide for deficit. Are we not experimenting enough for such a financial year as the one we are entering upon? Why should we enter upon this enormous expenditure when we can well afford to pause and wait? This is not a normal year.

Mr. J. D. REID: As regards the Welland canal, the hon. member practically states that we are just commencing this work. This work was originated by the Government of which he was a member, and that policy was the right one to adopt.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the national debt of Canada then?

Mr. J. D. REID; I am coming to that. There was no objection to that policy, and we proceeded with the work in normal times. The work was closed down when the war commenced. As I stated the other evening, we did not want to commence this work at present. Immediately the armistice was signed thousands of men in the Welland canal district were thrown out of employment, and there were returning from overseas thousands of men who wanted employment. What the hon. member is finding fault with now is that when the works were closed down, the Government, in order to provide work for men thrown out of employment and for soldiers returning from overseas, decided to proceed with the work. The hon. gentleman to-night objects to the Government having arranged to find work for those men whose families require food to keep them alive. The hon. member might also censure the Government for proceeding with other works. Why should we have proceeded with certain works in Montreal? In that city the locomotive works and the car works wanted employment for their men. Those industries were manufacturing munitions, and when the armistice was signed, locomotive and car work had to be proceeded with in order to give employment to those thrown out of employment so as to prevent unrest. The hon. member states that in the West they were willing to forego the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. I do not think any member in this House and especially any member from the West expected that we would proceed with work on the Georgian Bay canal for years to come. But what have we done in the West in order to provide employment? The Government is proceeding with the construction of railways in the West, constructing branch lines, paying large prices for rails and ties, and doing everything possible to find employment for returned soldiers and others. The Canadian Pacific railway are not proceeding with construction in the West as the Government are, and president Beattie will say that the reason is that they do not want to pay the price that must be paid at present for rails and other material. We are also proceeding with the construction of railways in order to keep the rail plant going at Sault Ste. Marie. The Government gave contracts there for 100,000 tons, and only yesterday we gave another small contract to keep the plant going. A deputation of employees from Sault Ste. Marie came to Ottawa and told me the condition they would be in if that plant was closed down. We gave the plant an order for rails for the purpose of providing employment and not because we really wanted the rails. We could have done without them at that time, as we need not have proceeded with the work. Yet the hon. member to-night would censure this Government for trying to keep the Sault Ste. Marie plant going in order to keep these men and their families in food until orders which were expected very

shortly were received from overseas. The same is true at Sydney where we gave the Dominion Iron and Steel Company work in manufacturing steel rails until somewhere around the first of July in order to keep their employees going. That is the reason why we have been giving these orders and why the Welland canal is being proceeded with at present. If the men who are employed on this Welland ship canal can get employment in any other way in that district, which has always been their home, from which they left to go overseas and fight for this country and to which they have returned, I am willing to close down the work at any time, but just as long as returned soldiers are walking the streets and wanting employment and have families to provide for, I am willing to put an amount in the Estimates for this work, and I believe the people of Canada will stand by me in my endeavour to provide work for them.

Mr. McCREA: I doubt very much if the minister has any returned soldiers on this work. How many returned soldiers are there on it?

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member was not in when I gave the figures which are those of May 2. As I stated, the work was commenced particularly for returned soldiers, but of course there are certain kinds of this work that you cannot get and I would not ask returned soldiers to do. For that reason, returned soldiers cannot be altogether employed. We are not trying to rush the work; we are trying simply to keep the men, who are really in need of work, and who have families to provide for, going until times have become normal again. The intention is to close that work down just as soon as possible provided that these men can get work elsewhere.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the rate of wages per diem paid to returned soldiers? I am not speaking of engineers.

Mr. J. D. REID: Common labour, 40 cents an hour. When we started this work the Minister of Labour sent one of his best men up there to ascertain what the prevailing rates were and we paid those rates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister says this work is to be stopped as soon as there is a return of normal conditions.

Mr. J. D. REID: We gave it on a percentage basis not to extend longer than 31st December next. I thought that by that time conditions would be normal again and we would decide on what was to be done in the future. But we can close the work down at any time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is not continuous work then? The minister does not intend to complete that work?

Mr. J. D. REID: If things become normal and the financial situation is such that it would be advisable to go on with the work, we intend calling for tenders. But that is a matter for future decision.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is there not some productive work on which these men could be put that would be better than what they are doing? What percentage are the contractors paid on labour?

Mr. J. D. REID: Eight per cent, out of which overhead charges have to be taken.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is that the total percentage?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is the total, but they do not get it on material we supply ourselves.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That seems to be a small percentage compared with what the Minister of Naval Service was paying at Montreal. I understood he was paying 65 per cent on the total amount of labour and 10 per cent on top of that, on labour and material combined. If the Minister of Railways is able to make a bargain at 8 per cent out of which overhead charges have to be paid, he has done much better than his colleague.

Mr. J. D. REID: That may be for some large plant or machinery or something of that nature. We pay 8 per cent and have our own plant and the contractor has his own overhead charges.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the extent of the work—how many miles?

Mr. J. D. REID: About seven miles altogether is under contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Between what points?

Mr. J. D. REID: Port Weller and Thorold, and also at Allanburg.

Mr. McKENZIE: A matter of great national importance occurs to me in connection with this work. My conception of

ideal transportation has always been that our grain should be carried direct by rail from the point of shipment to tide water. I suppose it can be done cheaper the other way, but it seems to me that there is considerable difficulty in handling grain when it is shifted from one kind of conveyance to another. The Minister of Railways is also the Minister of Canals and he is competing with himself. He is working up a system of canals to take traffic from his system of railways. Would it not be well to bring these two departments together and try to strike a middle course and see if the Minister of Canals could not agree with the Minister of Railways on some system by which we might have the magnificent condition in this country that a car of grain loaded at Port Arthur, or Winnipeg, or anywhere in the West could go direct to Montreal, Halifax, or St. John and be dumped straight into the ship? We are willing to spend millions and hundreds of millions of dollars on this new railroad, the Transcontinental railway. We have built a grade of railway hitherto unknown in this country for large trains to carry freight cheaper than before. It is well worth while for the minister and all of us to consider if it is not possible, even at a small loss, when we own the railroads ourselves, to carry freight by rail from point of shipment straight to the city of Montreal, say, at tidewater?

Mr. J. D. REID: It has been a recognized fact that the carrying of grain or any freight by water can always be done more cheaply than by rail. The very fact that the Canadian Pacific railway, which is in opposition to the Canadian Government railway, carry their grain from Port Arthur to Midland or Port McNicoll on the Georgian bay and then transfer it to the rail is proof of the economy of water transportation. They take every bushel they can by vessel, and, if I remember rightly, in normal times the very best the Canadian Pacific railway could carry grain from Port Arthur to Montreal for—and they did not claim that they were making money—was 12½ cents per bushel. That was at a low rate; in winter it is 22 or 22½ cents. By vessel from Port Arthur to Montreal at the same time the rates were 5 or 6 cents a bushel, or at most one-half. During the season of navigation practically no grain leaves Port Arthur or Fort Williiam over rails. The Canadian Pacific railway carry their traffic in a most economical way, and it is quite evident that when they carry freight of all kinds to and from the west by vessel, from Port Arthur and Fort William to Georgian Bay ports, and then by rail to Montreal, the reason must be that they cannot possibly compete or carry traffic on as economic a basis by rail as by water. If they could, they would not go to the expense of unloading into elevator at Port Arthur and lifting it out of the vessel at Port McNicoll and putting it on cars again. I have taken up this matter with the railway officials, who have no doubt they can prove in a very short time that there could be no successful competition in this direction. When the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Cochrane) was Minister of Railways he gave a rate of 6 cents per bushel from Armstrong, I think, or the station opposite Fort William, through to Quebec. The steamer could take the freight at Port Arthur or Fort William and take it through to Quebec at 6 cents a bushel and make money, while on every bushel of grain we carried from Armstrong to Quebec at the same time by rail we lost money.

We could not possibly compete. That was the experience we had in operating both services. I do not know that I could give any better evidence than that, but there would not be any trouble in convincing the leader of the Opposition from evidence that could be got from the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Railway Companies, which have had actual experience both by water and rail. All of these companies have their own traffic steamers.

Canals—Capital—Trent canal—construction and betterments, $1,000,000.

Towards construction of a high level bridge over the Otonabee river at Hunter street, Peterboro, Ont., $50,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that in connection with the canal?

Mr. J. D. REID: This is for carrying on the work that is in progress there. There are several contracts that are going on.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What were your returns from the Trent canal last year?

Mr. J. D. REID: The only items in connection with the contract work are on the Severn division of the Trent canal. The canal has been opened through from Trenton to Orillia. Two hundred thousand dollars is asked for contracts that were started when the war broke out, and we are just starting them again to keep men employed in that district. The rest is for works along the canal, including the Gilmour's siding

bridge, four works on the four divisions to cost $11,000, $7 000, $16,000, $2,000; Grand Trunk high level bridge, $5,278; Rice lake, $14,000, etc.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. gentleman give me any idea of the movement of ships through the Trent canal last year, the salaries paid the officials, and the returns?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Trent canal is free of tolls. It was only opened about a year ago and it is used by small craft.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many ships passed through the canal last year?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not the record here. I had been under the impression that the building of the canal was really throwing money away.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Say that a little louder, please.

Mr. J. D. REID: I say I was under that impression until I went through it last year. We spent $16,000 000 on the Trent Valley canal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Sunk it?

Mr. J. D. REID: We did not sink it, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why. There is quite a lot of traffic on that canal in which small craft take part, but in addition there is 150,000 horsepower of electrical energy developed and the people of the locality get the benefit of it. All the power used between Toronto and Kingston is supplied from the Trent river that never would otherwise have been supplied, and if you can get 150,000 horsepower with a capital investment of $16,000,000 you are getting it cheaply. Then, we have the waterway besides.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do we sell power?

Mr. J. D. REID: We get a rental from the plant of the Seymour Power Company. We get the same rental that the company got, and we have quite a large revenue from that.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How much do we get?

Mr. J. D. REID: Two dollars per horsepower at the dam. There is an electrical plant there that produces 150,000 horsepower, and there will be more produced when the canal is completed to Georgian bay, and for all we will get $2 per horsepower. We might get more than $2 but the idea is to give the people power at the cheapest rate.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many horsepower did we sell last year?

Mr. J. D. REID: We sold 30,000 or 40,000 horsepower. There is a building there ready to put additional machinery in. But on account of the war during the last five years people would not put in plants.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are there any expenditures made on account of transmission lines?

Mr. J. D. REID: A power house and transmission line would have to be put in by us. The Seymour Power Company have put in their own power house and we simply rent them the water-power.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a vote of $50,000 for a bridge. Would the minister tell us something about that?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is a bridge over the canal in the city of Peterborough. The bridge will cost not less than $300,000. If we built our own small bridge it would cost $50,000 or $60,000. The city wanted a high-level bridge, they proposed to spend $300,000 or $350,000 and of that amount we will pay $50,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many lift locks are there on the canal?

Mr. J. D. REID: Two; one at Peterborough and the other at Kirkfield.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to understand the policy of the Government in connection with this bridge. Does the department maintain the bridge across the St. Peter's canal?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, but we do not do so in this case because this is a permanent, high level bridge. There will be no after-expense. We simply pay $50,000 and we are through. The mayor told me that the contract would be about $350,000, and we agreed to pay $50,000 on a cost of $300,000 or over.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister mentioned that it was only last year that the Trent canal was opened to traffic?

Mr. J. D. REID: It has been open for some years, but not right out into lake Ontario; it is from Orillia down through Peterborough, but that is inland. Now the

intention is to open it from lake Ontario to Georgian bay. At present you can go almost through that entire stretch, but there are yet one or two small sections to be completed which when finished will enable a steamer to travel from Montreal to Georgian bay. At the present time the steamer can only go as far as Orillia.

Mr. McKENZIE: This $1,000,000 is partly for the extension of the canal ?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is for the completion of the canal to the western end.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the contractors?

Mr. J. D. REID: Randolph Macdonald, or rather the York Construction Company.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is an old name.

Mr. J. D. REID: The old gentleman is dead; I think very likely the present contractor is his son.

Lachine Canal, Dredging—$25,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is for the upper end of the Lachine canal.

Soulanges Canal, Improvements—$152,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: The sum of $75,000 in this vote is for a road along the canal. We cut off the farmers' thoroughfare by building the canal, and we now have to build this road for them.

Trent Canal, Improvements—$329,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is for repairs at Bobcaygeon. The sum of $150,000 is for the construction of a new lock there on account of the dilapidated condition of the present structure. On account of the outbreak of the war the work was temporarily abandoned. I was on the spot myself last year, and the lock will really not stand any longer. Something has got to be done right away.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the nature of the work?

Mr. J. D. REID: The construction of a new lock to replace the present structure which has been in existence for probably sixty years.

Welland Canal, Improvements—$25,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: When will the Trent canal be finished ?

Mr. J. D. REID: There are just two small sections on the Severn river. We have not got through with either of them, but it will only take one season if we go at the work energetically.

Miscellaneous—Arbitration and Award—$20,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I want to again bring to the minister's attention the claim of an old gentleman whose name is Paradis, which means in English " Paradise." Let me remind the minister that my old friend and his old friend, Mr. Paradis, is getting on in years. He has a just claim against the Crown, which has been examined and re-examined, investigated and re-investigated, and it seems to me that it is time a decision was arrived at. The property of the dear old gentleman was destroyed by the Intercolonial many years ago, and his claim has been before the Exchequer Court and before the department. I understand there is only a question of a few thousand dollars as between Mr. Paradis and the minister. My hon. friend is convinced, I believe, that Paradis is an honest man. He has already one foot in the grave, and he would not deprive the Government of a red cent to which he was not legally entitled. Cannot the minister, who is a young man compared with Mr. Paradis, help this old gentleman to close his eyes in peace and allow his family to receive the amount which belongs to him?

Mr. J. D. REID: This claim came up before my predecessor and he was prepared to recommend a payment of $7,500. The amount was afterwards increased to $12,000, and the last time I took the matter up, in order to try and effect a settlement, I was prepared to recommend $15,000. Mr. Paradis, however, is asking for $80,000 or $90,000. He has been to see me very often, and I would like to see his claim settled, although he is not legally entitled to any such amount as he asks. The last I heard of it, Mr. Paradis was asking for $30,000 or $35,000, with interest for a certain period, which would bring the claim up to $40,000. The hon. gentleman will therefore see there is quite a difference of opinion between us. I will have to get the authority of Council before I can settle the matter, but the difference between the amount asked for by the claimant and that deemed proper by the department is a little too much.

I sympathize with the old gentleman, but I am afraid I could hardly settle with him on what he is willing to accept, although he claims that if he did settle for that it

would not be one-third of what he lost. I promised the old gentleman to bring it up before a subcommittee of the Privy Council to see if we can come to terms.

Mr. LEMIEUX: During the present session?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have been promising to do it, as a matter of fact, for the last couple of months, but it has been very hard to get members of the Council together. It is really my fault, and I will try to see if I cannot get it attended to before the end of the session.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. member appoint me to the committee? As a member of the Privy Council I might be helpful.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am afraid the hon. member might be partial.

Railways—Canadian Government Railways—Construction and Betterments, $11,121,681.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think we had better leave the Canadian Government railways for another time.

Mr. J. D. REID: What about the Hudson Bay railway item?

Mr. McKENZIE: Then there is item, No. 108, miscellaneous, which I think will require some explanation. It is now eleven o'clock and such an awfully hot night that I think we might better leave them over.

Mr. McISAAC: I would like to ask the minister regarding a matter which is very dear to the hearts of the people of Prince Edward Island; that is, the progress that the Government hope to make in the near future in broadening the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway. Could the hon. minister gfve me some information as to the earliest possible date on which the work will be completed, as to the portion of the work he hopes to do this year, and next year, and so on; what sections of the road will be taken up in turn; and, in general, what the ideas and hopes of the Government are regarding the early completion of this work, which is so important to the people of the province from which I come.

Mr. J. D. REID: Last year we decided to standardize the line between Port Borden and Summerside, so that cars could be loaded between those points and be brought over the main line. That work was started and proceeded with as rapidly as possible

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

last year. My information is that if we can get the labour next month we will be operating into Summerside and Charlottetown with standard cars. We do not intend standardizing the line any further than Charlottetown or Summerside during the present year. After the rails are laid there will be a lot of work to do in putting the road in shape, and we feel that under present financial conditions we would not be justified in proceeding further during the present year.

Mr. McISAAC: It is understood, I suppose, that next year the work will be proceeded with?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is the intention, of course, that this road should be standardized all through. I could not say how much will be done next year. But the matter will be taken up and considered with the Estimates of next year with a view of proceeding with the work when financial conditions permit.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Are details available as to how this large amount of money is going to be expended on the Canadian National railways, both with regard to construction and betterments and equipment?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have the details of item 3, $11,121,681. This is the summary: Lines east of Quebec, $6,004,140; Transcontinental west of Fort William, $993,208; Halifax terminals, $1,600,000; 11 p.m. branch lines, New Brunswick, $500,000; mechanical department, $524,333; general appropriations, constructions and betterments, $1,500,000. I have the further details somewhere if the hon. member wishes to hear them.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think we might as well let this item stand. I know some members of the House would like to say something on the items to which I have referred, and as the minister has made very good progress to-night, perhaps we might defer further consideration of these items.

Mr. MANION: Before the request of the leader of the Opposition is granted I wish to bring a matter to the minister's attention. I have a communication from the municipality signed by the reeve, Mr. A. A. McGillivray, and sent to me by Mr. J. McK. Hunt, with regard to changing the

name of a small station on the Canadian National railway, and I would like to have an assurance from the minister that he will try once again to get this done, as the directors do not think it convenient to take any action. As a matter of fact, the village of Slate River is some miles from the station of that name, whereas the village of Rosslyn is right there.

Mr. J. D. REID: I did take that up with the management, and my recollection is that they claim there is another station of a similar name. However, I will take the matter up with them again.

Progress reported.

Hon. Mr. Reid moved the adjournment of the House, and the House adjourned at 11.09 p.m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1919

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r. = first, second, or third reading. Amdt. = Amendment. Com. = Committee. Con. = Consideration. Div. = Division. M. = Motion. Ques. = Question. Ref. = Reference. Rep. = Report. Res. = Resolution. Sec. = Section.

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 13, 41, 73, 116, 141, 185, 230, 272, 318, 358, 399, 424, 463, 514, 551
No quorum, order lapses, 397; reinstated, 398

Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Admiralty Court, Montreal, ques. 1440

Advertising. *See* Government advertising

Aeronautics, 1264, ques. 1340. *See also* Air Board
Air Service, 4689
Canada's hinterland, development by, 302
European-Asiatic route via Canada, 305
Mail service, by, 2036
Naval air bases, ques. 1532
Permanent Force in Canada, 2867
Transatlantic flight by Hawker, 2564

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code

Agricultural Education. *See* Technical Education

Agricultural Implements, 4008
Duties on, 3690
Freight rates on, 3926

Agriculture
Bulls, Ayrshire and Holstein, ques. 601
Department of
Orders in Council respecting, tabled, 270
Report of, tabled, 111
Staff and salaries, 2959
Experimental farms, prices, markets, pests, cold storage, etc., 2959-2976
Live stock
Bulls, Ayrshire and Holstein, ques. 601

Agriculture and Colonization, Committee, 113, 2652, 4376

Air Board Bill. 1r., 1865; 2r., com., 2050; 3r., 2143
Provincial jurisdiction, 2052, 2060

Alcohol. *See* Proprietary; Prohibition

Aliens, 222, 375, 497. *See also* Asiatics; Immigration Act Amdt.; Naturalization
Enemies
Deportation of, 1946

Aliens—*Con.*
Interned, 1712, 1947; ques. 1611
Naturalization of. *See* British nationality
Discrimination—charged, 376
Non-alien territory, in, 1947
Policy respecting, 753
Prohibition of certain classes, Motion, Mr. Stevens, 769
Property and trade amongst, ques. 844
Property of, custodian, ques. 1535
West in, conduct of, 2320

Allan, Mr. G. W. (South Winnipeg)
Board of Commerce, 4511
Industrial unrest, Winnipeg strike, returned soldiers, etc., 3061
Militia, Permanent Force, 3979
Titles, 1474

Alpine Club, 4046

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (St. Antoine)
Baker, the late Lieut.-Col. Geo. Harold, M.P., 4456
Board of Commerce, 4527-8
Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill, 3738
Divorce, 3778
Housing scheme, 2536, 2542, 2546
Immigration Act Amdt., 1950
Income Tax, ques. 2049, 3722, 3729-35
Peace Treaty, copy of terms, 4239
Pensions, 4182-9, 4196-7, 4277, 4298
"Unmarried wife," 4277
Purchasing Department, Commissioners' Salaries, 3815
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2768-9
Soldiers' Land Settlement — improving farms, 3882
Unsalaried war workers, 3815
Victory Bonds, ques. 2047

Amherst
Amherst Mineral Water Company, ques. 3997
Carriage Factory building, ques. 3997
Dr. Goodwin and Dr. Bliss, ques. 3377, ques. 4070
Internment Camp, 3848, ques. 4070
Morris, Col., ques. 2565

Amos Station, 2460

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 495. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Canada at the Peace Conference, 495; Union Government—conscription, 496; disfranchisement of defaulters—aliens—franchise—pensions, 497; returned soldiers and tuberculosis—patronage in Civil Service, 498; Civil Service Commission—public health—Canada's soldiers, 499; national unity, 500
Pensions, ques. 1076
Proprietary Medicines, 2481
Public Health, 1198

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Centre Winnipeg)
Daylight Saving, 896
Hutterites, 1920
Immigration, exclusion of certain classes, 1920
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1328
Postal workers—Civil Service Re-classification, 2342
Prohibition, 2356
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3872
Sympathetic strikes—collective bargaining—Winnipeg strike, etc., 2851, 3019
Yukon placer mining, 632

Anti-loafing, ques. 883

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 32 (for 1919-20, for $52,310,026.12). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 842
2. Bill No. 113 (for 1818-19, for $18,827,098.72). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 2462; 3r., 2463
3. Bill No. 123 (for 1919-20, for $148,211,640.39). Res., 2952; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 2953
4. Bill No. 181 (for 1919-20, for $162,527,610.91). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4689

Archambault, Dr. J. U., ques. 1306

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 435. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French language and seconding of the Address, 436; peace and victory—Kinmel Camp riots—prohibition, 437; high cost of living, 438; prices, profits, food control—titles, 439; industrial unrest—Hon. Mr. Calder and Liberalism, 440; Government measures and Liberalism, 441; Mr. Richardson, M.P., in Europe—Quebec and enlistment—Soldiers' votes, 443; National unity, 445

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Bankruptcy Bill, 1987
Non-traders, 2476
Provinces and, 1998
Trustees, 2006
Board of Commerce, 4530, 4560-4
Printing of Bill in French, 4530
Budget, The, date of, 2752
Canadian Expeditionary Force, enlistments in, ques. 2904
Canadian National Railway, 1857
Canadian soldiers, prisoners of war, ques. 1077
Censorship of soldiers' letters, 1663
Chambly Canal and Highway, ques. 2045
Clemens, Judge, investigation relating to, ques. 3066
Cold storage companies, taxation of, ques. 2904
Complaints of Canadian soldiers, alleged suppression of, 1618
Dafoe, Mr. John W., ques. 974, ques. 1789
Enlisted and conscripted men, lists, motion for, 1908
Fishermen, tax on, ques. 2144
Food Controller McFall, report of, ques. 4464
Franking of pamphlets, ques. 1791
Georgian Bay Canal, 2855
Gibson, Major, ques. 884, ques. 1440
Immigration, 2598-9
Industrial unrest, 1858
Hull industrial disputes, ques. 2905
Industrial Relations Commission, 1260
Labour Disputes Board, ques. 1535
Labour unions of the West, 1343
Winnipeg strike, nationality of leaders, 2598
Labour, Minister of, ques. 884
Letter carriers' bonuses, ques. 848
McLennan, Judge F. S., ques. 1075, ques. 1106, ques. 1906, ques. 2905
Montreal Admiralty Court, ques. 1440
National Service Registration, ques. 2145
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4003-5
Pensions, 4031
Pension Commissioners, ques. 1790
Postmaster General, representation of in House of Commons, ques. 974
Public Health, "Social Welfare," 1188
Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904
Siberian Expedition, 4001
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, ques. 974
Soldiers, in Hull, Pontiac and Wright, ques. 602, ques. 603
Toronto meeting—"Fellow Bolsheviki," 1997
Victory Loan, Montreal brokers, ques. 1612
War Service gratuities, ques. 4241
Washington, representation at, 2077-8

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Agricultural fairs, 2996-7
Arid Belt, so called, irrigation station, 2974
Budget, 3577; Liberal Unionists, 3577; Treatment of immigrants — wheat prices, 3578; Tariff Commission, 3579
Highways and railways, 742
Judges in Saskatchewan, 2311
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2765-6

Argue, Lieut.-Col. J. F., ques. 3068

Argyll House. *See* War, Military Management

Arisaig Wharf, 2780

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Athabasca and Grande Prairie Railway Company, 2778-9
Canadian Pacific Railway, 3215
Inter-Imperial trade—ocean transport rates —Board of Investigation, 3240, 3327
Pelee Island, 4041
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2625
Railway Committee, 1864, 1886
Steamship Services, 3829-30
Railway Act Amendment Bill (Coastwise and Inland water traffic), 71
United States, management of ships in, 2210
Upper Lakes, Government ships on, 2255
Water-borne traffic and rates, control of, 2068, 2929-40
Water-powers, Dominion control, 2530

Armistice. *See* Peace; League of Nations

Army, Canadian permanent. *See* Militia Act Amendment

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Budget, 3672. Labour unrest—returned soldiers, 3673; tariff and cost of living, 3674; Tariff Board, 3675
Divorce Court Bill, 3784, 3786
French River waterway, 1087
Mail contractors, 2089
Naturalization, powers of Secretary of State, 4112
Pensions, 4173
Purchasing Commission, 3813
Sailors' wages, 2600
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3865, 3870

Arthurs, Colonel James, M.P.
Service pay and expenses, ques. 2653

Asiatics in Canada, 433, 1048, 1976
Naturalization and voting, 3822

Asphalt, oil for manufacture of, 4003

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 605

Auditor General, death of, 115

Auditor General's report, 138, 312, 514, 744

Australia, markets and shipbuilding, 2207, 2222

Automobiles, Government-owned in Ottawa, ques. 880

Baker, the late Col. Geo. Harold, 549, 2224, 4456
Pension to unmarried sisters, 3004

Baldwin, Mr. Willis K. (Stanstead)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 332; Demobilization—development of natural resources, 332; housing —capital and labour, 333; franchise—Siberian expedition — inland revenue stamp taxes, 334; farmers and production—Department of Trade and Commerce, 335; infant mortality, 336
Budget, 3276. Reciprocity—titles, 3276; public debt—commissions, 3277; shipbuilding—produce and save, 3278; Franchise Act—good roads, 3279; Quebec, 3280
Emigration to United States, ques. 2046
Good roads, 4390
Weights and measures, 2156-8

Ball, Mr. Robt. J. (Southeast Grey)
Fire prevention, 1579
Telephone companies, 2650

Ballantyne, Hon. Charles C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)
Biological Board, 2568
Budget, 3270. Liberal Party and Free Trade, 3270; Manufacturers and the tariff, 3271; War Profits Tax, 3272; United States competition — foreign trade, 3273; shipping and shipbuilding, 3275; moderate protection, 3275
Buoys, etc., 2608
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill, 2802-8, 3755, 3928-38
Cold storage, Montreal warehouse, 1619
Crerar, Hon. T. A., resignation of, 3270
Dominion steamers, 2600
Fisheries Act. Amdt. Bill (British Columbia), 2097, 3758-61
Fisheries patrol service, oyster culture, lobsters, hatcheries, etc., 2887-2903
Halifax Harbour Master, 2693-5, 2800-02
Industrial unrest—Speech at Verdun, 3241
Life-saving stations, 2850
Lighthouses and keepers, 2608-9, 2613
Livestock shipments, inspection, 2602
Marine and Fisheries Department, salaries, etc., 2600
Marine hospitals, 2613

Ballantyne, Hon. Charles C.—*Con.*
Masters and mates, 2600
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners (rate of interest), 3757
Meteorological service, 2613
Naval Service
Halifax, discharge of men at, 1959, 1996, 2226
Ministerial statement, answer to charges, 2811, 2839-47
Northern waters patrol, 2849
Pilotage, 2610, 2612, 3157-62
Radio-telegraph service, 2848
Royal Naval College, 2850
Schools of navigation, 2601
Shipping, registration of, 2602
St. John Harbour Commission, 4299, 4306, 4337-9
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2608
Shipbuilding, programme, vote, ministerial statement, 2202-16, 2251-3, 2261-3, 4682-6
Steamboat inspection, 2614
Steamers
"Brant," 2607
"Champlain," 2606-7
"Montcalm," 2607
Vancouver Harbour Bill, 3742-54, 4017-21
Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070
Verdun, speech at, 3241
Wharves, generally, 2611
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 2603-4
Wrecks, investigations into, 2601

Bankruptcy Bill. 1r., 229; 2r., 931; com., 1981, 1998, 2263, 2467; 3r., 2510; Senate amdts. concurred in, 4132

Banks. *See also* Finance
Excess circulation, 1103
Mergers, 1088

Bateman, Lieut. R., ques. 3067

Bate, McMahon & Co., 1277

Betiscan protective works, ques. 645

Bear River, N.S. Harbour and shipping master, 3242

Beaverbrook, Lord, 2872

Béland, Hon. Henri Severin (Beauce)
Air Board Bill, 2061
Aliens, interned, 1712
Belgium, reconstruction, 3294
Budget, 3293
Child welfare, 1200
Civil Service examination, 4496
France, steamship line to, 1291
Franchise, 3298
Jellicoe, Admiral Sir John, ques. 751
Laurier, the late Sir Wilfrid, 3293
Military Service Act, 1163

Béland, Hon. Henri Severin—*Con.*
Navy, the British, 3301
National unity, 3302
Pensions, 2692, 3001
Prohibition, 2348, 2358
Proprietary medicines, 2484, 2487, 2653
Public health, 1202, 1375
Soothing syrups, amdt., 2488, 2491-3
Three Rivers harbour master, 2694
Trade Commissioners, 4493-4
War Measures Act, 1163
Welcome to on release from German prison, 3
Acknowledgments, 3293

Belanger vs. **The King,** 1021, 1279

Belgium, restoration of, 3294
Cablegram from Belgian Senate, 1955

Bell, Col. F. McKelvey, resignation of, 3240, 3422, 3472, 3926, 4674

Bench, freedom of, 350. *See also* Judges Act Amdt

Bernier, Mr. K.C., 1021, 1027

Berubé, Esdras, case of, 2250

Best, Mr. John (Dufferin)
Agriculture—seed, 2971
Civil Service
Efficiency, 1558
Re-classification, 1960
Salaries of $2,500 and over, 1439, 4481
Daylight saving, 889
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 852
Good roads, 4425, 4428
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1245
Purchasing Commission, 3812

Biological Board Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2396; 2r., com., 2568; 3r., 2617

Blair, Mr. H. C., superannuation, ques. 2398

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Budka, Bishop, ques. 646
Eight-hour day and Peace Treaty, 1996
Industrial unrest, labour unions, Bolshevism, strikes, etc., 3004
Partisanship in appointments, 2095
Postmen's 1918 strikes, 2037
Prohibition, 2358, 2665
Soldiers' land settlement; inclusion of Royal Air Force, 1437, 3873

Bliss, Dr. P., payments to, ques. 3377

Blondin, Lieut.-Col. P. E., ques. 1790, 2042, 2084

Board of Commerce Bill. 1r., 4198; 2r., 4497; com., 4527, 4549; 3r., 4567
Protest of Montreal Board of Trade, 4466, 4553
See also Combines

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boisdale Wharf, 2780

Bolshevism, 35, 42, 105, 111, 127, 141, 143, 145, 160, 247, 354, 368, 371, 435, 479, 1062-8, 2284, 2285, 4691
Calgary labour meeting, 1343
"Fellow Bolsheviki," 1997
Siberian Expedition and, 319
Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880
See also Criminal Code; Immigration; Industrial unrest

Boivin, Mr. George Henry (Shefford). *See* Deputy Speaker

Bonnell, Mr. Saul (East Kootenay)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 445

Boots and Shoes from United States, ques. 978

Boots, purchase of, 3202

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Bell, Lt.-Col. McKelvey, 3240, 3473
Birthday congratulations, 4133
Board of Commerce, 4466, 4474, 4554
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Acts Consolidation Bill, 3585
Bruce Report, 4001
Canada Shipping amdt., 3936-7
Canadian Pacific Railway Bill, 3214
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4696
Civil Service. *See under this head* Industrial unrest
Collective bargaining. *See under this head* Industrial unrest
Crerar, Hon. T. A., resignation of, 3193
Divorce Court Bill, 3777, 3789, 3791
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 4621-5, 4644-9
Franchise Bill, 2906
Georgian Bay Canal, 2855
Good Roads, 4426-30
Suggested amdt., 4430-2
Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3211
Horse racing, 4466
House of Commons, Saturday and morning sittings, 3420
Business of the House—legislation pending, 3999
Postponement of legislation, 4690
Inter-Imperial trade, Board of Investigation, ocean transport and rates, 3240, 3327
Industrial Relations Commission, 4621
Industrial unrest, 3056

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Collective bargaining, 2908
Conference, 2908, 3195
Peace Conference labour principles, 2852
Postal employees, Calgary, 3194
Post office appointments after, 4347-8
Strikes, 3056
Ottawa Street Railway, 4535
Toronto, 2851, 2953
Winnipeg, 2953, 3069-70, 3472, 3587, 3927
Trial of arrested parties, 3740
Intoxicating Liquors Bill—Senate Amdt., 4071-2, 4133
Free conference, 4497
Intoxicating liquors, interprovincial trade in, opinion of Minister and Deputy Minister of Justice, 4133
Letter postage rate, 4621
Members, absence of from Chamber, 3195
Peace celebration, 4238
Peace Conference, presence at. *See* Peace Conference
Peace Treaty, copy of terms, 4239
Ratification of, 3937
Signing of, 3473
Labour provisions, 4239, 4692
Poland and Ukranians, etc., 3472, 4534, 4620, 4690
Privilege, Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
Proportional representation, 3069, 4620
Purchasing Commission, 3209, 3215, 4453-5
Railway Act Consolidation
Control of rates, 4144
Rates, three-year limit, amdt., 4147, 4152; res. moved, 4169; agreed to, 4170
Senate amdts., 3473-4
Telephones, 4167
Red Cross Society, 3162-4
Return from Europe, reception by the House, 2800
Senators, responsibility for opinions of, 4152
Shipping for St. Lawrence coal trade, 4335
Soldiers' votes, statement of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, 4135
Wheat, prices, 4466
Canada's contract with Greece, 2907
Ypres, war memorial, 4465

Boughton Island, P.E.I., 2784

Bourdreault, Benjamin, Judge of Exemption, ques. 1439

Bourassa, Mr. Joseph B. (Lévis)
Lévis aqueduct, ques. 1789
Separation allowance, ques. 1908
Transcontinental Railway, accidents, ques. 1211

Bowman, Mr. James (North Huron)
Daylight saving, 927
Bow River, election petition, 4
Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, 4486
Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Connaught rifle range, 1896-7
Daylight saving, 904
Farming, conditions and prospects, 2964
Good roads, 4390
Highways and railways, 743
Income tax, farmers and, 3734
Land grants to religious denominations, ques. 2462
Livestock Amdt. Bill, 2066-7
Mail contractors, 2085
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1249
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4384
Boyer, Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Coteau Landing roadway, ques. 2045
Highways Aid Bill, 732
Isle Perrot bridges, 733
Maple syrup and sugar, ques. 645
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, soldiers' hospital, ques. 1212
St. Zotique—River Beaudette roadway, ques. 2144
Vaudreuil-Soulanges rural mail, ques. 2566
Boys, Mr. William A. (South Simcoe)
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1246
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2622-8
Senate amdts., 4157
Transmission lines on highway, consent of municipalities, 3126
Bradbury, Lieut.-Col. G. H., ques. 1107
Bran and shorts, 4007
Brien, Mr. John Wesley (South Essex)
Pelee Island, 4033
Briquetting coal. *See* Coal
Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Railway Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highway, consent of municipalities, 3098, 3102, 3112, 3124
Shipbuilding, transportation, trade, 2230
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2949
British Columbia Courts. *See* Interpretation Act
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Act Consolidation Bill. 1r., 3585; 2r., 3816; com., 3820, 4110, 4257, 4339; 3r., 4344
Secretary of State, powers of, 4110
Married women, 4127
Naturalization, Canadian autonomy, 4119
British Navy, 3301
British North America Act, method of amdt., 415
Broderick, Mr. Michael E., ques. 729
Brouillard, Mr. Joseph O. (Drummond and Athabaska)
High Commissionership, ques. 3242
Purchasing Commission, ques. 3470
Social Hygiene Conference, ques. 3068
Bruce Report, the, 1483, 2885, 4001, 4071
Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Lethbridge)
Budget, 3455. Tariff, 3455; cost of living, 3456; production and wealth, 3457; Western farmers, 3458
Canadian National Railway, 1855
Government contracts, personal position, 2033, 2036
Immigration Act Amdt., 1912
Industrial unrest, eight-hour day, profiteering, etc., 3021
Irrigation, 4601
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1913
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2033
Taber irrigation district, 4211
Budget, The, 3145. *See also* Ways and Means
Amdt., Mr. McMaster, 3260; neg. on div., 3678; debate, 3242, 3293, 3378, 3422, 3474, 3587
Inquiry as to date of, 1343, 1712, 2752
Budka, Bishop, ques. 646, 1917-38. *See* Poles, Ukrainians, Ruthenians
Buoys, Atlantic coast, 1866, 1910
Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1984
Board of Commerce, 4472, 4497, 4549, 4599-4600
Board of Internal Economy, ques. 605
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3817-23, 4110-33, 4257, 4272
Revocation of certificate, 4119
Secretary of State, powers of, 4111, 4124, 4266
Canada Evidence Act, amdt., 1389-92
Canadian National Railway Company, 1395, 1403, 1414, 1420-21
Capital stock, 1777
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1717-26, 1751, 1765, 1787
Directors
Appointment, 1625, 1631, 1636
No personal responsibility, 1783
Payment of, 1653
Electric and power companies, 4573
Executive committee, 1667-74
Expropriation, 1695
First meeting, 1664-6
Fiscal year, 1705
Head office, 1651-3
Parliamentary control, 1691

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway Co.—*Con.*
Public ownership, 1748
Securities
Advances and, 1777-8
Issue of, 1780
Other companies, of, 1781
Steamships, 1682, 1689
Town sites, 1769
Work for the general advantage of Canada, 1706
Civil Service re-classification, 3927
Conference with Senate, no suspension of sitting of House, 3948-9
Criminal Code, aliens and British subjects, 4358-61
Dominion lands, pulp, etc., 4251-4
Dominion water-powers, 2512-32
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572-81
Amdt., 4580; neg., 4588
Good roads, 3909, 3911-2, 4395, 4423, 4426-7
Housing scheme, 2557-61
Income War Tax Amdt.
Members of Parliament, sessional expenses, 3991-2
Iron, galvanized, 3689
Judges' salaries, 4218, 4235, 4368, 4435-7
Jacobs, Mr., personal explanation, 4234
National harbours, advantages of Three Rivers, 3754
Negroes, rioting in England by, 3741
Newsprint control, 4540-1
Orders in Council, government by, 2557
Peace, celebration, 4238
Pensions, 4193-5, 4197
"Unmarried wife," 4208-10
Purchasing Commission, 3195, 3810-15, 4439-45, 4453-4
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2619-39
Telephone companies, 2647
Steamship services, 1289
Technical Education Bill, 3791-3808
Decennial payment to provinces, 3892
Toronto Suburban Railway Company, ques. 1611
Tuberculosis, Indians, 4062
Welland Canal contracts, 1594-6

Bureau of Statistics, 3838

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden (West Peterborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 108. Liberal party—reconstruction, 108; wages and cost of living, 110; Bolshevism, 111
Budget, 3599. Minister of Finance—Dominions' interchange of Governors General—Protection or free trade, 3599, 3601; Union Government, 3600; land held vacant for speculation, 3601
Canadian National Railway, 1801

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden—*Con.*
"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic," 1385
Civil Service, Outside, delay in appointments, ques. 3680
Combines and trusts in Great Britain, 3741
Cost of production, cost of consumption, 2854
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2466
Foreign credits and home supplies, 3836
Harbours, national, control of, 3746-8
High cost of living and minimum wage, 2908
Income tax, allowance for children, 3724
Industrial unrest, cost of living, wages, etc., 3015
Judges' salaries, 2958
National economic interests, 2253
Public ownership, 1801
Purchasing Commission, 3203
Titles, 1457, 2712, 2715, 2731
Transmission lines on highways, municipal powers, 3088-9, 3110
Trent Canal
Rates of wages, ques. 3586
Remuneration to returned soldiers, ques. 3470
War trophies, 2043

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Bolshevism, 2285
Briquetting lignite, 3472, 4488
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3819
Daylight saving, 914
Geological Survey and mines development, 4491-2
Government advertising, 2023
Government Printing Bureau
Civil Service Commission and, 1812
Strike, 230, 312, 399, 513
Immigration Act Amdt.—advocates of violence, 2285
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1320
Mines Branch, 4489-91
Naturalization, 4264-5
Non-ferrous metals, 3682
Peat experiments, 4489
Public Printing and Stationery Dept. reorganization, 4687
Purchasing Commission, 3220-2
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 833
Technical education, 3801
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 986

Business Profits Tax. *See also* Budget; Revenue Bills
Proceeds, ques. 1791

Butter, price of, 1618

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3821
Budget, 3643. Resignations from Government—Opposition leadership, 3643; all protectionists, 3644; shipping, coal and steel, 3644
Civil Service, sessional employees, 1558
Expropriation, Dominion water-powers, 2518
Housing scheme, 2548
Militia, Permanent Force, 3981
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1250
Naturalization, 4271
Nova Scotia Highways Board, 4435
Patronage, 1272
Pensions, 4280
War expenditure ($350,000,000), shipping and trade, 2234

Cables, 1052, 2794
State control of, 1827

Cadet Corps. *See* Militia

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Air Board Bill, 2051-3
Bank mergers, 1095
Banks, excess circulation, 635
Canadian Government Railways, 2458, 2460
Canadian National Railway Company Bill, 1405, 1414, 1421
Annual meeting, 1799
Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
Capital stock, 1777
Directors, 1627, 1639, 1799
Extension of time for construction of lines, 1717, 1770-6
First meeting, 1659, 1664-5
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
Parliamentary control, 2119
Political influence, 1633
Profit sharing with employees, 1622
Publicity, 1644
Public ownership, 1770, 2219
Civil Service, 2913
Cold storage, 2984-5
Combines, 4568
Cost of living, 4332
Dominion water-powers, 2513, 2516
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4587
Experimental farms, 2976-8
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1574, 1585
Fisheries Act Amdt. (Salmon), 3759
Fisheries Department, salaries, etc., 2889, 2893
Foreign trade, credits to other countries, 2167, 2834-6
Gold, prohibition of export of, 1102-3

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Good roads, 3907, 3912, 4411, 4429
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 399, 666, 1127, 1130-1, 1157
Hanna, Alta., removal of engine crew to, 671, 1407
Housing scheme, 2538-40, 2561, 2564
Immigration and Colonization Department, work of, 2570, 2593-4
Advertising, 2597-9
Exodus of settlers, 2579
Free land as attraction for settlers, 2572-4
Hutterites and Mennonites, 2570
Land speculation and, 2574
North Ontario as field for, 2574
Income tax
Farmers and, 3735
Publicity, 3718
Timber limits, 3721
Industrial unrest, 2908, 2953
Winnipeg strike, 2508, 2753
Lobster packing, 2989
Ottawa-Pembroke postal service, 2034
Packing companies, taxation, 4478
Parliament Building, 2336, 2340-1
Pensions, 4292
Railways, nationalization of, politics and, etc., 667-671
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2799-2800
Seed grain, 628, 1030
Shipbuilding, 4684
Steamship subsidies, 1293
Surveys, 4049-55
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 831
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3099-3104, 3115
Welland Canal contract, 1594-7

Calder, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 62. Victory—after-war problems, 63; demobilization, 64; employment—soldier settlement, 65; reconstruction and repatriation, 67; progressive legislation—returned soldiers, 68; United Canada party, 69; tariff, 70
Aliens. *See, under this head,* Immigration
Budget, the, 3337. Union Government—tariff, 3338; elections, 3339; tariff revision, 3340; gravity of pending questions, 3341
Canadian National Railway
Branch lines in Saskatchewan, 1766-7
Connor, Mr., Immigration agent, 2591-3
Dominion Elections Act, 4651, 4656-7
Exhibitions, 2600, 4682
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 767
Good roads, 787, 3917

Calder, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Immigration. *See also, under this head,* Immigration Act Amdt.; Immigration and Colonization Department
Belgians, 2587
Canada's attractions, 2573
Chinese, of, 1975, 2599
Dangerous and undesirable aliens, 759
Great Britain, from, 2594
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1875, 2570-1
Northern Ontario and Quebec, 2573-4
Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, to, 2573, 2582
Policy
All Canada, for, 2585
Need for, 2577
United States, from, 2598
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 1206, 1866-83, 3175, 3211-3
Acts of violence, 2283
Conspiracy, ques. 1949
Deportees, 1978
Domicile, 1971, 2286
Enemy aliens, 1945
Espionage, 1948
Illiterates, 1954, 1960, 1964
Non-enemy aliens in enemy territory, 1947
Officers, 1972
Psycopathic inferiority, 1945
Immigration and Colonization Department
Advertising, 2597-8
Agencies, 2569, 2586-94
Colonization work, 2570
Connor, Mr., agent, 2591-3
Deputy Minister
Extra work, payment for, 2441, 2442
Purposes and methods of, 1972, 2568, 2572, 2594, 2598
Land grants to Canadian Northern, 1873
Land prices in the West, 2579
Patriotic Fund, 3240, 3738
Public Health, 1199
Director General of, 2572
Quarantine, 4682
Retaining settlers, 2579, 2590
Technical education, res., vote $10,000,000, 3164-74
Technical Education Bill, 3791-3808
Distribution of grants, 4136
Town planning, 767
United States head tax, 1111, 1942

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Budget, 3556. Public debt and natural resources, 3556; Manitoba's forests, fisheries and mines, 3558; Great War Veterans' scheme of mineral prospecting, 3560; development of resources by

Campbell, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Government, 3561; Stefansson's proposition for development of the North, 3561; Mr. McMaster's amdt., 3564
Canadian National Railway, 1837
Lines, description of, 1838
Dominion Elections Act, 4647-8
Experimental farm, 2979
Good roads, 4409
Hudson Bay Railway, 4688
Judges' salaries, 2958
Land for soldiers—forest reserves, 3070-3
Naturalization, 4126
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, statistics, 2651-2
Titles, 2744

Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 928; 2r., 1383, 1388; com., 1388; 3r 1619

Canada Food Board
Expenses, ques. 602, ques. 613
Fish, 121; ques. 2750
Licenses, ques. 602
Reports of Controller McFall, 4070, ques. 4464
Revenues, ques. 602

Canada Grain Act, administration, 3837

Canada Grain Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 3940, 3949; 1r., 3966; 2r., com., 4073, 4380; 3r., 4380; Senate amdts., 4662
Appeal Board, 4099
Surplus, 4073, 4380

Canada Medical Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3240

Canada Registration Act
Cost and result, ques. 728
Lamontagne, Miss., ques. 1957, ques. 2145
Operation, ques. 844
Pictou, registrar at, ques. 2144

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. Pilotage and harbour masters. Res., 2802; 1r., 2808; 2r., com., 3157; 3r., 3162
2. Transfer of ships. Res., 3754; 1r., 3757; 2r., com., 3928; 3r., 4002

Canada Trade Commission, 4493

Canada Year Book, 3839

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See* Council

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* War

Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See also* Shipping
Rates of freight charged by, ques. 4241
Vessel for, ques. 3998

Canadian Mining Institute, 4492

Canadian Mission in London, ques. 1905

Canadian National Railway Company Bill. Res., 1380, 1394; 1r., 1422; 2r., 1620; com., 1623, 1663, 1713, 1734, 1797; 3r., 2143. Amdt. (Mr. Fielding—Revenue and Audit Act to apply), 2102; neg. on div., 2130; amdt. (Mr. Copp—Intercolonial Railway), 2133, neg. 2137; amdt. (Mr. Lapointe, Kamouraska—labour representation), 2138, neg. on div., 2141
Clauses and discussions
Abandoned lines, 1708
Advances and securities, 1777
Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
Capital stock, 1647, 1776
Charters, schedule of, 1766
Closure, discussion under, 1797-1864
Constituent companies, 1694, 1784
Construction, extension of time for, 1709
Authority of Parliament necessary, 1779
Directors
Nomination of, 1623
Nomination of returned soldier, 1638
No personal responsibility, 1783
Payment of, 1623, 1653
Responsibility of, 1671
Term of office, 1646
Estimated expenditure, 4688
Executive Com., 1667
Finance, expenses to be paid out of revenue, 1699, 2102
First meeting, 1657-64
Fiscal year, 1705
Freight rates, 2457
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
Head office, 1648
Inquiries—Minister may provide for, 1782
Lines to be included, 1677, 1784
United States, in, 1693
Municipalities, consent of, 1782
Name, 1779
Orders in Council, powers under to construct, 1767
Railway and Expropriation Acts to apply, 1694
Securities
Issue of, 1779
Other companies, of, 1781, 1861
Steamships, 1681-2
Work for general advantage of Canada, 1706

Canadian National Railway
Cap Rouge, repairs, 2460
Cars and rails, contracts for, ques. 1907
Coal, ques. 611, ques. 1211, ques. 1906, res. for papers 2906, ques. 4377
Construction and betterments, 30, 4614
Directors, ques. 612
Employees (Canadian Northern) for, ques. 846
Government Railways
Construction and betterments, 3190
Expenditure proposed in year 1920-21, 3190
Locomotives, 1212
Halifax terminals, ques. 2398
Intercolonial. *See that title*
Labour troubles, reported, 1617
Lands at Fort William, Canadian Northern, ques. 883
Legal expenses paid
Bureau and Bigué, to, ques. 2047
Tachereau, Roy, Cannon & Parent, to, ques. 2047
Locomotives, ques. 1212
Managers, ques. 748
Mileage, rolling stock and equipment, finance, value, etc.—answers to questions by Leader of Opposition, 1610
Montreal terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
National Transcontinental. *See also* Canadian National Railway Bill
Accidents, ques. 1211
Business during 1918, ques. 3065
Damage claims, ques. 616
Government use of line, Winnipeg, Quebec, Halifax and St. John, ques. 2398
Station operations and receipts, ques. 1211
Officials, transfer from Moncton, ques. 748
Patronage, abolition of, 1624
Prince Edward Island Railway
Coal purchase, ques. 4377
Gauge, broadening of, 460
Quebec and Cochrane line, 2456
Quebec bridge, ques. 977
Toronto building occupied by, ques. 612
West, in, 424

Canadian Northern Railway
Arbitration, ques. 2045, ques. 2145
Bonds, ques. 4241
Common stock, ques. 1214
Date of Government taking possession, ques. 1212
Equipment Trust, ques. 4240
Liabilities, ques. 1212
Net earnings, 1918, ques. 2462
New Westminster, 423
Port Mann, ques. 979
Securities, ques. 1214

Canadian Official Record. *See* Public Information

Canadian Patriotic Fund, 1164

Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill. 1r., 3240; 2r., com., 3738; 3r., 3740

Canadian Press News Service, 4482

Canadian Red Cross Society, 2874

Canadian Red Cross Society Incorporation Bill. 1r., 3004; 2r., com., 3162; 3r., 3164

Canals
Appointments on, 3175
Chambly, ques. 2045
Trent, returned soldiers, ques. 3470
Wages, ques. 3586
Welland, lock tenders, ques. 604
Construction, 1592

Canned Goods. *See* Weights and Measures; Meat and Canned Foods

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 264. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—military service defaulters, 264; Canada's war record, comparison of provinces—national unity—Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister, 265; German fleet—Canadian Navy—Canada a nation, 266; the Press—reconstruction, 267; party government—Union Government, 268; legislation by Order in Council—provincial rights, 269; franchise, 270
Bankruptcy Bill—Provinces and, 2008
Blondin, Hon. P. E., Postmaster General, 2042
Budget, the, 3413. Hon. Mr. Calder and Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3414; Peace Conference, 3415; public finance, 3416; industrial unrest, 3417; development of the Cabinet as an institution, 3419
Canadian National Railway
Lines in United States, 1693
Lines to be included, 1686
National Transcontinental, damage claims, ques. 616
Parliamentary control, 1670-1
Pesident's salary, 1659
Canadian soldiers in Ireland, ques. 849
Divorce Court Bill, 3789
Dominion parks, 2302
Expropriation for, 2304
Dorchester county
Level crossing accident, ques. 972
Mail service, ques. 729
Telephone lines, ques. 849
German merchant fleet, 1289
Good roads, 4418
Immigration
Deported conspirators, 1950
Illiterates, 1954
Non-enemy aliens in enemy territory, 1947
Kent House site, ques. 976
Laflamme, Mr., expenses of, 2042
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1323

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1323
Pensions, 2692
Pomeroy, Major A. L., ques. 2657
Proprietary medicines, 2487
Public health, jurisdiction, 1199
Quebec Harbour Commission, ques. 601
Railway Act—"avocats," 2632
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2695
Technical education, 3795, 3805-7
Titles, 2727
War Expenditure Bill, "any measure deemed necessary or advisable," 2244

Canso
Censorship, ques. 847
Distressed seamen, 2614
Harbour Master, 3158

Capilano Bridge, 2790

Capital and Labour. *See* Industrial Unrest

Capital Punishment, 1957

Carleton, Que., mail service, ques. 727

Carter, Mr. T. J., Solicitor, Public Works Department, 1270, 1274

Carvell, Hon. F. B. (Minister of Public Works)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 41. Reconstruction, 41; Bolshevism—Government expenditure, 42; shipping—unemployment — highways, 43; Department of Public Works, 44; housing, 45; branch railways—demands upon the Government, 46; local public works, 47; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—income and other taxes, 48; wanted, $100,000,000 a year, 49; immigration—duty of private employers, 50
Aerial service and works, 1265
Cables, 2794
Canadian National Railway, position of Intercolonial, 2135
Daylight Saving, 91
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 4647-59
Dry docks, 2360, 4307
French River waterway, 1080
Harbours and rivers, 4613
Highways Aid Bill, 740-3, 4405
Hospitals, 1264
Hydroplane stations, 1263, 1274
La Prairie dyke road, 4059
Militia pensions, 2756
Ottawa City, arrangement with, 2495-2500, 4380-5
Ottawa highways, 2791-2
Parliament buildings, 2331-41, 4621
Provincial voters' lists, 2446
Public buildings, 4610-2
Public works, explanations in Committee, 2359-94, 2780-97

Carvell, Hon. F. B.—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
Demands on Government for, 46, 2792
Department—staff, salaries, etc., 1262, 1266-70
Railway Act Consolidation—transmission lines on highways, hydro-electric, 3097, 3106-8, 3112, 3117, 3120
St. John Harbour, 2359, 4301-6, 4337-8
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2800
St. Charles River works, 1297
Seignorial rights, 2787
Slides and booms, 4607
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 828
Telegraphs and telephones, 2793-6, 4608
Tender and contract, 1263
Titles, 2737
War structures and works, 1263
Wireless, 2794-5

Casgrain, Mr. P. F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Budget, 3427. Complaint of governmental delay, 3427; prices, 3429; patronage, 3430; wealthy ministers, 3431; extravagant expenditure, 3432; taxes, 3433; Government and the Press, 3434; "Produce and save," 3435
Canadian National Railway, 1835
Branch lines, 1693
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
Intercolonial, ques. 750
Quebec and Saguenay Railway
Baie St. Paul, branch, 2449
Flag stations, 1690
Transcontinental, accidents, ques. 1211
Capital punishment, commutation, 753
Compassionate allowance, case for, 3175
Debates, printing of, 424
Desjardins, Mr. Charles ("Ti-noir"), ques. 750
Dominion Bills, issues of, ques. 616
Experimental farms, ques. 1077
Gobeil-Simard investigation, ques. 619
Government printing, ques. 844
Isle aux Coudres, 2609
Laflamme, Mr. J. K. L., ques. 750
Lighthouses and keepers, 2608
Newsprint inquiry, ques. 752
Pilots, 2613
Prohibition, 2358
Steamers
Cold storage on, ques. 882
"Champlain," ques. 616, 2606, 2614
War, correspondence concerning, motion dropped, 753
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2946
Winnipeg strike, 2508

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
Highways, 787, 789, 790
Weights and measures, 2153

"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic," 1383-8

Cavell, Edith, monument to, 2447

Censorship, 226, 295, 1110
Cable, ques. 847
Hazel Hill and Canso, ques. 847
Literature, forbidden, case of J. H. Lewis, 270
Removal of, 135

Chambly Canal highway, ques. 2045

Champlain Market wharves, ques. 1438

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Prohibition, 2349

Charges of Management, 4475

Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296, 4464

Charlton, Mr. William A. (Norfolk)
Daylight Saving, 913

Chartered Banks, Excess Circulation Bill. *See* Finance Act

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Prohibition, 2663

Child Welfare. *See* Public health

Children, medicines for. *See* Proprietary

Chinese in Canada. *See* Asiatics; Immigration

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Amherst internment camp, 4070
Buoy picked up, 2607
Cheticamp and Grand Etang, port physician, 2614
Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379
Inverness Railway, 4614
Mail contracts, 2082
Port Hood wharf, 2782
Steamship services
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1302, 3828
Hendrie & Co., 3830
Sick Mariners' Fund and fishermen, 2615

Circulation and Reserve, ques. 614, 637. *See also* Finance Act

Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. *For Departments, see their titles*
Appointments, ques. 2049
Temporary, 279
Commission, 85, 293, 404, 1498
Appointments by, 161-6, 260, 963, 3230
Charges against
Chief clerk of files, 163, 286
Fruit inspector, 161, 282
Immigration and Colonization publicity agent, 279
Schools, preparatory for Civil Service, 164, 288

Civil Service—*Con.*
Charges against—*Con.*
Superintendent of penitentiaries, 162, 283
Theft of examination papers, 164, 289
Toronto Customs hardware appraiser, 161, 278
Toronto deputy postmaster, 161, 276
Examinations and examination papers, 162, 164, 282-4, 287, ques. 750
Printing Bureau appointments placed under, 1812
Returned soldier suggested as member of, 996
Salaries, 4495
Secretary, 165, 289, 292
Disadvantages of, 962, 4477
Double salaries, 1902
Examination, 985, 987, 990, 998. *See also this title under* Commission, *above*
Income tax, 3497. *See also* Ottawa Improvement
Pensions, on, 3713
Inside, efficiency of—Special Committee of Inquiry into
Appointment, 1554, 1709
Reports, 2652, 3004, 3376, 3420, 4133, 4534
Insurance, report tabled, 138
List, tabled, 398
Murray, Sir George, report of, 2113, 2920
No minister of, 1559-60
Outside
Delay in appointments, ques. 3680
Dissatisfaction amongst, 404
Salary increases, 945-6
Overmanning of, 4605, 4670
Overseas men
Civil and military pay, 2925
Promotions, ques. 729
Patronage in, 58, 498, 1267, 1271, 3234
Postal employees' salaries, 1794
Postmasters at sub-stations, 404
Post Office appointments after strike, 4345
Promotions, 983
Reclassification, ques. 610, 956, 1267, 2292, 3827. *See* Civil Service Act Amdt.
Arthur Young & Co., 2911
Coms. of Civil Service Commission engaged in, ques. 617
Postal workers, correspondence, 2342
Report asked for, 1960
Report of, 3519
Returned soldiers, and, 291, 962
Wounded men and; motion Mr. McCurdy, 981; amdt., Mr. Morphy, 997; withdrawn, 1002
Salaries, 86, 1559
$2,500 and over, ques. 1439
Specialists, appointment of, 983, 989, 1182
Strikes
Civil Service—*Con.*
Appointments after, confirmation of, 3809
Superannuation, 1266-9, 4476
Report tabled, 138
Special com. report, 4133
Transferring officials, 278
Vacancies, advertising of, 2049
War bonus, 1, 955, 4687
Mail carriers, ques. 848
Vote of $2,500,000, 2824
Women in, ques. 2751

Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2909; 1r., 3293

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Secretary for the Department of Militia and Defence)
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2764
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1014

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 231. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 231; victory and peace, 232; conscription—Liberal party, 233; tariff, reciprocity, free trade, 235; reconstruction, 236; markets and their effect on trade, 238; taxation, cost of living—farmers' movement, 239; income tax—British Corn Laws, 240; free wheat—competition, 241
Board of Commerce, 4467
Budget, the, 3378. Political independence, 3378; bureaucracy, 3380; lowering tariff—Messrs. Calder and Crerar, 3381; reconstruction, 3382; tariff proposals, 3383; prices and tariff, 3384; Britain under free trade, 3386; revenue raising methods—tax-free bonds, 3387; industrial unrest, 3388; Canada a bond of nations, 3390
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3932-4
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1729
Finance, Parliamentary control, 2118
Public ownership, 2118
Civil Service, deputy ministers, payments to, 1591, 2442
Daylight Saving
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342
Railroad time, 1453
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 872
Grain trade, operation of elevators, 4089
Highways, 787, 3914, 3919, 3924, 4387, 4401, 4411, 4416
Provincial jurisdiction, 3901
Housing scheme, 2541, 2548

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Immigration
Great Britain, from, 2596
Prohibition of certain classes, 1918
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1317, 1339
Militia, permanent force, 3974
Naturalization, 4122-3
National harbours, control of, 3745
Pensions, 5203-4
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4288
Ploughs, duty on, 3690-6, 3701, 3704
Post Office appointments after strike, 4348
Prohibition, 2657, 2664, 2679
Proportional representation, 3069, 4620
Public health, social welfare, 1138-40
Purchasing Commission, 3203, 3815, 4454, 4620
Scientific research, 4462
Shipbuilding, 2217-9, 2253-4, 2257
Soldiers' land settlement, 3866
Tariff
Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 813
Explanation of vote, 3749
Titles, 1467, 2712, 2746

Clemens, Judge, investigation relating to, ques. 3066

Clements, Mr. Herbert S. (Comox-Alberni)
Alien enemies and treatment of soldiers, motion, 753
Mounted Police, 761
National non-sectarian schools, 756
Naturalization papers, 754
Technical education, 756

Closure
Canadian National Railway. Notice, 1789; discussion, 1797
Interpretation of rule, 1796, 1799

Coal
Canadian National Railway, ques. 1906
Lignite, briquetting of, 3472
Railway contracts for, 1909
Railway rates, and. *See* Budget
St. Lawrence route, ques. 3471, 4335
Supply, 174

Coal Tar derivatives. *See* Proprietary

Coasting Trade
Railway Commission control. *See also* Railway Act Consolidation Bill
Bill to provide, 71
United States, with, 1110, 1209, 1260

Cochrane, Hon. Francis, Senate request his attendance at Hudson Bay Com., 2511

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 124. Peace and victory, 125; Bolshevism—capital and labour, 127, 130; His Majesty the King, 128; income tax, 130; tariff, 131; Peace Conference, presence of the Prime Minister, 132
Agricultural implements, duties, etc., 3072, 3099
Ploughs, 3691
Bankruptcy Bill, 1990, 1994, 1999, 2003, 2475
Budget, the, 3349. Industrial unrest—Peace Treaty, 3349; Russia, 3351; trade conditions and tariff, 3353; tariff investigation commission, 3359; coal duties and freight rates, 3361; dumping, 3362
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1850
Freight rates and tariff duties, 3700
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership—nationalization; railways extending into United States, etc., 687
Illiterates, immigration of, 1965
Income tax, 3737
Materials for manufacture, purchase of in Canada, 3699, 3702
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart and others, 1531
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1329
Militia, permanent force, 1899, 3973
Passports, 1052
Pensions, 4031
Railway. Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highways, Hydro-Electric, 3087
Railway rates, Commission control, 4146
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 999
Shipbuilding, 2257
Titles, 1469, 2723, 2739, 2746-8

Cold Storage, 2062
Taxation of companies, ques. 2904
Transportation, 2980
Warehouses, 2982
Food in, destruction of, ques. 2906
Montreal, proposed building, 1619, 2062

Collective Bargaining, 3908. *See also* Industrial unrest

Collins, Mr., case under Military Service Act, 1326

Combines and Fair Prices Bill. 1r., 4198; 2r., com., 4567, 4588; 3r., 4601. *See also* Board of Commerce

Commercial Cable Company, property at Hazel Hill, N.S., ques. 2046

Commissions, return of number of, ques. 646

Connaught Rifle Range, 1894-8

Conner, Mr., Immigration agent, 2590

Conscientious Objectors. *See* Military Service

Conscription, 233, 346, 489, 496, 510. *See also* Military Service Act

Conservation, Commission of, report tabled, 312

Consular Officers, payment to, 1900

Contract by Tender vs. Force contracts, 1606

Cooper, Mr. Richard C. (Vancouver South)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 336. General Currie — St. Julien, 337; Cambrai, Mons, 337; Canada's war record, decorations won—proposed grant to Sir Arthur Currie, 339; Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 339, 340; scholarships as war memorials, 340; national defence service—women in Government service—aliens and fishing licenses—public works to give employment, 341; immigration—war service gratuity and clothing allowance, 342; war service button—land settlement — pensions — prohibition — taxes —vocational training, 343; party government, 344
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3822
Daylight Saving, 887
Militia pensions, 2755-60
Pensions, 4175, 4201
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3868-9
Women in Civil Service, 2751

Copp, Mr. Arthur B. (Westmorland)
Air Board Bill, 2051-6
Bankruptcy Bill, 2004, 2007
Canada Food Board, ques. 613
Canadian National Railway
Coal purchases, ques. 1906
Directors, ques. 612
Appointment—politics and patronage, 1639
Intercolonial Railway
Lines to be included, 1677
Managers, ques. 948
Moncton, transfer of officials from, ques. 948
Operation, 4615-8
Position of in C.N.R., amdt., 2131-7
Pugwash spur, 3067
Steamships, P.E.I., ferry, 1690
Toronto, buildings in, occupied by, 612
Demobilization, men in garrison at St. John, 3236-7
Divorce Court Bill, 3784
Economy in expenditure, 4053
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2464
Fisheries
Lobsters, 714-24, 2902
Oysters, 2897
Petitcodiac River, fishway in, 2898

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Forestry and timber limits, 4053-4
Franchise, 4635
Government employees' compensation, 705-6
Housing scheme, 2560-1
Immigration agents, 2588
Indians, 4061
Judges' salaries, 4371
Lighthouse keepers, 2609
Migratory birds, 4604
Napadogan, ice at, ques. 972
Naval Service, 2241
Newcastle wireless station, 2849
Parliament buildings, 2338
Pensions, 4299
Commissioners' salaries, 2452
Proprietary medicines, 2486-7
Public Health, Director General, 2572
Purchasing Commission, 3237
Sackville public building, 4612
St. John harbour, 4300, 4305
Steamship services, freight rates, 1285
Steamships, management of, 4685-6
Technical education, 4136
Payment to provinces by population, 3893
Tinplate, 4447

Cost of Living. *See* High Cost

Costa Rica, message in celebration of peace, 2

Coté, Eugenie, alias "Venus," 2808

Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566

Coteau Landing, highway, ques. 2045

Cottonseed Meal, 2446

Council of Agriculture, 578
Platform, 531
Policy and representatives, 556
Wood, Mr. H. W., 556, 566, 586

Courts Martial. *See* War, Naval Service, Military Service Act

Cousineau, Mr. L., ques. 1306

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 168. Liberal Party, 168; Peace Conference, presence of Prime Minister, 168; Union Government—co-operation in the work of government, 170; medical men and patronage—housing, 171; tariff, 172; railways—Mounted Police, 173; coal supply—Health Department, 174; industrial unrest, 175
Budget, 3474. Tariff and reciprocity, 3474; Western problems, 3478; Hon. Mr. Crerar and wheat prices, 3479; tariff and prices, 3480; manufacturers' action under protection, 3481; implement prices, 3483; Western Provinces and natural resources, 3484

Cowan, Mr. Walter D.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway, 1840
Cold storage warehouses, 2983-4
Daylight Saving, 898
Housing scheme, 2538-40
Immigration, 2576
Package goods, net weight, 2153
Postmasters and inspectors, 2031-3
Proprietary medicines, 2482-3
Public health, 1197
Red Cross Society, 3168
Rentals paid by Government, 2505
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2319
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2774-5
Water-powers, 4049
Wheat, drought resisting, 2972

Credits, foreign. *See* Trade

***Crerar, Hon. T. A.** (Minister of Agriculture)
British embargo on Canadian cattle, 2963
Budget, the, 3328. Resignation from the Government, 3329; tariff and national development, 3330; prices, 3332; tax proposals, 3336
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3953, 3961-4
Cattle, number in Canada, 2997
Co-operation, federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture, 2966
Cold storage
Transportation, 2981
Warehouses, 2982-8
Dairy products and the war, 2967
Daylight saving, 926
Experimental farms, 2965, 2976-80
Fairs, 2996-7
Flax, 1550
Grain trade—elevators, 4073, 4082
Health of animals, 2988
International Institute, 2992
Livestock Act Amdt. Bill, 1570, 2061-7
Livestock, pure bred, 2992
Meat and Canned Goods Act, 2989
Militia, permanent force, 3972
Oleomargarine, 2982
Pests, 2979-80
Publications, 2990
Resignation from Government, 3193, 3329
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 820
Wheat
Drought resisting, 2972
Local mills and, 2974
Market for, 2999-3000
Wheeler, Mr. S., experiments of, 2972-3
Yukon, wheat growing in, 2974

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
1. Fire prevention. 1r., 1382; 2r., 1573; com., 1574; 3r., 1619
2. Sexual offences. 1r., 1710; 2r., com., 2159; 3r., 2305; Senate amdt., 4634, 4689

Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
3. Excessive punishment. 1r., 2851
4. Unlawful associations, etc. 1r., 4134; 2r., com., 4355; 3r., 4380; Senate amdts., 4660
Unlawful associations, 4355; concealed weapons, 4356; bribing peace officers, 4361; venereal disease, 4362; indictable offences, corporations, 4363; election by prisoners, 4363; challenging jurors, 4363

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Immigration Act. Amdt., 1876
Alien enemies, 1948
Illiterates, 1953, 1961, 1968
Prohibited classes, amdt., 1969, 2280; withdrawn, 2283
Imperial Conference, 1919, 1948
Imperial Court of Appeal, ques. 1075
Peace Treaty, ratification, 2200
Pensions, 4296
Prohibition, 2349, 2655; amdt., 2656-7, 2688
Research, scientific, 4457
National Research Institute, 1565
Seed grain, 1031

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (West Elgin)
Militia pensions, 2755
Resignation as Minister of Labour, 129

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
Capilano Bridge, 2790
Chinese and Japanese immigration, 1976
Daylight Saving, 920

Cruelty to Animals, 2603

Currency Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 637; 1r., 639; 2r., com., 1044; 3r, 1111

Currie, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Arthur, 336, 370, 500
Currie, Col. John A. and, 545, 547
Proclamations by, ques. 607
Proposed grant and testimonial, 339, 548

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 545, 551. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — personal reference, war record, second battle of Ypres, 545; Canada's soldiers deserving of the nation's thanks — returned soldiers, 548; tribute to dead soldiers—Col. Baker, Col. Sharpe, 549; Rhyl riots, 550; tariff—economic war, 551; free wheat, 552; manufacturers and exports, 553; demobilization — soldiers' land settlement, 554; manufacturers' earnings—class hatred, 555; Canadian Council of Agriculture, 556; income tax—industries and resources of the several provinces, 559; proposals of action—elevators, ships, factories, 564;

*Resigned as Minister of Agriculture June 4; p. 3194

Currie, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Conservative party, 566; Mr. Wood, President, United Farmers of Alberta, 556, 566
Franchise, 4642-3
Pensions, 4197
Railway Commission and freight rates, 4145
Shipbuilding, 2219
Siberian Expedition, ques. 1440

Customs and Inland Revenue
Department
Commissionership of, 3927, 4380
Messrs. H. C. Blair, Bryson Macdougald, John Ridley, ques. 2398
Preventive service, 965
Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216
Salaries, 954
Duty, rebates of, ques. 646

Customs Tariff Act Amdt. *See* Revenue Bills

Dafoe, Mr. John W., ques. 974, 1789

Dairying Industry, development of, 2980

Dams, Government, 2796

d'Anjou, Mr. Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 224. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 224; bi-lingualism, 225; women's franchise—censorship—Orders in Council, 226; Siberian expedition—Military Service Act defaulters, 227; franchise, War-time Elections Act—Union Government—national unity, 228

Bradbury, Lieut.-Col. G. H., ques. 1107

Budget, 3450. War and conscription, 3450; election law, 3451; Siberian expedition—French-Canadians in the war, 3452; Guelph Novitiate, 3453; Hon. Mr. Crerar and Hon. Mr. Calder, 3454; tariff, 3455
Enlistments, May-December, 1917, ques. 609
"Hochelaga," steamer, ques. 609
Intercolonial, express parcels, ques. 2047
Keddy, Dr. O. B., ques. 2797
Laferriere, Capt. Alban, ques. 3135
Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612
Mahon, Mr. C. E., ques. 1612, ques. 1790, ques. 2295
Military Service Act, ques. 1306, 1332
Militia, permanent force, 3977
Naval Service recruiting, ques. 747
Parent, Dr. Rufus H., ques. 1213
Thompson, Lieut.-Col. Alfred, M.P., ques. 747

Dansereau, Mr. Lionel, 357

Davidson, Mr. Avard Longley (Digby and Annapolis)
Canadian National Railway, legal expenses, ques. 2047
Good roads, 3913-25, 4387, 4390, 4394, 4430, 4433
Point of order: discussion of motion standing on Order Paper not permissible—upheld, 190

Davis, Mr. Fred Langdon (Neepawa)
Board of Commerce, 4518
Budget, 3631. Greater revenues needed, 3631; excise and land taxes, 3632; tariff revision, 3633; farm labour shortage, 3634
Civil Service, com. on efficiency, 1517
Fire prevention, 1577-8
Immigration, restriction of, 1938
Livestock, pure bred, 2993
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1260
Naturalization, 4130
Ruthenians, 1938

Daylight Saving, 456, 505, 1074, 1208, 1383, ques. 3242
Ethier, Mr., vote of, 1482
Government's policy, 647, 970
Health and, 912, 915
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342, 1422
Point of order (Mr. Denis) as to hour of sitting, 1432
Railway time, 929, 1433
Special motion to take up order, 886
Res. (Mr. Cooper), 887; amdt. (Mr. McCoig), 892; point of order (Mr. Guthrie), 903; amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Mackie, Edmonton), 910; div. 928

Debates. *See* House of Commons

Déchène, Mr. Aimé Miville (Montmagny)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 87. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 87; soldiers' settlement, 88; immigration—commissions, 90; foreign trade, 91; war indemnity—pensions, 92; taxation — thrift, 92; tariff — public health, 94; returned soldiers, 95
Canadian National Railway, 2129
Dominion Police, ques. 2047, ques. 2144
St. Barnabé Island, ques. 4464
Spirituous liquors, entered at Quebec, 1533

Deep Brook post office, ques. 751

Defaulters. *See* Military Service Act

Delisle, Mr. Michel Siméon (Portneuf)
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 1534
Destroyers, purchase of, ques. 1534
"Hochelaga," steamship, ques. 606
Life-saving stations, ques. 606

Delisle, Mr. Michel Siméon—*Con.*
Newfoundland R.N.R. ratings, ques. 1611
Seymour Narrows batteries, ques. 975
"Stadacona," steamer, ques. 880
Trawlers, ques. 746

Demobilization. *See* War

Demers, Mr. Marie Joseph (St. Johns and Iberville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 344. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—reconstruction—franchise, War-time Elections Act, 344; aliens—independence of judges, 341; conscription—defaulters, 346; Canadian autonomy, 347
Conscriptions, number of, ques. 972

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 446. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French Canadians and national unity, 447; Quebec province and the "Black Robes," 448; the Orange Sentinel and national unity, 449; war indemnity, 450; Canada's sacrifice in war—Military Service Act, defaulters, 451; tariff and the Liberal party, 452; Liberals and Unionists, 453
Business of the House, pending legislation, 3420
Canada Evidence Act Amdt., 1390
Daylight saving, point of order as to time of meeting of House, 1432
Franchise, 3420
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 692
Parliament Buildings fire, 725
Pensions, 4181, 4185

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Rulings and statements of
Bills
Amendments
Changing character of Bill, 1745
Procedure in, 1198, 1204
Committee, in
Reading of clauses by Chairman, 2001
Motion to refer back, 4064
Preamble read and postponed, 1623
Principle not to be discussed in Committee, 1929, 2053
Reconsideration of clause only by unanimous consent, 2929
Schedule, order of, 1725
Taxation measures originating in Senate, 2490
Chair to be addressd, 2538
Closing of debate, 3207
Closure, 1799

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Committee, limitations of debate in, 1034-5, 2508
Committees appointable by the House, not by Committee, 1639
Conversations in Chamber, 4200
Interruptions, 1174, 2869
Language
Not disorderly except as applied to members, 1930
Objected to
Bolshevists—"Your friends," 1068
"Wilfully leading the House into error," 1854
Leader of the House, announcements by, 1566
Motion and amdt. debatable together, 2725, 2728
Motions not debatable
That Committee rise, 1583, 3816
To report a Bill, 4017
No motion before the House, 1566
Opportunity for discussion under the rules, 2760
Order and "Privilege," 2840
Past debate, 1608, 2885, 4588
Quorum, 397, 2361
Relevancy, 1175, 1273, 1631, 1746, 2068, 2480, 2661, 2977, 3734, 3813, 3984, 3986, 4480
Nickel, 3684, 3689
Orders in Council, 4487
Ottawa agreement, 4384-5
Pensions, 4257
Vancouver harbour, 3752-3
Repetitions, 3978
Resolution standing on Order Paper, debate not permissible, 190
Senate debates, reference to, 3278
Statement of member to be accepted, 1607
Taxes cannot be increased by Committee, 2487

Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Batiscan, works, ques. 645
Blondin, Lieut.-Col. P. E., ques, 1790
Enlistment of certain soldiers, ques. 3067

Desjardins, Mr. Charles ("Ti-Noir"), ques. 750

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 353. Profiteers—returned soldiers, 353; immigration—Bolshevism—Siberian expedition, 354
Budget, 3531. Social unrest, 3532, 3535; unsatisfactory answers to question,

Deslaurier, Mr. Hermas—*Con.*
3533; cost of living, 3534; soldiers and liquor, 3536; Military Service Act, defaulters, 3537
"Canada," C.G.S., ques. 745
Canadian National Railway, locomotives, ques. 1212
Daylight Saving, 3242
Halifax disaster, ques. 879
Hull armoury, ques. 1215
Labour Union convention, Calgary, ques. 2143
Lamontagne, Miss Yvette, ques. 1957, ques. 2145
Luxuries, taxes on, ques. 749
Montreal, port of, labour, ques. 3997
Montreal strike, 1482, 1615
National Service Registration, accounts, ques. 2296, ques. 2565
Ontario and Quebec, Northern, colonization, ques. 748
Ste. Marie wharf, ques. 1958
Salvarsan, ques. 2144
Strikes in Canada, ques. 1792, ques. 2143
Transcontinental Railway
Business during 1918, ques. 3064
Stations, ques. 1211
Weights and measures, inspectors, ques. 2296

Destroyers, purchase of, ques. 1534

Destructive Insects and Pests, 111, 2979

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Budget, 3343. Pending questions and government, 3343; Canada's tariff history, 3344; waste, 3345; increased production, 3347
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1722-4
Directors
Salaries, 1623
Term of office, 1797
Head office, 1665
Patronage, 1625
Civil Service war bonus, 2919
Arthur Young & Co., 2920
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2163
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 877
French River waterway, 1086
Influenza, cure of, 1175
Judges' salaries, 2957
Loans, public, 4198
Military Service Act, administration in Wright county, 2399-2402
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1254
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Tariff, 824
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-4

Dickson, Mr., contractor, 1376

Divisions
Budget, 3678
Canadian National Railway
Finance, 2130
Labour representation, 2141
Third reading, 2142
Cost of Living, 4334
Daylight Saving, 928
Divorce Court Bill, 3781
Fire prevention, 1619
Intoxicating liquors, 4072
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4336
Permanent force, 4002
Purchasing Commission, 3226
Railway Act
Power clause, 4165
Telephone clause, 4169
Tariff, 841
Titles, 1481, 2748

Divorce
Fees, remission of, number of divorces, 2779
Jurisdiction of Provincial Courts, 1438, 2779, 4535

Divorce Court Bill. 1r., 1662; 2r., 3761; motion (Mr. Fripp), six-months hoist, 3777; neg. on div., 3781; com., 3783

Dogfish, ques. 979

Dominion Bills, issues, ques. 616. *See* Currency

Dominion Coal Company, demand for ships, 2406

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 4533; res., 4534, 4621; 2r., 4622, 4635; com., 4646; 3r., 4659

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt. Bills
1. Bill No. 79. 1r., 1789; 2r., com., 2297; 3r., 3344
2. Bill No. 125 (Land for soldiers). 1r., 2953; 2r., com., 3070; 3r., 3073

Dominion Iron and Steel and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal companies
No amalgamation, 2342
Steel rails, 2251

Dominion Lands
Orders in Council tabled, 185
Provincial taxation of, 709

Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Rates of interest). Res., 1111, 1112; 1r., 4063; 2r., com., 4251; 3r., 4254

Dominion Lands Surveys Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 72; 2r., com., 930; 3r., 1029

Dominion Parks, expenditure, 4046

Dominion Police, 2925, 4670
Bourdon, Henri, ques. 1440
Men employed, ques. 2047
Special force, ques. 2144
Suspensions, ques. 1440

Dominion Power Board, 4028

Dominion Revenue and Expenditure, ques. 1217

Dominion Steamers, 2600. *See* Vessels

Dominion Water Powers Bill. 1r., 2291; 2r., com., 2512; 3r., 2576
Application, 2512
Bond issues, 2526
Director of water-power, 2523
Private lands, expropriation, etc., 2517, 2524
Surveys, 2522
Title in Crown, 2516

Dorchester
Customs receipts, ques. 882
Level crossing accident, ques. 972
Post offices and mail service, ques. 729
Telephone lines, ques. 849

Dorval, buildings, ques. 610

Douglas, Mr. James McCrie (Strathcona)
Board of Commerce, 4505
Canadian National Railway, branch lines in the West, 1771-3
Postal employees' war bonus, 2928
Returned soldiers
Civil re-establishment, 2764-7
Civil Service positions for, 1000
Telegraphs, North country, 2795

Douglas, Mr. John C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Petit de Grat—Mulgrave service, 1303

Doukhobors, 2043

Draftees. *See* Military Service Act

Drainage. *See* Reclamation

Draper, Mr. P. M., ques. 3999

Drugs. *See* Proprietary

Drummond, Sir George, sale of paintings, 2447

Drummond, Mr. Huntley, Commissionership of Canada, ques. 3242

Dryden, Mr. Michael, appointment, 287

Dry Docks, 2360

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 4306; 1r., 2r., com., 4307; 3r., 4337

Duchemin, Mr. H. P., ques. 1536, ques. 1791

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 116. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French Canadian Liberals—peace and victory, 116; United States' part in the war, 117; demobilization—franchise, 118; resignation of Mr. McCurdy, 119; reconstruction, 120; fish prices, 121; Canada Registration Act—Peace Conference, 122; shipbuilding—coal miners, 123; ideals in public life, 124
Aliens, naturalization, ques. 616
Amherst Carriage Factory building, ques. 3997
Blair, Mr. H. C. and MacDougald, Mr. Bryson, ques. 2398
Buoys, Magdalen Islands, 1866
Canada Registration Act, ques. 978
Canada Shipping Act. Amdt., 3929-34
"Canada," steamer, coal, ques. 1340
Customs and Inland Revenue salaries, 961
Dennis building, Halifax, ques. 972
Dogfish reduction works, ques. 979
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2286-9
Fish, Canadian, alleged accumulation in Great Britain, 3328
Fish, compulsory inspection, 949-951
Fisheries, British Columbia, 935, 3759
Fort George postmistress, ques. 602
Halifax harbour master, 2694
"Hochelaga," steamer, dismissals from, ques. 1340
Immigration Department, appointments, 2592-4
Immigration, discharged seamen, 1980
Liquor on patrol vessels, ques. 1340
"Lottie Russell," steamer, ques. 746
Lunenburg harbour, 2607
Marine hospitals, salaries, 2613-4
Messeroy, Mr. John A., ques. 1610
Military Service Act, ques. 749
Naval Service
Administration of, 2176
Boys in, ques. 607
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 606
Canadian vessels in action, ques. 607
Courts-martial, ques. 607, ques. 1534
Efficiency—conduct in war, 2821, 2840
Pay, increase of, ques. 607, ques. 746
"Princess," steamer, ques. 615
Prize money, ques. 607
Starrar, Mr. Hall, ques. 616
Trawler "T-30"
Men sentenced, 3472
Repairs, ques. 2397
Newfoundland steamship service, 3829
Nova Scotia Carriages, Limited, ques. 3066
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Pilotage, 2806
Proprietary medicines, 2483
Public Information Department, ques. 750
Pugwash brickyard railway spur, ques. 4239

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1001
Shipbuilding, 2252, 2262
Steamship services
Britain, 1282
Clipper ships, 1288
Jamaica, 1284
Steel plate, price of, 2252, 2262
"Tuna," H.M.C.S., ques. 1534, ques. 1905
Victory Loan, cost of, ques. 1918, 2798
Wireless operators, separation allowance, ques. 1905
Woodbury, Harry, and Military Service Act, ques. 2048
Wrecking plants, 2605

Duff, Mr. Justice, allowance for Imperial Privy Council, 4687

Dunkirk, base commandant at, report of, ques. 1216

Du Tremblay, Mr. Pamphile Réal (Laurier-Outremont)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 149. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Canada's war record, 149; French Canadian Brigade—industrial unrest—public expenditure, 150; business situation—tariff, 151; development, use of natural resources, 152; soldiers' settlement—labour problems—trade relations with the United States, 153; Victory Loan—war indemnity and public debt, 154; national unity, 155
Daylight Saving, 910
Public health, provincial rights, 1367
Seed grain, 1032, 1041
War indemnity, Canada's claim, 773

Ecum Secum wharf, 2780

Edmonton Bridge, 2790

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208

Education. *See also* Schools; Technical; Vocational
Land for school purposes, ques. 848
Mennonite schools, 2571
National non-sectarian schools, 756
Quebec, schools in, 2914

Edward VII, His late Majesty, monument to, 2797

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 254. New Opposition leader, 254; Liberal party, record of leading Liberals, 255; franchise—Peace Conference, attendance of the Prime Minister, 256; repatriation in Quebec—war activities of various parts of Canada, 257; enlistment figures by provinces, 258; tariff, free trade record of Mr. Clark (Red Deer) and others, 259; Civil Service appointments by the Commission, 260; Union Government—tariff—defaulters and slackers, 263
Agricultural implements, duties, 3704-5
Bank mergers, 1097
Barriefield, militia buildings, 3985
Board of Commerce, 4552, 4555
Budget, 3435. Reply to Mr. Casgrain, 3435; reply to Mr. McMaster, reciprocity, 3437; Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3438; protection and agricultural prosperity—profits and prices, 3440; Hon. Mr. Crerar and prices, 3442, 3638; tariff, 3444; Union Government, 3449
Calvin residence, Kingston, ques. 3377
Civil Service
Commission, 260, 2916
Examinations, 4490
Salaries, increases, 2915, 4480
Conscientious objectors, 1929
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2161
Daylight Saving, 913
Education
Bi-lingualism in schools, 241
National non-sectarian schools, 2403
Technical, 2897-9
Eight-hour day, 914
Empire Parliamentary Association, ques. 2749
Feldspar, 3693
Finance Department, vacancies, ques. 847
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payment of, 850, 877, 1102
Good roads, 792, 3903, 3917-9, 3924, 4398, 4430
Immigration
Illiterates, 1965
Prohibition of certain classes, 1929
Income tax, judges, 3714
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1250
Militia
Pensions, 2759
Permanent force, 1898, 3985
Policy and system, 1888
Parliament buildings, 2338
Pensions, 4298
Post Office
Mail contractors, 2085
Postmasters, 2085, 2927
Surplus, 2090
Privilege: statement of Ottawa "Journal," 1997
Prohibition, 2684
Return of Canadian soldiers, strikes delaying, 3741
Ross, Mr. P. D., 1997, 2915-7

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley—*Con.*
Royal Military College, clerk of works, ques. 4377
Titles, 2736
Correction, 3753

Electrical Measure. *See* Units

Electrical Development. *See* Canadian National Railway; Water power

Electric and Power Companies Bill. 1r., 4377; 2r., com., 4572; 3r., 4588

Elevators. *See* Grain

Electrocution Bill. 1r., 1957

Elkin, Mr. Stanley Edward (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Agricultural implement duties—rebates, 3702-3
Fire prevention, 1576
Gold taken into United States, 637

Embezzlement, Quebec officer charged with, 2294

Emigration
Belgium, from, ques. 1874
United States, to, ques. 2046

Empire Parliamentary Association, ques. 2749

Employment Bureaux. *See* Unemployment

Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 2450

Employment Works, 1597

Ethier, Mr. Joseph Arthur Calixte (Laval-Two Mountains)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 133, 141. Peace—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — reconstruction, 133; Military Service Act, defaulters, 134; censorship—public works—highways—returned soldiers, 135; Public Health Department—unemployment—Georgian Bay canal, 136; prohibition, 137, 138, 141; General Pau's visit, 137, 141; Bolsheviki, 141, 143; duties on implements and raw materials—Prime Minister at Peace Conference, 142; financial situation—Siberian expedition, 143
Vote on Daylight Saving, recording of, 1482

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 370. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—German - Canadian soldiers, 370; Canada's national status—Union Government and Bolshevism—Liberals and Unionists, 371; censorship—conscientious objectors, 372; reconstruction—financial situation—taxation, 373; succession tax—industrial unrest, 374; aliens, 375; discrimination in naturalization, 376

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
Budget, 3589. Cost of living—industrial unrest, 3590; tariff and manufactures, 3591
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1727
Directors, 1805
Public ownership, 1750
Draftees sent overseas, ques. 2297
Eight-hour day, 2856
Farm help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1959
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1576, 1586
Grand Trunk Railway, obligations, 666
Immigration
Agents in United States, 2569-70
Exodus of settlers, 2580
Mennonites, 1927, 2570-1
Prohibition of certain classes, 1927
Ministers and Commons, motion, 1002
Naturalization, alien enemies, 4114-6, 4130, 4339
Prohibition, 2662
Railway Act Consolidation Bill
Power clause, 4163
Transmission lines on highways, Hydro-Electric, 3086
Roumania, credit to, 1110
Steamship services, 1296
Welland Canal, collapse of walls, 1593

Ewart, Mr., Public Works Department, 2331

Excess Profits War Tax, 419, 430, 526, ques. 977

Exchange Rate, ques. 2145

Exchequer Court
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership and, 664
Land expropriation, Belanger vs. The King, 1021

Exhibitions, ques. 1215, 2600, 4682

Experimental Farms, 2976. *See also* Agriculture
Number and location, ques. 1077
Report tabled, 111

Exports. *See also* Trade
Feed, ques. 2048
Woollens, ques. 845

Expropriation of buildings by the Government, 2506

External Affairs Department, 4669

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Budget, 3522. Government by Order in Council, 3522; free speech—industry and finance, 3523; industrial unrest 3524; Military Service Act administration, 3525; minorities, 3526

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway, 1421
Fertilizers, 2979
Monk Station roadway, ques. 1438, 2202
"Montcalm," steamer, ques. 978
"Princess," steamer to replace, ques. 2797

Fairweather, Mr., Canadian Northern Railway arbitration, ques. 2145

Farm Help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1958

Farm Life, good roads and, 789

Farm Loans. *See* Banks

Federal District, 4385

Federal Hotel, Ottawa, lease of, ques. 2045

Ferguson, Sir Charles, and Canadian soldiers, 469

Fertilizers Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1568; 1r., 1570; 2r., com., 2286, 2463; 3r., 2510

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens (Shelburne and Queen's)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 473. Latitude of Debate on Address—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—returned soldiers in Parliament, Lt.-Col. Peck, V.C.—financial situation, 473; absence from Parliament of Ministers, 474; Peace Conference, war indemnity, 475; Peace Congress organization, 476; Canada's place therein, 477; Bolsheviki, 479; Canada's national status—Imperialism and Imperialism, 480; manufacturers and the West, 482; Laurier Government and the tariff, 483; party government, 484; Tariff Commission, 485; personal position as a candidate in election, 486; Union Government, 487; Liberals and Unionists, 488; conscription—Dominion grants and provincial rights, 489; highways—public health—prohibition, 490; franchise, 492; War-time Elections Act—aliens—"The word of an Englishman," 493; a free Parliament—titles, 494
Bank mergers, 1093
Board of Commerce, 4498
Bridges, Dominion responsibility, 2789-92
Budget, 3664. Fiscal situation, 3664; Civil Service—salaries of Ministers—currency, 3666; tax-free bonds, 3667; tariff—reciprocity, 3668
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3931-7
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1646
Closure, 2099
Directorate, 1628, 1633, 1653
Labour representative on, 2141
Returned soldier on, 1638

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Finance, 1698, 1702, 2098
Amdt., receipts and expenditures subject to Revenue and Audit Act, 2102
First meeting, 1666-7
Fiscal year, 1705-6
Head office, 1652
President's salary, 1657
Railway Act, application of, 1694
Supplies, purchase of, 3197
Canadian Press, news service, 4485
Chartered banks, excess circulation, 636
Civil Service, 2761
Extra work, deputy ministers, 2441
Overmanning of, 4671-2
Reclassification, 4488
Salaries, 964, 4476-7
Superannuation, 2761
Cost of Living Com., 4322
Daylight Saving, 917
Divorce Court Bill, 3779, 3784
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572, 4584-6
Fees, payment of officials by, 2692
Fish, cost of, 2890
Fisheries Com., 2463
Good roads, 784, 786, 4432-3
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 708
Halifax
Dry dock, 1281
Harbour master, 2692
House of Commons, Saturday and morning sittings, 3376, 3421
Housing scheme, 2537
Immigration Act Amdt., 1879
Illiterates, 1966
Income tax, 3720
Judges' Act Amdt. Bill, 4377
Judges' salaries and taxation, 2956, 4231-4, 4436-9
Lobster, canned, 725
Migratory birds, 2165-6
Militia pensions, 2754-7, 2761
Parliament buildings, 2339
Peace Treaty, ratification, 2200
Pensions, 4178-83
Postage stamps used on cheques, 2031
Prohibition, 2349
Proprietary medicines, 2487
Soothing syrups, 2492
Provincial autonomy (technical education), 3169
Public health, 1374
Public works, Nova Scotia, 2783
Railway Act Consolidation
Senate amdts., 4156
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3095-8
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2696

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Seed grain advances, 627
Steamship services
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
United States ports to, proposed, 1296
West Indies, 1288
Subsidies—steamship vs. railway, 1297
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 837
Taxation, not to be increased by Com.—point of order, 2487
Technical education, 3169, 3796
Telephone companies, 2647
Titles, 1478, 2740
War Expenditures ($3,500,000,000) Bill, "Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2242-5
Borrowing powers under, 2248

Finance. *See* Budget; Canadian National Railway; Highways; Technical Education; Loans
Canada's war expenditure, 14
Imperial Munitions Board, ques. 977
Loans, public, flotation cost, 211, 274, 290

Finance Act Bill. Res., 633; 1r., 644; 2r., com., 1103; res. referred to com., 1102; 3r., 1111

Finance, Department of
Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379
Salaries, 4475
Vacancies, ques. 847

Finley, Mr. Albert Ernest (Souris)
Immigration of illiterates, 1952

Fire Prevention. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Fiset, Dr. Michael, ques. 1791

Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill (British Columbia licenses). Res., 933; 1r., 936; 2r., 2097; ref. to special com., 2098; com., 3757; 3r., 3761

Fish and Fisheries
Alleged accumulation of Canadian fish in Great Britain, 3328
Breeding establishments, 2899
British Columbia, 426
Canadian Fisheries Association, 2888
Dogfish reduction works, ques. 979
Fisheries Com., 114, 2463
Report tabled, 111
Fishways, 2898
Graft alleged, Major Burde's charges, 427
Inspection. *See also* Fish Inspection Act
Maritime Provinces, in, 2896
Pickled fish, of, 2898
Lobsters, 2894, 2899. *See also* Meat and Canned Goods Bill
Canned, 2902
Hatcheries, 2899
Port Daniel West, 609
Marketing overseas, ques. 2750

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Naval men, returned, and, 451, 1959
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Officers
British Columbia, Chief Inspector, ques. 1534
Maritime Provinces, Inspector, 2896
Overseers, 2893-4
Salaries and disbursements of, 2887
Oysters, 2894-9
Prices, 121
Protection service, 2848
Salesmen, 2889
Salmon fishing by farmers, 2896
Salmon and halibut, ques. 1535
Souris, P.E.I., fish drier, ques. 1662, ques. 3470
Tax on fishermen, 2144
Twine and cordage, 3708
Utilization of waste, 3341

Fish Inspection Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 949. 1r., 952; 2r., ref. to Com. on Marine and Fisheries, 2098

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles
Letter from, 971
Payments to, 850, 1102
Pension, ques. 1109

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 202, 2074

Flax Industry
Bounty, 3842
Res., Mr. Glass, 1537

Flint, the late Thomas Barnard, 1341

Fontaine, Mr. Joseph Eloi (Hull)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 417. Financial situation—the war and profiteering—War-time Elections Act, 417; returned soldiers, 418; Military Service defaulters—tariff, 418; surplus profits tax—economy—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 419
Civil Service, 2921
Cost of living, 2921
Government property in Hull, ques. 1215
Loans to Imperial Government, ques. 1215
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1328
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4249
Royal Air Force, repatriation of, ques. 1611

Food Board. *See* Canada Food Board

Food Control. *See* High Cost of Living

Foran, Mr. J. K., ques. 607

Foran, Mr. William, Secretary Civil Service Commission, 165, 289, 292

Forbidden Literature. *See* Censorship

Foreign Trade. *See also* Trade
Roumania, 3241
Sir Clifford Sifton, and, 1908

Forest Products Laboratories, ques., 3068

Forests. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks; Dominion Forest Reserves

Forests, Waterways and Water Powers
Com. appointed, 114

Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379

Fort George Postmistress, ques. 602

Fortier, Mr. Hyacinthe Adelard (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 508. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —centralization of government, 508; government by Order in Council, 509; conscription, defaulters, 510; autonomy and British connection, 511
Budget, 3554. "Produce and save," 3554; alleged persecutions under Military Service Act, 3555

Fort Lawrence, N.S., dredging, ques. 3680

Fort William Grain Company, ques. 2048

Foster, Mr. Thomas (East York)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 397, 399. Sir Thomas White, Acting Prime Minister, 397; immigration, 399; highways and the provinces —transcontinental highway, 401; farm work and Government highway assistance—housing, 402; temperance question, 403; Outside Civil Service—postmasters at sub-stations — Civil Service Commission, 404; women's franchise, 405; War-time Elections Act and aliens — Ministers in the Senate, 406
Canadian National Railway, 1649
Daylight Saving, 926
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4578-9
Fire prevention, 1586
Highways, 731
Live Stock Act Amdt., 1571
Prohibition, 2658
Public Works Department, unexpended balances, 1280
Railway Act Consolidation
Disagreement with Senate, power clause, 4162
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3093
Telephone companies, 2644
Toronto Harbour improvements, 2363

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 176. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —Canada's war record—post-bellum conditions, finance, demobilization, returned soldiers, 176-7; franchise—tariff, 178; high cost of living, 179; profiteering—the Press, 180

Fournier, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1649, 1801
Liquor for Siberian Expedition, ques. 845
Pilotage—Shipping Act Amdt., 2806
Proprietary medicines, 2484-7, 3824-7, 3939
Public ownership of railways, 1866
St. Valerie wharf, 2786

Franchise. *See* Women; Dominion Elections Act; Enemy Aliens
Governor General's Speech, 1
Nova Scotia franchise law, 518

Franking of Pamphlets, ques. 1791

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Welland Canal lock tenders, 604

Fraser, the late John, Auditor General, 115

Fraser River works, 422

Fraser Seigniory, ques. 882

Fraser Valley, *See* Representation Act

Fraserville, Que., Riou Store, ques. 1611

Fraternal Societies, foreign. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Free Trade. *See* Budget; Tariff

French Language
Income tax forms, 3712
Loan, printing bonds, 4475
Use of in seconding Address, 17

French River, 1077, 2796

Fripp, Mr. Alfred Ernest (Ottawa)
Bankruptcy Bill
Order of court, 2010
Settlement and preference, 2008-9
Trustee, remuneration of, 2011-2
Board of Commerce, 4557
Daylight Saving, 920
Divorce Court Bill, 3776
Dominion Police, pay of, 2926
Horse racing, 1710
Letter postage rate, 745
Ottawa City and the Dominion Government, 2498, 4250
Pensions, 4191-6, 4207
Prohibition, 2349
War memorial building, ques., 1216
War Purchasing Commission, 3200

Frozen Beef, 1287, 1292

Fuel Control, ques. 612, ques. 1532, ques. 2145

Fulton, Mr. Frederick John (Cariboo)
Good roads, 3904
Judges' salaries, 2954-5
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4288

Fushimi, Prince, visit of, 2455

Gabarus, beach protection, 2780

Galicians and Poland, 3472. *See also* Poles and Ukrainains

Galvanized Iron, 3681, 3689

Game, protection of. *See* Migratory Birds

Garden Villages
Returned soldiers, for, 761, 4012. *See also* War, Soldiers; Soldiers' Land Settlement

Gauthier, Mr. Louis Joseph (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 73. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—unemployment—war debt of France, 73; shipping and conscription—patronage in repatriation medical service, 74; industrial unrest—Liberal party, 76; reconstruction—capital and labour, 77; agrarian question—Opposition's duty, 78

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles Arthur (Témiscouata)
Alcohol in medicines, ques., 646
Berubé, Esdras, 2250
Canadians in Royal Navy, 1434
"Champlain," steamer, 2606
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 858
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 946
Intercolonial Pension Fund, ques. 605
Isle Verte, 2784
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1312
Medical officer to Indians, 1906
Military Service Act, 1313
Defaulters, 971, 1866, 1957, 2250
Privilege, correction, 970
Proprietary medicines, 2481-7
Public Information, Department of, 2145
Riou store, Fraserville, ques. 1611
Seigniorial rights, ques. 882, 2786-7
Taxation Bills originating in Senate, 2490

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles, fire ranger, 2921

Georgian Bay Canal, ques., 843, 1082. *See also* French River Waterway

German Fleet. *See* War

Gibson, Judge, ques. 1440

Gibson, Major, ques. 884

Glace Bay harbour, 4613

Gladu, Mr. Joseph Ernest Oscar (Yamaska)
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1240

Glass, Mr. Samuel Francis (East Middlesex)
Canadian National Railway, 1859
Daylight Saving, 900, 1431
Flax industry, 1537, 1553
London public building, 4611
Proprietary medicines, 3487

Gobeil-Simard investigation, ques. 619

Gold. *See also* Finance Act
Prohibition of export of, 1102
Shipments, ques. 614

Good Roads. *See* Highways

Goodwin, Dr. B. E., ques. 3377, ques. 4070,

Gordon, Hon. Major Rev. C. W., ques. 1440

Government Employees' Compensation Bill.
Res., 701. 1r., 708; 2r., com., 938; 3r., 1029
ques. 4465

Government Ownership
Aeronautics, of, 2053, 2059
Railways, of. *See* Canadian National

Government Printing Bureau. *See* Printing Bureau

Government Railways. *See* Canadian National

Governor General's Speech, 1
Address in reply. *See* Address

Goyette, Magistrate, 2400

Grain. *See also* Canada Grain Act
Fort William and Port Arthur, ques. 604, ques. 605
Interior terminal, 505
Terminal, statistics of, ques. 880
Great Lakes, on, ques. 599
Prices, 537
Seed, ques. 979
Wheat. *See that title*

Grain Supervisors, Board of, 3837

Grand Etang, 2609

Grand Trunk Railway. *See also* Grand Trunk Pacific; Canadian National
Superannuation and Provident Fund, ques. 1213

Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada Bill. 1r., 111; 2r., 229; com., 1184; 3r., 1210
Government's offer, company's counter 659, 694

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Receivership Bill. *See also* Canadian National
Res., 649; 1r., 696; 2r., com., 1112; 3r., 1261-2
Statement by Minister, 316

Great Lakes
Armed vessels on, 1261
Government ships on, 2255-8

Great War Veterans' Association
Housing, resolution, 762

Greece, contract with Canada for wheat, ques. 2907

Greek Catholics in communion with Church of Rome, 1383

Green, Mr. Robert Francis (West Kootenay)
Dominion lands, reclamation of, 641
Good roads, 3901
Immigration Act Amdt., 1914

Gregory, Mr. William T., ques. 601

Grey, Mr. George Edwin, habeas corpus, 111

Grierson, Mr. Frank, ques. 613

Griesbach, Brig.-Gen. William A. (West Edmonton)
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 3819; amdt., 3821; withdrawn, 4118
Militia, permanent force, 3976, 3981
Pensions, 4174, 4180, 4195, 4201, 4206, 4282, 4292
"Unmarried wife," 4282
Titles, 2717, 2719

Grisdale, Mr., Deputy Minister of Agriculture, 2961, 2965

Grocers, Wholesale. *See* Private Bills

Grosse Isle, 2784

Guelph Novitiate. *See* Military Service Act

Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3196, 3201, 3211

Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435, 1483

Gustave, Stuart, property bequeathed to Government, 544, ques. 604, 648, 2769, 2770

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Solicitor General)
Bankruptcy Bill, 229, 1981-95, 1998-2015, 2467-78
Arrest of debtor ("abscond"), 2266-8, 2279
Bona fide transactions, 2471
Claims, 2472-3
Composition, 1983
Assent to, 1984
Contributory, 2009
Court's jurisdiction, 2268-70, 2474-5
Dividends, no action for, 2471
Inspectors, 2015
Limited partnerships, 2270, 2475
Malicious proceedings, 2272-4, 2279
Meetings of creditors notices, 2014
Non-traders, 2477
Order of Court, 2010
Proof of debt, 2263-4
Secured creditors, by, 2265
Provinces, and, 1998-9, 2008
Settlements and preferences, 2008, 2469-70
Trustees
Appointment, 1984-90, 2468
Discharge, 2472
Insurance by, sale of patented articles, 2006-7
Powers, 2468
Reports, 2468
Security by, 1992-5, 2468-9
Surrendered, 2001
To be kept in force, 1998-9
Substitute, 2000-4
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 3816-23, 4110-32, 4257-74

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Criminal Code, Aliens and British subjects, 4357-8
Daylight Saving, 903
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1315
Religious conscientious objectors, 782
Sedition, report of Special Com., 3285

Guysborough public library, ques. 846

Halifax
Dennis building, ques. 972
Dry dock, 1281
Explosion, ques. 879
Overseas mails, 886, 929
Terminals, cost of, ques. 2398

Halifax Harbour Master Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2692; 1r., 2695; 2r., com., 2800; 3r., 2802

Halladay, Mr. Howard H. (Bow River)
Budget, 3582
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2162
Daylight Saving, 902
Hanna townsite and Mr. D. B. Hanna, 1410

Hamilton, Mr. Charles McGill, Director Canadian National Railway, 1638, 1834

Hamilton, Major W. J., ques. 3067

Hanmer, Mr. I. B., cattle breeder, 2995

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1408. *See* Canadian National Railway

Hanna, Alberta, townsite of, ques. 1535

Harbours. *See their names*
Dues, statement tabled, 40

Harold, Mr. John (Brant)
Budget, 3505. Reply to Mr. McKenzie, 3506; Canadian and American manufacturers, 3507; agricultural implements, 3508; business profits tax, 3509; land tax, 3510; free trade or protection, 3511
Canadian Expeditionary Force, files mislaid, ques. 1108
Freight rates, 3699
Gundy, the late W. P., 3201
Manufacturers' profits, 3699
Ploughs, duty on, 3701
Purchasing Commission, 3200-3
War; removal of bodies of the dead, ques. 1107

Harrison, Mr. Charles Robert (Nipissing)
French River waterway, 1077
Government employees' compensation, 945
Lake Nipissing water-power, ques. 1341

Hart, Mr. James I., ques. 602

Harvesters, admission into Canada, 1944

Hastings, Mr. J. R., appointment, 161, 283

Hawker, Mr., transatlantic flier, 2564

Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 2791

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Budget, 3583
Immigration, illiterates, 1967
Indian Reserves, expropriation, 2302
Purchasing Commission, 3209

Head tax on Canadians entering United States, 1942

Health. *See* Public Health

Health Department Bill. 1r., 843; 2r., 1164; com., 1182, 1185, 1366; 3r., 1383

Hebrews, illiteracy among, 1967
"Helena," motor boat, ques. 3998

Henders, Mr. Richard Coe (Macdonald)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 454. Peace and its problems, 454; Union Government — Military Service Act, 455; public health—prohibition—daylight saving, 456; reconstruction—tariff, 457
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 4376
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 4010
Board of Commerce, 4558
Budget, 3647. War and after-war problems, 3648; Western farmers and direct taxation — tariff, 3649; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt.—co-operation of interests, 3650
Daylight Saving, 902
Grain trade
Appeal Board, 4100, 4103-4
Speculation, 4105-9
Warehouses and elevators, 4097
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 1572
Pensions, 4297
Ploughs, duty on, 3692
Prohibition, 2662
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2950

High Commissioner, ques. 3242
Reported resignation, 647

High Cost of Living, 394, 409, 523, 1594, 1663, 2921, 3280-3. *See also* Board of Commerce; Combines; Industrial Unrest
Butter, price of, 2063
Daylight Saving and, 896
Measures to reduce, ques. 1792
Minimum wage and, 2908
Special Committee
Appointed, 2953
Reports:
2nd, 4069. Motion (Mr. Nicholson) to concur, 4307; amdt. Mr. McKenzie, neg. on div., motion agreed to, 4333
3rd (recommendations), 4664

Highways, 16, 25, 43, 53, 135, 167, 184, 302, 312, 458, 490, 530, 542, 2791-2
British Columbia mountains, through, 431
Farm work, effect on, 402, 732
Government policy, 731
Prices and, 789
Provinces and, 401
Railways and, 742-4
Transcontinental, 401

Highways Aid Bill. Res., 729, 784, 3899; 1r., 3926; 2r., com., 4386; 3r., 4435

His Majesty the King
Banquet to President Wilson, 103, 148

Historical Monuments, report tabled, 184

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 155. Canada's sacrifice in the war—"Department of Public Welfare"—mothers' pensions, 156; old-age pensions, unemployment insurance—trades unions—housing, 157; returned soldiers, pensions, 159; franchise—Bolshevism—the Civil Service, 160; theft of examination papers, 164
Board of Commerce, 4502-3
Canadian National Railway, 1807
Civil Service
Commission, 160
Committees, list of, ques. 617
Examination papers, theft of, 164, 2082, 2084
Post Office Department, salaries, 2082
Toronto letter carriers, 1341
Daylight Saving, 905
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 876
Foran, Mr. J. K., ques. 607
Guelph Novitiate, 1237
National non-sectarian schools, 2430
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2023-6
Newsprint control, 4539, 4547
Post Office statistics, ques. 2903
Quebec City, post office, ques. 2751
Quebec and Hamilton post offices, ques. 2750
Toronto, Montreal, and Winnipeg post offices, ques. 2750
Transmission lines on highways; Hydro-Electric, 3126

Holbrook, Mr. George H., ques. 646

Homestead Entries, ques. 751

Horse Racing, 1710, 4466

Hospitals, 2774. *See also* War
Maternity, 1374
Quebec Military, ques. 844
St. Anne's, 1264
Toronto Base, ques. 845

House of Commons. *For questions of Parliamentary procedure see* Speaker; Deputy Speaker
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 2851
Ash Wednesday, 185
Easter, 886, 1075, 1109, 1162
Leave to discuss urgent matter
Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt, charges of, 1099
Quorum, for want of, 397
Board of Internal Economy, ques. 4, 605
Business of the House
Budget Speech, time of, 1343, 1712, 2752
Government business, precedence for, 1110
Initial Committee rule, suspension of, 4456
Legislation forthcoming or postponed, 599, 1342, 1616, 2398, 3999, 4690
Questions, outstanding, 1342
Chamber, acoustic properties of, 2331, 2337, 2396, 2538, 2657
Committees, standing, 4, 111-2, 696
Estimates, Committee on, proposed, 1557
Daylight Saving and sittings of the House, 970, 1432
Debates, official report of
Committee appointed, 114
Reports
Special editions of members' speeches, 1162, 1206
Volumes, publication of, 2198
Divisions. *See that title*
Galleries, admission to, 1910
Members
Apartments for, proposed, 2498
Representing two ridings. *See* House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill
Sessional indemnity of, 749
War record of, personal list, 195
Ministers in Senate, representation in, ques. 884, ques. 974
Motion, Mr. Euler, 1002
Officers
Clerk of French Journals, 357
Deputy Sergeant at Arms, 4
Messengers, pay of, 1558
Press Gallery, record in the war, 209
Privilege, Senate Address in place of request by Message, 642
Quorum, 397, 2361
Reading room, 318, ques. 843
Returns, inquiries for and statements concerning, 886, 1908, 4000
Sittings
Dominion Day, 4198
Non-suspension of, conference with Senate, 3948
House of Commons—*Con.*
Sittings—*Con.*
Saturday and morning, 3376, 3420
Wednesday, 1109
Speaker, living allowance, 2444
Vacancies, 1163. *See also* House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill
Votes and Proceedings and Journals, 41, 3065, 3292
House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 643
Housing, 15, 30, 45, 53, 144, 157, 223, 333, 530, 542, 1188. *See also* Public Health
Farm buildings in the West, 171
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 761
Loan to provinces of $25,000,000
Inquiry as to time of presenting measures, 1616
Order in Council tabled, 71
Resolution and debate, 2532
Hudson Bay and Strait, 2511
Hudson Bay Railway, 4409
Port Nelson terminals, 4688
Hughes, Gen. William S., 162, 285
Hughes, Lieut.-General Sir Sam (Victoria)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 195. House of Commons members' war record, 195; Military Service Act—Union Government—War Measures Act, 199; politics, patronage, independence — soldiers, regulars vs. irregulars, 200; Canada's rights—political intrigues, 201; the Press, 201, 203; Munitions Board—formation of Union Government, 202; "Canadian Official Record," 203; organization of Canada's forces at the front, 204; St. Julien, Cambrai, Mons, 205; demobilization and repatriation, 207; population, development — Press Gallery record in the war, 209; finance, public debt, 210; munitions—Victory Bonds, 213
Canadians entering United States, head tax, 1110
Canadian Expeditionary Force, rifles and ammunition, 1614
Canadians in Imperal service, 1997
Canadians in Royal Air Force, ques. 646
Canadian soldiers imprisoned, 1434
Circular, farmers and military service, 1326
Civil and religious liberty in re-established countries, 2043
Commercial Cable property, Hazel Hill, N.S., ques. 2046
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4584
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1658-70, 2464-5
Greek Catholic children, 1383-8
Guelph Novitiate, 4620
Motion for Com. of inquiry, 1218

Hughes, Lieut.-General Sir Sam—*Con.*
Halifax Harbour Master, 2801
House of Commons galleries, 1910
Immigration agents in United States, 2586
Interim supply—agreement of leaders, 842
Juvenile delinquents, 1383-8, 3843
Kinmel Camp riots, 316, 424
Land for soldiers, 3071-2
Marine insurance, Roumanian, etc., relief, ques. 2798
Military escort of Roman Catholic bishop, ques. 2296
Military management, charges of General Smart, etc., 1517, 1527
Military Service Act
Defaulters, 4238-9
Uniformity of administration, motion, 1308
Military trials in England, 1959
Militia pensions, 2755-7
Milk—marking of containers, 2345
Nova Scotia, farm conditions, 2586
Pensions, 4183, 4289-91
Committee, 139
Poles and Ukrainians, etc., 2343, 3472, 4466
Princess Patricia's Regiment, ques. 616
Prohibition, 2348, 2350-6, 2668
Purchasing Commission, 3204
Roumania, credit to, 3241
St. John Harbour—Fort Latour, 4302
Scientific research, 4461
Selkirk postmaster, ques. 1308
Service medal, ques. 883
Soldiers' complaints against authorities, alleged suppression, 1618
Soldiers' graves, 332
Trawlers built for Canada, 2210
Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880
War Purchasing Commission, 3199
Wireless stations, 2795
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 984

Hull
Armoury, ques., 1215
Government property in, ques. 1215
Industrial disputes, ques. 2905

Hutterites. *See also* Immigration; Mennonites
Admission to Canada, 1382, 1875
Mass meeting in Winnipeg regarding, 1920

Hydro-Electric. *See* Railway Act

Immigration, 90, 99, 217, 300, 342, 354, 395, 399, 433, 1047
Chinese, ques. 751

Immigration Act Amdt. Bills. *See also* Immigration and Colonization
1. (General.) 1r., 1206; 2r,. 1866; com., 1876, 1910, 1960, 2280; 3r., 2305; Senate amdt., 3175

Immigration Act Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
Alien Labour Act and, 1943
Aliens, enemy, 1945
Definition, 1876
Deportation, 1977
Deputy Minister, 1980
Domicile, 1942, 2286
Exclusion of certain classes, 1916, 1944, 1976-1969, 1923
Inquiry, Board of, 1972
Inspection, 1973
Non-immigrant classes, 1980
Officers, 1972-1980
Transportation companies, 1978-9
2. (Advocates of violence.) 1r., 3211; 2r.. com., 3r., 3213

Immigration and Colonization. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt
Aliens, Government policy respecting, 753
Belgians, 2587
Canada's attractions, 2573
Department of
Agents
United States, 2569, 2588
West, in, 2588
Staff and salaries, 2568-72
Deputy Minister, 1915, 2440
Interpreters, 1972
Exodus of settlers, 2579-81, 2590, 2595
Great Britain, from, 2594, 2596
Hutterites and Mennonites, 2570-1
Land, cheap, 2572-9
Naturalization papers, 754
Northern Ontario and Quebec, to, 2574
Nova Scotia, to, 2582
Policy for all Canada, 2585
Restrictions, proposed changes in the law, 769
Parliament's powers, 773

Imperial Board of Investigation, 3240

Imperial Court of Appeal, ques. 1075. *See also* Supreme Court

Imperial Government, loans to, ques. 1215

Imperial Guards, 2753

Imperial Munitions Board, 19, 2073

Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference, 40, 244, 1044
Cables, 1052
Minister's (Hon. Mr Rowell) statement., 1044
Passports, 1052
Ratification of acts of, 1059
Resolution, 1918 Conference, 1948
Resources of Empire, 1052

Income War Tax. *See also* Budget; Revenue Bills
Assessment, total, ques. 2049
Evasions, alleged, 429

Income war tax—*Con.*
Exemptions, 1917-18, ques. 611
Farmers, ques. 2049
Gross taxable income, ques. 2296
Judges and, 3711-3
Montreal office, ques. 2905
Officials, 2798
Unmarried women and, 3992

Independent Workers of the World. *See* Industrial unrest; Bolshevism; Winnipeg strike

India
Famine in, 2616
Status of, 1045

Indian Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 4171; 2r., com., 4254; 3r., 4257

Indians
British Columbia, 4062
Caughnawaga, 4057
Greater production on farms, 4664
Liquor and, 4063
Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Northwest Territories, 4061
Medical attendance, 4060
Medical officer, ques. 1906
New Brunswick, 4061
Nova Scotia, 4060
Reserves
Opening up of, 414
Parks, expropriation for, 2302
Restigouche, ques. 609
Returned soldiers, lands for, 3807, 4015
Roads and bridges on, 4057
St. Peter's, ques. 1076
Seabird Island, 414
Schools, 4063
Tuberculosis and, 4062

Industrial Disability, Government insurance against, 994

Industrial Relations Commission, 1260, 4620
Personnel, 1305
Scope, 1432

Industrial and Scientific Research, 4376
Com., 1709, 2097, 4457
Report, motion to concur, 4457
Health laboratory, 1370
National Institute proposed, 1565
Vote of $120,000, 3341

Industrial Unrest, 16, 20, 26, 57, 73, 150, 296, 374, 393, 443, 574, 890, 899, 1858, 2883, 2929. *See also* Bolshevism; Board of Commerce; High Cost of Living; Industrial Relations
Conference to settle disputes, 2908, 3194
Discussion on motion to adjourn, 3004
Situation in the West, 2798

Industrial Unrest—*Con.*
Strikes
Canada, in, since signing of Armistice, ques. 2143
England, in, delaying return of Canadian soldiers, 3741
Montreal, 1482, 1615, 1663
Ottawa Street Railway, 4535
Sympathetic, "Collective bargaining," 2851
Time lost due to, 1792
Winnipeg, 2508, 2565, 2616, 2752-4, 2598, 2953, 3241, 3472, 3927. *See also* Post Office Appointments Bill
Arrests and trials, 3740
Prisoners' mooted removal to Kingston, 3587
Riots, 3843
Western situation, 2908

Infant Mortality. *See* Health

Inland Revenue
Bonded warehouses and liquors, 966
Violations, ques. 1536
Department
Expenses of, ques. 3242
Report tabled, 550

Inland Water Navigation
Railway Commission Control Bill. 1r., 71. *See also* Railway Act Amdt.

Inspection and Sale Act Amdt. Bill (Containers). Res., 2344; 1r., 2345; dropped, 3940

Insurance. *See also* Criminal Code
Department, 4479
Marine, Roumanian, etc., relief, ques. 2798

Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1259; 2r., 1567; ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1568; com., 3987; 3r., 3988

Intercolonial Railway. *See also* Canadian National
Express parcels, ques. 2047
Freight stolen at Charmy, ques. 2396
Mulgrave services, 1302
Operation, 4616
Position of, 2131
Property, earnings, expenses, ques. 750
Provident Fund, ques. 605, ques. 2045. *See also* Government Employees' Compensation

Inter-Imperial Trade, proposed Investigation Board, 3327

Interior Department
Deputy Minister, extra salary for immigration work, 2440

International Joint Commission, 462, 1901-4, 2396, 4670
Lake of the Woods Board, 1904

International Waters, sewage in, 1195

Interpretation Act Amdt. Bill (Superior Courts). 1r., 1957; 2r., com., 3r., 2313; Senate amdts., 2959

Interpreters for immigration service, 1972

Intoxicating Liquors
Custom houses as storage places for, 956, 966
Illicit stills, 969
Interprovincial trade in, opinions of Minister and Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, 4133
Northwest, in, statement tabled, 229
Quebec, entered at, ques. 1533
Shipments, prosecutions for, ques. 882
Siberian expedition, for, ques. 845

Intoxicating Liquors Act, 1919, Amdt. Bill. Res., 2345; 1r., 2396; 2r., com., 2654; 3r., 2752. Amdt. (Mr. Cronyn), 2656-7; neg., 2689
Senate amdt., 3782; House disagrees, res., Sir Robert Borden agreed to on div., 4071-2, 4133; Senate insists, 4475; free conference, 4497, 4550, 4572; House insists, 4659-60
Dominion Alliance, 2685
Intemperance
Causes of, 2686
Recreation, a cure for, 2686
Labour and, 2660, 2670-1, 2680
Medicinal value of liquor, 2667, 2682
Native wines, 2668
Ontario Temperance Act, 2655, 2678 2688
Prohibition, extension of, 2658-9
Provinces, 2347, 2662, 2679
Manitoba, 2673, 2678
Ontario, 2676, 2682
Rowntree and Sherwell report, 2685
Saleeby, Dr., opinion of, 2683

Inverness Railway, 4614

Iron, material for galvanizing, 3781, 3689

Irrigation, 4601

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 633; 3r., 696

Isle Perrot bridges, 733

Isle Verte wharf, 2784

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel William (George Etienne Cartier)
Alpine Club, 4046
Bankruptcy Bill, 1983-5, 1992-5, 2000-15, 2264-73, 2468-78
Board of Commerce, 4460, 4552
Bolshevism, 2284

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel William—*Con.*
British Remount Commission, ques. 976
Budget, 3624. Reply to Minister of Finance—Mr. M. Clark and party government, 3625; post-war tariff revision, 3626; Hon. Mr. Crerar's resignation, 3627; Bankruptcy Bill—vacancies in House of Commons, 3630; Hon. Mr. Rowell and Cabinet secrets, 3627, 3631
Butter, price of, 1618
Canadian National Railway
Finance, parliamentary control, 2128
Head office, amdt. 1648, neg. 1653
Combines, 4569, 4590
Amdt., "British subjects," 4590-8; neg., 4591
Criminal Code, 4356-63
Aliens and British subjects, 4356-61
Sexual offences, 2164
Daylight Saving, 893
Deputy Minister of Interior, 2443
Electric and power companies, 4577-9
Employment works, Welland canal, 1600-4
Franchise, 4639
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 940-8
Hebrews
Crime, absence of, 1881
Illiteracy unknown, 1967
Juvenile delinquents, 1386
House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill, 643
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
Deported conspirators, 1949
Illiterates, 1952, 1967; amdt. proposed, 1960
Open-door policy, 1880
Temporary residents, 1942
Travelling musicians, 1942
Violence against constituted authority, 2284
Income tax, judges—personal explanation, 3720, 4234
Industrial unrest—Winnipeg strike, Peace Conference labour principles, collective bargaining, etc., 3043
Interned alien enemies, ques. 1611
Judges' salaries, 2956-9, 4374
Naturalization, 4118
Amdt., 4120; neg., 4126
Radziwill, Princess, ques. 618
Roumania
Credit to, 1618
Proposed Canadian guard for border, 1618
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, resignations, 4673-6
War expenditure, 1865
Weights and measures, 2150-2, 2159

Japan
Fushimi, Prince, visit of, 2455
Immigration from. *See* Asiatics; Immigration
Market for ships, 2220

Jellicoe, Admiral Sir John, ques. 751

Jenkins, Colonel, report of, 2285, 2294

Jesuits. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Budget, 3462. Industrial unrest, 3462; wheat and prices, 3463; School Lands Trust Fund, 3463; Hudson Bay Railway—Victory Loans, 3463; tariff and the land, 3465
Canadian National Railway, 1834
Franchise, 4641
Livestock, pure-bred, 2994
Ploughs, duty on, 3693
Titles, 1478

Jones, General Guy Carleton, ques. 615

Judges Act Amdt. Bills
1. (British Columbia.) Res., 2305; 1r., 2313; 2r., com., 2954; 3r., 2959
2. (Salaries.) Res., 4063, 4212; 1r., 4376; 2r., 4435; com., 4436; 3r., 4439; Senate amdts., 4661
3. (From the Senate.) 4135; 1r., 4377

Jurisdiction, federal and provincial. *See* Public Health; Highways; Technical Education

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amdt. 1r., 970; 2r., com., 1383; not proceeded with, 3843

Kay, Mr. William Frederic (Missisquoi)
Automobiles, Government-owned, ques. 880
Ayrshire and Holstein bulls, ques. 601
Canadian merchant marine, ques. 3998
"Canadian Volunteer," steamer, ques. 3998
Daylight Saving, 921
Food Board revenues, ques. 611
Fuel Control Board, ques. 1532
Military service payments, ques. 601
Newsprint control, ques. 613
Oleomargarine, 3708
Opposition and lower duties, 3703
Public Information Department, ques. 728

Keefer, Mr. Francis Henry (Port Arthur and Kenora)
Canadian Grain Act Amdt., 3955, 4097
Canadian National Railway
Annual meetings, 1646
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1718, 1754
Directors, 1632
Expropriation, 1696
Head office, 1648

Keefer, Mr. Francis Henry—*Con.*
Cost of Living Com., 4317
Demobilization, N.W.M. Police, 2175
Dominion Police, 2926
External Affairs Department, 4669
French River waterway, 1083
Proprietary medicines, 2479-81
Public health, 1195
Medical profession and, 1378
Sewage in international waters, 1195
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2175, 2326
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2946

Kemp, Hon. Sir Edward, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Overseas Military Forces from Canada in the United Kingdom)
Administration of overseas forces, 2294, 2856-83
Demobilization, strikes delaying, 3741
Jenkins, Col., report of, 2294
Negroes, rioting in England by, 3741
Permanent Air Force in Canada, 2867-8

Kennedy, Mr. William Costello (North Essex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 101. Government promises—franchise, 101; Paris Conference, Ministers in attendance, 102; foreign trade, 103; Bolsheviki—returned soldiers, 105; Siberian expedition—pensions, 106; employment of returned soldiers, 107
Budget, 3512. Taxation and public debt, 3512; tax-free debts, 3513; bank amalgamations, 3516; unwise regulation of trade, 3517
Head tax on Canadians entering United States, 1942

Kingsmill, Admiral, ques. 1340

Kingston, Calvin residence as nurses' home, ques. 3377

Kinmel Camp Riots, 315, 462, 550, 1100, 1320. *See also* War
Courts-martial, ques. 3469
Statement by Acting Prime Minister, 512

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Budget, 3646. Soldiers' land settlement, 3646; a protectionist Budget, 3647
Fisheries of Prairie Provinces, 2892

Kohn, Mr. Louis, ques. 747

Kriegoff, paintings of, 2447

Labelle, Mr. F. A., ques. 1306

Labour. *See also* Industrial
British Columbia, in, during war, 754
Eight-hour day, 914, 1996, 2856
Farm, shortage—returned soldiers, 140, 3905

Labour—*Con.*
Interprovincial Convention, Calgary, ques. 2143
Organized, opinions on prohibition, 2660
Peace Conference, principles on, 2852
Strikes in 1918, ques. 619

Labour Bureaux, 4607

Labour Department
Crothers, Hon. T. W., resignation as Minister, 139
Representation in House of Commons, ques. 884
Work of, 145

Labour Disputes Board, Chairman, ques. 1535

Lachute, Custom house, ques. 976

Laferriere, Capt. Alban, ques. 3135

Laflamme, Mr. J. K. L., ques. 750, 2042, 2084

Lake of the Woods Technical and Control Boards, 1904, 2067

Lake St. Joseph hotel, ques. 3067

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Bank mergers, 1098
Board of Commerce, 4553
Income tax, 3714
Farmers and, 3733
War expenditures, 1363
Woollen trade, orders, 1363

Lamontagne, Miss Yvette, ques. 1957, ques. 2145

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Budget, 3321. The war, 3321, 3324; Province of Quebec—national debt, 3322; expenditure, 3323; French language—tax-free bonds, 3324; indirect taxation, 3326
Judges' pensions, ques. 1109
Loans to Allied countries, ques. 2565

Land. *See also* Dominion
Grants
Canadian Northern Railway, ques. 975
Railway companies, 1873
Religious denominations, ques. 2462
Policy, 587
Settlement of British sailors on, 1875
Surveying—Paris foot, 952-4
Tax, 819. *See* Revenue Bills

Lang, Mr. Norman (Humboldt)
Budget, 3467. Finance and tariff, 3467; aliens and franchise, 3468; pensions and land settlement, 3469
Grierson, Mr. Frank, ques. 613

Langlier, Mr. Justice, 1312

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 242. Canada's soldiers—Peace Conference and world peace, 242; indemnity payable by Germany—Prime Minister's presence at Peace Conference, 243; Imperial War Cabinet—Canada a nation, 244; Mr. M. Clark—reconstruction, 245; tariff — national unity—The Press, 246; Bolshevism—War-time Elections Act, 247
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 3926, 4008
Air Board Bill, 2052
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, schedule, 1787
Directors, 1654
Government ownership, 1746
Head office, 1648
Labour representatives, amdt., 1643, 2137-40
Collective bargaining, 2908
Daylight Saving, 647, 917
Divorce Court Bill, 3785, 3791
Dominion Elections Act, 4622, 4650, 4658
Experimental Farm labourers, war bonus, 2924
Good roads, 4431
Provincial jurisdiction, 3906
Government Employees' Compensation 704, 947-8
Imperial Cabinet and Conference
Constitutional changes resulting from, 1068
Ratification of acts, 1059
Intoxicating Liquors Bill, Senate amdt., 4072
Judges' salaries, 4213, 4228-9, 4237
Laflamme, Mr., expenses of, 2084
Mail-car route, Quebec-Edmundston, 2083
Naturalization, 3816, 3820-2, 4117-26, 4249
Retroactive effect, amdt., neg., 4126
Peace Treaty labour provisions, 4239
Pensions, 4209
Seigniorial rights, 2787
Statistics Act Amdt., 599
Tea duty, 4005
Technical education, 3794, 3804
Titles, 1477
War Measures Act, 2148

Lapointe, Mr. Louis Audet (St. James)
Canadian National Railway
Directors, 1654
Head office, 1649
Labour, industrial unrest, etc., 1663, 3009, 3194
Steamship services, 1285, 1291
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 840
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-4

Laurier, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid, death of
Adjournment out of respect for, 4
Eulogies: Sir Thomas White, 5; Mr. McKenzie, 7; Mr. Lemieux, 9; Mr. Redman, 14; Mr. Manion, 18; Mr. McMaster, 32; Mr. Sinclair, 51; Mr. Gauthier, 73; Mr. Dechene, 87; Mr. Kennedy, 108; Mr. Duff, 116; Mr. Cockshutt, Mr. Ethier, 133; Mr. Du-Tremblay, 149; Mr. Clark (Red Deer), 231; Mr. McIsaac, 248; Mr. McCoig, 251; Mr. Edwards, 254; Mr. Cannon, 264; Mr. Maclean (Halifax), 272; Mr. Whidden, 221; Mr. d'Anjou, 224; Mr. Cooper, 339; Mr. Pelletier, 393; Mr. Savard, 407; Mr. Stacey, 412; Mr. Fontaine, 419; Mr. McQuarrie, 420; Mr. Archambault, 436; Mr. Denis, 447; Mr. Sinclair (Queen's), 458; Lt.-Col. Peck, V.C., 463; Mr. Fournier, 176; Mr. McGibbon (Muskoka), 181; Mr. Pedlow, 185-6; Mr. Turgeon, 307; Major-General Mewburn, 319; Mr. Cooper, 339-40; Mr. Demers, 344; Mr. Euler, 370; Mr. Anderson, 495; Mr. Ross (Middlesex), 508; Mr. Fortier, 508; Mr. Prevost, 521; Mr. Maharg, 529; Mr. Parent, 540; Mr. Currie (Simcoe), 545; Mr. Lemieux, 567; Mr. Reid (Mackenzie), 587; Mr. Michaud, 166; Mr. Fielding, 473; Mr. Béland, 3293
Monument to, 2797
State funeral ordered, 2

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Canada-Great Britain steamship service, ques. 1107
Canadian National Railway
Improvements, ques. 978
Quebec bridge, ques. 977
Quebec and Halifax, ques. 977
Daylight Saving, 891
Dominion exhibitions, ques. 1215
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
National harbours, Quebec, 3752-3
Quebec, Champlain market wharves, ques. 1438
St. Malo workshops, ques. 1212
Transcontinental Railway, ques. 2398

Leader of the House, congratulations to Sir Thomas White as, 397

Leader of the Opposition
McKenzie, Mr. D. D.; Congratulations on election as Leader of the Opposition, 27, 51, 254, 567

League of Nations, 308, 348, 367, 1382, 2042. *See also* Peace
Covenant tabled, 138
Reference in Governor General's Speech, 2

Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henri)
Dorval building, ques., 610

Leger, Mr. Auguste Théophile (Kent, N.B.)
Agricultural pamphlets, 2991
Canadian National Railway, 1652
Cold storage, 2986
Daylight Saving, 904
Lobster, canned, 722
Local mills and wheat, 2973
Members of Parliament, accommodation for, 2498
Moncton and Buctouch Railway, 1382
Military Service Act, defaulters, 1208; ques. 2566
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Soldiers, furlough in France, 271
Weights and measures, 2153

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve, and Gaspé)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 567. Tariff and embargo—new Opposition leader—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 567; "Quebec situation"—Liberals and Unionists, 568; victory and peace—Canada's national status—party government, 570; a free Parliament, 571; outlook for Canada, balance of trade, industrial unrest, 574; complaint of Government inaction, charges by General Smart and Col. Pratt, 575; Council of Agriculture platform, 578; Ministers interrogated, 579; Canada and the Empire, 582; national unity, 585
Aerial service, 1264
Air Board, 2053, 2055-7
Agriculture
British embargo on Canadian cattle, 2962
Literature in both languages, 2975
Production, 2959-60
Baie St. Paul, branch line, 2450
Bank mergers, 1088
Bankruptcy Bill, 1982-93
Belgium, 1874, 2586
Borden, Sir Robert, birthday congratulations, 4133
British sailors on land, settlement of, 1875
Bruce report, 4000
Budget, 3363. Party politics, 3363; Prime Minister and Cabinet, 3364; public debt and economy, 3366; war indemnity—reconstruction, 3369; low tariff, 3370; industrial unrest, 3374; French Canadian Liberals, 3375
Budget Speech, date of, 1712
Business profits war tax, suggested booklet, 4003

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Cables
St. Lawrence, 2794
State control of, 1827
Cadet corps, 1888
Canadian National Railway, 1399
Capital stock, 1826
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1713-5, 1728-9
Directors, ex-soldier, 1688
Finance — receipts and expenditures through consolidated revenue, amdt. 1415, neg. 1418
Lines to be included, 1678-9
Securities of other companies, 1781
Canadian Press news service, 4483
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, oath, 2016
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4699
Canals
Trent, 3187-9
Welland, deepening of, 3184-6
Caughnawaga and St. Lambert roads, 4058
Cavell, Edith, proposed monument, 2447
Civil Service
Commission
Appointment of woman as member of, 2909
Commissioners' salaries, 4496
Commissionership of Customs, 3927, 4380
Post office appointments after strike, 4346-8
Salaries, 2914
Superannuation, 2914-5
Cold storage and food, ques. 2906
Combines, 4593-4
Coté, Eugenie, alias "Venus," case of, 2440, 2808
Criminal code—medietate linguae, 4363-6
Daylight Saving, 888, 1208
Government policy, 970
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342, 1422
Divorce
Fees remitted, number of divorces, 2779
Provincial authority in, 1438, 2779
Dominion Parks, bird sanctuaries, 2304
Dominion Police, 2925-6
Dominion Steel Company, 2251
Drummond, Sir George, sale of paintings, 2447
Fish, inspection, 950
Foreign trade
Credits, 1615, 2171
North Europe, Canada barred, 1909
Japan, 4019
France, need of steamship service to, 1291

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Franchise, 4621-3, 4637
Woman suffrage, 4638
Fuel control, ques. 612
Government measures, time of presentation, 1617
Grand Trunk Railway bondholders, 4245
Housing scheme, 2557, 2562
Immigration, exodus, repatriation, 2581
Imperial Cabinet and Conference, 1070
Imperial Guards, 2753
Income tax, 3712-4
Children, allowance for, 3723
Judges' and others' pensions, 3713
Military pensions, 3722
Montreal office, ques. 2905
Industrial unrest, cause of, 2883
International Joint Commission, 462, 4670
Judges' salaries, 2312, 2955-6, 4221
Kreigoff, paintings of, 2447
Land grants, Canadian Northern, 1873
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1312
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 9
Loan, $100,000,000, 4243-6
Magdalen Islands, 623, 1300
Mail order houses, 2093
Maps, engraving and distribution, 4047-8
Mercier, Cardinal, visit of, 1482; ques. 1611
Mignault, Mr., K.C., 462, 4670
Military management overseas, 2883-7
Charges of Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1483, 1494-5
Military Service Act, 1312
Guelph Novitiate, 1232
Militia Department, overseas administration, 1099-1100
Militia
Pensions, 2758
Permanent force, 2980-1
Policy concerning, 1888
Mining industry, 4007-8
Montreal income tax office, ques. 2905
Murray Bay, ferry, 4335
Naturalization, 4111-31
Judicial vs. administrative powers, 4111
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1562, 2016, 2024-30, 4482
Nile Voyageurs, 4380
Ocean rates, 1051
Orders in Council, government by, 2554
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4248-50, 4380-3
Ottawa highways, 2792
Paradis, Mr., claim of, 3189
Paris agency, 1901
Parliament Building, 4621
Peace Treaty, 3473
Ratification of, 3937
Text, receipt of, 2096

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Pensions, 4186, 4200-4, 4206-9
"Unmarried wife," 4275, 4278, 4284-6
Amdt., neg. on div., 4338
Pilotage—Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 2805
Press, The, attitude of, 2917. *See also under this head* Newspapers
Proprietary medicines, 2488, 2492, 3939
Purchasing Commission, 3216, 4445
Advertising, 3232
Amdt. (six months' hoist), 3220; neg. on div. 3226
Exclusive power, 3232
Supplies that may be purchased, 3238-9
Religious conscientious objectors, 781, 784
Rental of buildings for the Government, 3236
Returned soldiers as mining prospectors, 4045
Rimouski and overseas mail, 886
St. Charles River improvements, Belanger vs. The King, 1021, 1026
St. Lawrence River water powers, 886, 1796, 1901, 4048
Schools and religious teaching, 2415
Seigniorial rights, 2787
Shell Oil Company, 929, 4070
Shipbuilding, transportation, trade, 2227
Sifton, Sir Clifford, office in London, ques. 1908
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2762, 2765, 2771
Technical education, 3171
Titles, 2742
Trade and Commerce Department, 2171, 2227-9
Transatlantic mail service, 1711
Vancouver harbour, 4017-9
Votes and Proceedings, and Journals, 3292
War expenditures ($350,000,000), 2169-71
"Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2172, 2241
Washington, representation at, 1075, 2075-7, 2201
Witley Camp riot, 3472
Woman masquerading as man, 2440, 2808
Woman suffrage, 4638
Ypres war memorial, 4465

Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612

Lesage, Mr. Joseph Edmond (Hochelaga)
Montreal, conveyance of mails, ques. 979
Public health—Orders in Council, 1369
Registration of defaulters, ques. 610

Letter Carriers, 1341. *See also* Civil Service

Letter postage rate, ques. 745, 4621

Lévis
Aqueduct, ques. 1789
Rifle Association, ques. 1213
Station, 2458

Lewis, Mr. J. H., 270

L'Hereux, Major Napoleon, ques. 978

Library of Parliament
Committee, 114-5
Report, 2

Life-saving stations, ques. 606, 2850

Lighthouses and keepers, 2608-13

Little Current, 2789

Little Sands, 2609

Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1570; 1r., 1572; 2r., com., 2061; 3r., 2143

Livestock, shipments, inspection, 2603

Livingstone's Cove, 2780

Loans
Allied countries, to, ques. 2565
Imperial Government, to, ques. 1215
Printing of bonds in both languages, 4475
Temporary, outstanding, report tabled, 138
$100,000,000, New York, cost of, ques. 1907
$75,000,000, 4198
$100,000,000 Loan Bill. Res., 1r., 4242; 2r., com., 4243; 3r., 4335

Loggie, Mr. William Stewart (Northumberland, N.B.)
Bankruptcy Bill, 2005, 2012
Budget, 3651. Free food, 3651; manufacturers' profits, 3652; cost of living—wheat prices—Union Government, 3653
Fish, refrigerator service, 2890
Live Stock Amdt. Bill—cold storage, 2063
Lobster, canned, 714-727
Pilotage, 2610, 2805
Steamship services
Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, 1303
West Indies, 1287-8
Weights and measures, 2156

Lunenburg Harbour, 2607

Lyons Fair, 3840

Macauley, Capt. A. C. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., trade discrimination, cable from, 140

Macdonell, soldier imprisoned, 1434

Mackenzie & Mann. *See* Canadian National; Railway Act Consolidation

Mackie, Mr. Henry Arthur (East Edmonton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 347. League of Nations, 348; Canada's national status—Province of Quebec—tariff, 349; freedom of the Press and of the Bench, 350; military service defaulters—Peace Conference and attendance of Prime Minister—war indemnity—education, provincial rights, 351; autocracy and democracy, 352

Mackie, Mr. Henry Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway
Extension of time, 1713-9, 1726, 1745
Public ownership, 1745
Canadian Northern Railway
Arbitration, ques. 1214
Bonds, ques. 4241
Equipment Trust, ques. 4240
Securities, ques. 1214
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2921
Civil Service and returned soldiers—Rangers Gauvreau and Trudel, 2921
Coal, railway contracts for, 1909
Criminal Code—neglect, 4362
Daylight Saving, 910
Deputy Minister of Railways, ques. 1215
Fairweather, Mr., ques. 2145
Good roads, 4422
Henry and Ferguson, Messrs, ques. 2045
House of Commons, difficulty in hearing speakers, 1211
Housing scheme, 2538-9, 2548
Immigration, 1932
Labour situation in the West, 2799
Militia, permanent force, 3978
Naturalization, 4262-8
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4282, 4286
Post office appointments after strike, 4354
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2619-22, 2628, 2652
Judges, transportation on railways, 2640-1
Schools, national, 2430
Ukrainians, 1932-8

Mackie, Mr. Herbert J. (North Renfrew)
Canadian National Railway, coal, res., 2906
Mail contracts, 2081
Pembroke wharf, 2787
Pensions, case of Col. G. Hunter Ogilvie, 2761
Upper Ottawa dams, 2796

MacLennan, Judge F. S., ques. 1075, ques. 1106, ques. 1906, ques. 2905

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Minister without portfolio)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 272. Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister, 272; finance, public loans, 274; Civil Service Commission, appointments, methods, Secretary, 274
Air Board Bill, 1864, 2050-6
Buoys, Atlantic coast, 1910
Bureau of Statistics, 3838-9
Canada Grain Act, administration, 3837-8, 4094-4109
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3942
Senate amdts., 4664
Canada Trade Commission, 4493-4

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Canada Year Book, 3839
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 3842
Canadian National Railway
Directors, payment of, 1654
First meeting, 1660
Head office, 1649
Civil Service
Commission. *See also, under this title,* Address
Appointments, 3230
Returned soldiers and women representation on, 2909, 2918
Salaries and contingencies, 4496-7
Efficiency, Committee of Inquiry, 1556-7
Labour and statistics, 4672
Overmanning of, 4604
Reclassification, 2203, 3519, 3927-8. *See also under this head,* Civil Service Act Amdt.
Returned soldiers and, 1001, 2921
Trade and Commerce Department, salaries, 4606
War bonus, 2924-8
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2909-22
Arthur Young & Co., 2111
Commissioners, 2914
Salaries of civil servants, 2914, 2922
Superannuation, 2915
Coasting, reciprocity in, 1209
Copyright, 4022
Editorial Com., 1566
Eight-hour day, 2856
Fertilizers Act Amdt. Bill, 1568, 2286-90, 2463-7
Fisheries
British Columbia licenses, 933, 936
Fish Inspection Act Amdt. Bill, 949-952
Flax, bounty, 3842
Foreign credits, 3832-6, 3831
Foreign trade
Lyons and other fairs, 3340
North Europe, Canada barred, 1909
High cost of living, 2908
House of Commons—Free conference with Senate, no suspension of sitting of House, 3249
Industrial and scientific research, 3341
Industrial unrest
Strikes
Montreal, 1566, 1615, 1663
Winnipeg, 2508, 2799, 2854-5, 2665, 3845
Danger to constituted authority, after-war conditions, etc., 3046
Magdalen Islands—Pictou service, 625
Marking of containers, 2344-5
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt.—lobsters, 713-727

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Montreal power strike, 1566
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1565
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Panama Canal, trade via, 1283
Patent, Trade Mark and Design, Copyright and Timber Marking Act Amdt., 4021
Patents Branch, 3808
Proprietary Medicine Bill, 2479-87, 2492-3, 2653-4, 3823-7, 3939-40
Royal Navy, Canadians in, 1568
Shipping and shipping rates, 4684-6
Statistics Act Amdt., 139, 595-9
Steamship services, 1105-6, 1282-1305
Australia, etc., 1105
Baddeck and Iona, 1300
European ports, subsidy not needed, 1291
Freight rates, 3830
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
Great Britain, 1282
Gulf of St. Lawrence, 3827-8
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1301
Mulgrave, 1302-4
Newfoundland, 1283, 1294
Petit de Grat and Mulgrave, 1303
Petitcodiac and Cumberland, 1303
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, 1304
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or, 1304
South Africa, 1289
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
West Indies and South America, 1283
Trade Commissioners, 3831
Units of electrical measure, 139
Weights and Measures Act Amdt. Bill, 952-4, 2149-59, 2290
Senate amdt., 4021

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Canadian National Railway, 1824
Cost of Living Com., 4317, 4325
Daylight Saving, 906
Freight rates and Government-owned railways, 3697
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 672
Non-ferrous metals—nickel, 3681-2
Railway Act Consolidation—Municipal and provincial freight bargains, 4141, 4147, 4150
Railway question and tariff question, 675
Railways, public ownership of, 672, 3694
Senate and House of Commons, 643
Senate reform, 4167
Tariff and public ownership, 3694
Weights and measures, 2157
Wheat prices, 4466

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Budget, 3567. Production and taxation, 3568; land tax—manufacturers' prices, 3569

McCoig, Mr. Archibald Blake (Kent, Ont.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 250. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—tariff—free tractors and ditchers, 251; prices, competition in agricultural implements, 252; highways—housing—commissions, Food Board, 253; Civil Service—demobilization of men in camps in Canada, 254
Board of Commerce, 4501-5
Budget, 3601. Production and economy, 3602; profiteering — conscription of wealth, 3603; agricultural implement duties—tractors, 3604; food prices, 3605
Daylight Saving, 892, 903
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569, 2465
Government railways, private cars, 1589
Livestock Act Amdt., 1572
Oleomargarine, 2201
Rural mail couriers, pay of, 2926
Weights and measures, 2157
Wheat, price of 1919 crop, 4466

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Bank mergers, 1096
Board of Commerce, 4515
Canadian National Railway, 1850
Civil Service organization, 1271
Daylight Saving, 925
Deputy Minister of Interior, 2443
Good roads, 4410
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 1154
Newsprint control, 4541, 4547
Seed grain, 1033-5
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 838

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Colchester)
Civil Service appointments, ques., 2049
Intercolonial Railway rates, 4170
Public Buildings, 4610
Truro, 4611
Resignation from Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 4676
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, res., 981; withdrawn, 1002

McDougald, Mr. Bryson, ques. 2398

McFall, Mr., Food Controller, ques. 4464

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 181. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Liberal party, 181; Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister—public debt and resources, 182; returned soldiers—tubercular cases, 183; highways—public health, 184

McGibbon, Mr. Peter—*Con.*
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3823
Canadian Expeditionary Force, patients in England, ques. 615
Civil Service Commission, returned soldier for, 2918
Divorce Court Bill, 3779, 3790
Good roads, 3909
Housing scheme, 2534, 2547
Interned enemy aliens, ques. 844
Jones, General Guy Carleton, ques. 615
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1244
Militia, Permanent Force, 3974
Paralytic military patients in Euclid Hall, ques. 749
Pay and Allowance Board, ques. 3998
Pensions, 4172
Board, ques. 3066
Payments, ques. 1307
Pratt, Col. A. C., statements of, ques. 1213, ques. 1216
Proprietary medicines, 2480-6, 2492, 2654, 2825-6
Public Health Department, appointments, 1182
Purchasing Commission, 3227
Scientific research, 1193, 1371
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2767-8, 2774-6
Deputy Minister, ques. 2586
Staff, ques. 4240
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3886
Technical education, 3174, 3805
Telephone companies, 2648
Totally disabled soldiers, ques. 1213
Transatlantic flight, ques. 2143
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2988

McGibbon, Mr. Peter Robert (Argenteuil)
Farming will save the country, 2963
Lachute custom house, ques. 970
Live Stock Act Amdt., 2066-7
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1502
Soldiers' land settlement, 3870

McGregor, Mr. Alexander (Pictou)
Pictou registrar, ques. 2144

McGregor, Mr. James D., cattle breeder, 2995

McIsaac, Mr. James (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 248. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Canada's status after the war, 248; franchise—alien enemies—Opposition critics—Peace Conference and presence of Prime Minister, 249; Liberal party—national unity, 250
Boughton Island, 2784
"Brant," steamer, 2607

McIsaac, Mr. James—*Con.*
Budget, 3517, 3519. Policy of protection—debt and revenue, 3518; reciprocity, 3519; labour troubles, East and West, 3520; public debt, 3521
Divorce Court Bill, 3779
Good roads, 3906
Judges' salaries, 2306, 4214, 4372
Little Sands, 2609
Magdalen Islands-Pictou service, 624
North Lake, 2784
Pictou-Montague service, 1304
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3190
Prohibition, 2687
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Souris fish drier, ques. 1662, ques. 3470
Technical education, 3799, 3893, 4136

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria). *See also* Leader of the Opposition
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 21. Chosen leader of the Opposition—congratulations to mover and seconder—Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 22; returned soldiers—distribution of population, 23; Canada's war record—orders in council—franchise, 24; highways—public health, 25; capital and labour, 26; economy—standard of living—Liberal party—"Light in the window," 27
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 4010
Agriculture, increased production, 2959-60
Small farms, 2975
Agriculture Department, publications, 2989-91
Air Board Bill, 2051-2, 2059
"Alert," The, 1966
Alien enemies, 773. *See also under this head,* Immigration
Baddeck and Iona wharves, 2611
Bankruptcy Bill, 933
Proof of debts, 2264
Trustee, 1981, 1986-8
Remuneration of, 2012
Replacement by creditors, 2003
Banks, excess circulation, 635
Board of Commerce, 4471, 4530, 4554, 4566
Bronze coins, 638
Budget, 3487. Reply to Mr. Cowan, 3487; coal and iron duties, 3490; bounties and protective duties, 3491; public expenditures, 3493; cost of living, 3494; Hon. Mr. Rowell, 3495; Government control of profits—"produce and save," 3496; fisheries, 3497; aliens—labour, 3498; industrial court proposed, 3499; party government — Liberal party's

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
trade policy, 3501; lessons of the war, 3504
Business of the House
Measures forthcoming, 1342, 3999
Business profits and income taxes, 3709
Cabinet Ministers in Senate, 1009, 2073
Canada Evidence Act Amdt., 1389-93
Canada Medical Act Amdt., 3240
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3755-6, 3935
Canadian National Railway Bill
Capital stock, 1842
Committee, reference to, suggested, 1621
Constituent companies, 1694
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1709, 1719, 1721, 1730, 1760-7
Directors, 1656, 1661
Responsibility to Parliament, 1674
Executive Com., 1668
Expenditures, how controlled, 2115
First meeting, amdt., 1667
Fiscal year, 1705
General policy, 1730
Labour troubles, reported, 1617
Lines to be included, 1677-80
Management and "politics," 1675
Parliamentary control, 1418
Power to acquire securities of other companies, 1862
Public ownership, 1398-9, 1730, 1750, 1757, 2115
Questions asked, 1610
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association —oath, 2016, 2295
Canadians in distress abroad, 2600
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4698
Canals
Positions on, and returned soldiers, 3176-7
Welland, deepening of, 3180
Cape Breton public works, 2782
Censorship: Lewis, Mr. J. H., case of, 270
Christmas Island-East Bay postal route, 2083
Civil Service
Commission, 3234
Efficiency, special com., 1569, 2913
Extra employees during war, 4706
Patronage, 3234
Sessional employees, bonus, 2313-4, 2927
Clark, Mr. Michael, and protection, 3748
Closure, interpretation of rule, 1796
Coal, briquetting of, 4489
Coal used by government railways, ques., 611
Cold storage, 2980-1, 2986
Combines, 4601

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Corporation, influence in public affairs, 2039
Cost of Living Com., 4320
Criminal Code
Seditious books, etc., 4368
Sexual offences, 2166, 4689
Unlawful associations, 4356
Customs, preventive service, 966
Customs warehouses as storage places for liquor, 956
Customs war tax, 3708
Deserters, punishment of, 72
Divorce Court Bill, 3783-9
Divorce, Privy Council decision, 4535
Dominion Elections Act, 4623, 4648, 4655-7
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt., 2298-9
Mineral claims, 2300
Dominion Steel Company, 2251, 2254
Dominion water powers, 2519, 2531
Economy in expenditure, 4245
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4587
Elevators and American grain, 3837-8
Employment works and contracts, 1604-6
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2288
Finance Department salaries, 4477
Fire prevention, 1578-9, 1583
Fisheries
British Columbia canning, 2098
Guardians, 2890-3
Inspection, 949, 951
Maritime Provinces, 2896
Pickled fish, of, 2898
Fisheries Act Amdt. (Salmon), 3759
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payment to, 865
Flint, the late Thomas Barnard, 1341
Foreign credits, 1359, 2188, 2196, 3832
Gabarus beach protection, 2780
Government advertising, 2038
Government by Order in Council, 4488
Government Printing Bureau, strike, 513
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 651, 1145, 1161
Government's legal position, 695
Grand Trunk Railway Bill, 1184
Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435, 1483
Halifax harbour master, 2694, 2801
Halifax-St. Pierre-Miquelon mails, 2092
Health Department, 4380
Highways, 731, 4408, 4431-3
Horse racing, 4466
House of Commons
Privileges of—Senate's action, 642
Procedure, reinstatement, preliminary motion under rule 25, 398
Saturday and morning sittings, 3376
Vacancies, 1615
Housing scheme, 2555, 2559, 2564

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Immigration and Colonization
Aliens, 2584
Chinese, 2599
Clearance, 1975
Deportees returning, 1977
Illiterates, 1954-67
Inspection, 1973
Lands and land policy, 2575, 2582-3
Nova Scotia, to, 2582-6
Income tax, judges, 3175-9
Indians and Eskimo, 4669
Industrial unrest—Government responsibility; cost of living, capital and labour—tribunal to settle disputes, etc., 3051, 3499
Inland Revenue Act Amdt., 1588
Irrigation Act Amdt., 633
Judges' salaries, 2308, 2955-9, 4368, 4373, 4437-9, 4661
Kinmel Camp, 462
Labour disputes, conference, 2908, 3051
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 7
Little Bras d'Or, 2789
Live stock, pure-bred, 2992-7
Live Stock Act Amdt., 1570, 2062-6
Loans made and to be made, 2245-50
$100,000,000, 4245
$75,000,000, 4198
Lobster packing, 2989
Magistrates and Military Service, 1313
Mail contracts, 2079-83
McRae, Col. J. D., 2234
Migratory birds, 2165
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1529
Military Service Act, 1313
Defaulters, 4238
Guelph Novitiate, 1257-9
Mining Act, need of, 425-7
Minister of Railways, annual statement expcted, 1588-9
Ministerial changes, 139
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners, 3757
National harbours, control of, 3742, 3745
Naturalization, 4265-73
Naval service
Charges of Mr. Duff, 2842
Halifax, demobilization of men, 2224
Rebuff by master of N.R. 30, 2947
Neil's harbour, 2781-2
Newsprint control, 4548, 4662
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2038
Opposition and the tariff, 3701
Orders in Council, 1368
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4248
Ottawa Street Railway strike, 4535
Partisan appointments, 2095

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Peat, 4490
Pensions, 3000, 4187-90, 4208
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4293
Pilotage, 2806-7, 3158, 3160
Post office revenue and expenses, 2037
Printing Bureau strike, 312
Public Health Bill, 1186, 1189, 1203
Social welfare, 1193-4
Public ownership, 1398-9, 1730, 1750, 1757, 2115
Purchasing Commission, 3228-39, 3810, 3814, 4454
Radiotelegraph service, 2849
Railway Act Consolidation, 2617-33
Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2631-3
Disagreement with Senate, proposed three-year limit, 4169
Telephone companies — compensation, 2649, 4168
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3090, 3098, 3103, 3115
Railway crossings, 937
Railway rates, municipal and provincial bargains, 4142
Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209
Reclamation of Dominion lands, 639
Royal Naval College, 2851
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1025
St. John harbour, 2359, 4306, 4337-8
Scotch Cove, breakwater, 2782
Seed grain, 1036, 1041
Shipbuilding, 2251, 2254
Soldiers' war gratuity, 2234
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 4681
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 2778, 3870
Default, re-sale, 3883
Exemption from legal process, 3885-7
Expropriation, 3889-90
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Steamship subsidies
Baddeck and Iona, 1296, 1299
Home prices and, 1292
Newfoundland, 1295, 3829
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
Strikes
Calgary, postal employees, 3194
Post office appointments after strike, 4351
Winnipeg, 2855, 2953, 3070, 3241, 3328, 3472, 3587, 3843, 3927
Trial of arrested parties, 3740
Supply, interim vote, 1919-20, 842
Sydney port, charges, 3158
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 808
Taylor, Senator George, death of, 885

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Technical education, 3166, 3173
Payment of subsidy by population, 3893
Provinces and, 3894-8
Titles, 1471, 2703
Trade Commissioners, 4494
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2989
"Tyrian," steamer, 2793
Vancouver harbour, 4017-20
Vocational training, under-age soldiers, 1019
War expenditure, 1359
Vote of $350,000,000, 2166, 2187, 2198, 2224-6, 2232
"Any measure deemed necessary or advisable," 2244
War indemnity, Canada's claim, 777-780
War Measures Act, 2148
Weights and measures, 952-3, 2154-8, 2290
Welland Canal contracts, 1597-1610
Wrecking plants, 2604
Yarmouth bar, 2783
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-5
Yukon placer mining, 630-2

McLean, Mr. Hugh Havelock (Royal)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1989, 1992-4
New trustee (amdt.), 2002-4
Notice of purpose of meeting, 2014
Order of court, 2010
Security, default, 2000
Trustee, remuneration, 2011

McLean, Mr., Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2631

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross (Brome)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 32. League of Nations, 32; financial position — taxation — franchise, 33; congratulations to mover and seconder—national unity—labour and capital, 34; Bolshevism, 35; Siberian force, 36; orders in council —party government, 37; finance and tariff, 38
Agricultural implements, freight on, 4009
Alpine Club, 4046
Bankruptcy Bill, 1985, 1992-5, 2006-8, 2265-74, 2278-80
Beef production, 2962
Board of Commerce, 4528-33, 4549-54, 4561
Budget, 3242; amdt. moved, 3260
War expenditures—purchase of Canadian Northern Railway, 3243; national debt—Canadian currency, 3244; taxation, 3247, 3251; trade balance, 3250; estimates, 3251; "Canadian Official Record"—Bureau of Public Information—shipbuilding—housing scheme—Roumanian loan, 3252; high cost of living—tariff, 3254; duty on coal, 3256; mergers, 3259

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1647, 1805
Capital stock, 1821
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1715-7
Directors, amdt., 1632; withdrawn, 1636
Expenses to be paid out of revenues, 1701, 1705, 2111
First meeting, 1659
Government policy asked for, 1396-7
Orders in Council, 1692
Parliament and expenditure, 2111
Canadian Press news service, 4482-6
Cheese, 2962
Civil Service, equality of conditions in, 4479
Combines, 4591
Criminal Code, 4356-62
Aliens and British subjects, 4358-9
Sexual offences, 2161
Unlawful associations, 4356
Dominion Elections Act, 4658
Dominion Iron & Steel, and Nova Scotia Steel & Coal, 2342
Dominion water powers, 2526-9
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2289-90
Fisheries inspectors, 2891
Flour mill machinery, 4006
Good roads, 4389
Government by Order in Council, 2549
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 940-6
Grain Act Amdt., Appeal Board, 4101
Housing scheme, 2537, 2549
Immigration Act Amdt.—deportation, 1977
Income War Tax
Payment on making return, 3737
Personal and living expenses, 3988-9
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3727
Unmarried women, 3993
Irrigation Act Amdt., 633
Judges' salaries, Mr. Justice Weir, 4369
Labour's share in railway management, 1823
Lobster, canned, 715-6
Militia
Permanent force, 3967-9
Policy and expenditure, 1889
Milk—marking of containers, 2345
Mines Branch, 4490-1
Newsprint control, 4539
Objectionable words addressed to, point of order, 2538
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4005
Ottawa, Wellington street, 2497
Parliament Buildings, Hall of Fame, 2503
Patronage, 1271, 1278

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross—*Con.*
Pensions, 4280, 4292
Grandjean, Julien, case of, 4032
"Unmarried wife," 4280
Press, the, and Government advertising, 1822
Public health, 1377
Purchasing Commission, 3222, 4449
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2631
Seed grain, 1040, 1043
Shipbuilding, 2255
Steamship subsidies, 1290
Subsidies, policy, 1298
Tariff—amdt. to Supply, 794
Titles, 1464, 2710
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3110
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1015
Wheeler, Mr. S., wheat grower, 2973
Wireless on Government vessels, 2809
Yukon placer mining, 631

McQuarrie, Mr. William Garland (New Westminster)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 419, 424. British Empire and Canada, 419; Royalty and aristocracy and the war—Canada's war record—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 420—new leader of the Opposition—Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister—Ministers and their duties, 421; Fraser river works, 422; Canadian Northern and New Westminster, 423; Canadian National Railway, 424-5; New Westminster and railways—British Columbia fisheries, 426; International Commission, Major Burdé's charges, 427; waste of fish, 428; Chief Inspector of Fisheries, office—income tax, abuses, 429; business profits tax—highways, 430; highway through British Columbia mountains—"Official Record"—technical schools—Health Department, 431; cost of living—immigration, Orientals in Canada, 433; Bolshevism—returned soldiers, 433, 435
Canadian National Railway, director from British Columbia, 1629
Civil Service war bonus, 2927
Daylight Saving, 904
Fisheries, British Columbia inspector, ques. 1534
Good roads, 3904
Railway Act Consolidation
Amdts., opportunity to make, sought, 2929, 3476, 4064, 4137
Municipal agreement, 4137

McQuarrie, Mr. William Garland—*Con.*
Railway Act Consolidation—*Con.*
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3095
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2948

Magdalen Islands, 623, 1910, 2794
Pictou service, 625

Magistrates. *See* Military Service

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 529. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 529; Peace Conference—Party and the farmers, 530; highways—housing—prohibition, 531; farmers' platform, 532; tariff, 534; manufacturers and Western farmers, 535; Union Government, 536; question of markets, 537; grain prices, 539; possible by-elections, 540
Bankruptcy Bill, provinces and, 2007
Budget, 3634. Returned soldiers—Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3635; direct taxation—freights, 3636; Hon. Mr. Calder, 3637; Western farmers' organizations, 3638; Western farmers and co-operation and income tax, 3639; apples—oleomargarine—labour troubles, 3640; regulation of food prices—land values tax, 3641; tariff reductions, 3642
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 4957-65, 4084-7
Appeal Board, 4101-5
Excess profits tax, ques. 977
Franchise, 4641
Good roads, 3899, 3910, 3925
National harbours and grain trade, 2749-52
Ploughs, duties on, 3690-6
Amdt., 3704
Seed grain, 1038, 1043
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3869
Incumbrances, 3884
Initial payments, 3881
Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties on, 3707

Mahon, Mr. C. E., ques. 1612, ques. 1790, ques. 2295

Manion, Mr. Robert James (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (seconder), 17. Bi-lingualism, 17; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Victory—demobilization, 18; Canada's war record, 19; employment bureaux—Canada's development—war work of women, 20; public health—immigration—Canada's duty, 21
Budget, 3280. Tariff changes, 3280; high cost of living, profiteering, 3281; New Zealand's experience, 3282; profiteering and revolution condemned—

Manion, Mr. Robert James—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
natural resources, development of, 3283
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3943, 3957
Appeal Board, 4103-4
Canadian National Railway, 1803
Civil Service Commission, returned soldier as member, 2909
Elevators and American grain, 3838
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 871
Military management, charges of General Smart, etc., 1526
Militia pensions, 2760
Parliament Buildings, 2339
Pensions, 4199, 4203
Case of John Taylor, 3001
"Unmarried wife," 4281
Proprietary medicines, 2491-3, 3824-6
Public Health Bill, 1179, 1202-3
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2325
Shipbuilding, 2259-60
Slate River—Roslyn station, ques. 3191
Technical education, 3798
Titles, 1475, 2718
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 985

Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
ity and, 711

Manitoba Surface Waters, Dominion author-

Manufacturers. *See* Tariff

Maple Syrup and Sugar, ques. 645

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Armed vessels on Great Lakes, 1261
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 605
Canadian National Railway
Branch lines, 1677, 1681-2
Directorate, representation of provinces, 1670
Carleton, Que., mail service, ques. 727
Civil Service reclassification, ques. 610
Fisheries jurisdiction, ques. 609
Good roads, 4424
Matapedia Valley, ques. 1662
Government vessels, employees on, ques. 609
Matapedia aqueduct, ques. 745
Naturalization, 4258-9
New Carlisle postmaster, ques. 727
Oyster culture, ques. 609
Pensions, 4178, 4201, 4205-9
Port Daniel lobster hatchery, ques. 609
Quebec Oriental Railway, ques. 605
Restigouche Indian Reserve, ques. 610
Strikes, 1663
Vocational training, ques. 971
West Indies, trade with, ques. 1533

Marcile, Mr. Joseph Edmond (Bagot)
National Service registration, ques. 1075, ques. 1307, ques. 2296

Marine and Fisheries
Committee, 114
Department
Quebec buildings, ques. 1217, ques. 1439, ques. 1439
Report tabled, 40
Staff and salaries, 2600

Marine Hospitals, 1201

Market Gardening, profits of, 764

Marlow, Col. F. W., ques. 3066

Marshall, Mr. David (East Elgin)
Canned goods, net weight, 2153
Daylight Saving, 903

Marshall, Lieut. Hall, ques. 1790

Martin, Mr. Peter Francis (Halifax)
Pilotage, 2808

Massett, wharf, ques. 603

Masters and Mates, examination, 2601

Matapedia
Aqueduct, ques. 745
Bridge, 2790
Highway expenditure, ques. 1662

Matches, stamps on, 969

Mayrand, Mr. Hormisdas (Maskinongé)
Coast protection, ques. 745
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, ques. 603
Guinness, Hon. Rupert, and, ques. 603

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt. (Lobsters). Res., 713; 1r., 727; 2r., ref. to standing com., 2097

Meat Supply and foreign demand, 3831

Medicines. *See* Proprietary

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 514. Tariff, duty on implements, 514; freedom of Parliament—party government, 515; War-time Elections Act, 518; disfranchisement—Canada at the Peace Conference, 518; Union government, 521
Alien enemies, 756
Alpine Club, 4046-7
Bills to be introduced, 4456
Board of Commerce, 4466, 4524, 4528-9, 4549-67
British subjects interned in Canada, 1713
Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill, 1388-94

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*

Canadian National Railway Bill
Abandoning lines, 1709
Capital stock, 1776-8
Advances and securities, 1778
Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
Closure of debate, 1789
Interpretation of rule, 1796
Constituent companies, 1694
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1715, 1727, 1760, 1765
Schedule, 1785
Directors, 1624-7, 1653-6, 1783
Executive Com., 1668-74
Expenses to be paid out of revenues, 1703, 1781-2
First meeting, 1664-6
Fiscal year, 1706
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675-6
Head office, 1652
Inquiries, 1782
Labour representation, 2139
Lines to be included, 1679
Parliamentary authority for construction, 1779
Railway and Expropriation Acts to apply, 1695-6
Securities of other companies, 1781; amdt., 1782; withdrawn, 1862
Work for general advantage of Canada, 1706
Criminal Code amdts.
1. Unlawful associations, concealed weapons, etc., 4134, 4355-67
Senate amdts., 4660
2. Sexual Offences, 1710, 2159, 2164
Senate amdt., 4634, 4689-90
3. Fire prevention, 1573-85
Combines Bill, 4198, 4567-70, 4588-4601
Cost of Living Com., 4327
County Court judgeships, vacancies, 1796
Daylight Saving, 1422
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt.
1. Corrective, 1789, 2297-2305
2. Land for soldiers, 2953, 3070-3
Dominion Lands Act Amdt., 1111, 1112
Pre-emptions, power sites, mining, timber, etc., 4251-4
Dominion Lands and Parks. *See above,* Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks
Dominion Lands Surveys Act Amdt., 72, 930-1
Expenditures, 4046-56
Dominion Power Board, 4048
Dominion water powers, 2291, 2512-31
Doukhobor lands, 2044
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 852
Forestry and timber limits, 4053-4

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 1149-59
Greek Catholics in communion with the Church of Rome, 1383-8
Guelph Novitiate, 1227, 1258-9
Indian lands, mining rights, etc., 4254-7
Indians
Greater production, 4664
Liquor and, 4063
Medical attendance, 4060
Ontario and Quebec, 4668
Reserves, roads and bridges on, 4057-60
Schools, 4063
Tuberculosis and, 4062
Industrial unrest—Winnipeg strike, pretensions of strikers, duties and responsibilities of Government, Bolshevism, collective bargaining, etc., 3035
Interpretation Act Amdt. (Superior Courts), 1957, 2313, 2959
Irrigation, 4603
Irrigation Act Amdt., 71, 632-3, 696
Judges Act Amdt. Bill (British Columbia), 2305-13, 2954-9
Judges Act Amdt. Bill (salaries), 4063-4212-38, 4435-9
Senate amdts., 4661
Juvenile Delinquents Bill, 1383, 3843
Langelier, Magistrate, 1324
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1260
Migratory birds, 4604
Convention, 2164-6
Military Service Act
Amdts. by Order in Council, 2294
Defaulters, 971, 1910, 2198, 4238
Uniformity of administration, 1308
Wright County, administration, 2400-2
Mining laws, 4257
Oil-bearing lands, 929, 4136
Pelee Island, 4042
Post office appointments after strike, 4349
Railway Belt Act Amdt., 5, 592
Railway policy of Government, 1397
Reclamation of Dominion Lands by Drainage Bill, 71, 639-642, 708-713
Returned soldiers
Government policy concerning, 759
Mining prospectors, as, 4045
St. Lawrence river dams, 886
Seed grain advances, 625-9, 1029-40, 4047, 4054-5
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 2291, 3848-91, 4012-7. *See also, under this head,* Returned soldiers
Land from forest reserves, 2953
Royal Air Force, inclusion of, 1438
Surveys, 4049-51
Taber irrigation district, 4210-2
Tuberculosis and Indians, 4062

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
War Measures Act Extension Bill, 1433, 1566, 2097, 2148
Water-power, 4049
Winnipeg strike, 3845
Yukon Act Amdt. Bill, 5, 592
Yukon, government of, 4045-6
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amdt. Bill, 71, 629-632

Members of Parliament, accommodation for, 2498

Mennonites, 1260, 1913, 1920-7. *See also* Immigration

Mercier, Cardinal, 1482, ques. 1611

Messeroy, Mr. John A., ques. 1610

Mewburn, Major-General Hon. S. C. (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 319. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Siberian expedition, 319; demobilization, 322; pensions—soldiers' land settlement, 323; dispersal areas, documentation, transportation, 324; the returned man and his job, 328; priority in return—war service badges, orders, decorations and medals, 327; war records and documents, 330; French Canadian Brigade, 331; soldiers' graves, 332
Air Board and Air Service, 2054, 4687
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Canadians in Imperial Service, 1997
Demobilization, 2173-6
Dental Service, and, 2775
Farmers' sons, of, 1958
Ministerial statement, 1793
Portland, 648
Port of debarkation, 2403
Progress of, 4535
St. John, men in garrison, 2236
22nd Battalion, 1616
Enlisted and conscripted men, lists, preparation of, 1908
Guelph Novitiate, 1222
Imperial Guards, 2753
Jenkins report on Canadian Army Medical Corps, 358
Kinmel Camp riots, 315
Military management, charges of General Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1493
Military Service Act, defaulters, 1208, 4238
Military trials in England, 1959
Militia
Allowances, 1886
Annual drill, 4495
Associations and bands, 1892
Cadet corps, 1888, 1892

Mewburn, Major-General Hon. S. C.—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Command pay, 1886
Engineer services and works, 1892
Headquarters and district staffs, 1893
Returned soldiers and, 1893-8
Peace rank of war officers, 1890
Permanent force, 1898-9, 4495
Rifle ranges, 1894-8
Surveys, 1899
Training areas, camps, 1900
Transport and freight, 1900
Units, war, continuance of, 1887
War record of militia, 1889
Militia Act Amdt. (Permanent Force), 3469, 3966-87
Militia Pensions Act Amdt., 2691-2, 2754-61
Period of service, 2754
Widows and children, 2758
Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, 550
Purchasing Commission, 4448
Roumanian border, proposed Canadian guard, 1618
Siberian expedition, 971
Soldiers
Complaints against authorities, alleged suppression, 1618
Furlough in France, 272
Halifax, discharge or leave, 1663, 1711
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1896
War expenditure ($350,000,000), 2173
War trophies and paintings, 2043
Winnipeg strike, 2753
Witley Camp riot, 3472

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 166. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—after-war conditions, 166; women's war work—national unity—highways, 167; railways — tariff — soldiers' dependents, 168
Canadian National Railway, 1816
Clair, N. B., Immigration agent, 2569
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 944-5
Militia, permanent force, 2969
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1000

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1995, 2266-7, 2279
Board of Commerce Bill, 4559
Second reading—Yeas and nays asked for, 4527
Canadian Pacific Railway Company Bill, 3214
Criminal Code Amdt. (Sexual Offences), 2163

Middlebro, Mr. William S.—*Con.*
Exportable wheat, ques. 1790
Fire prevention, 1577-82
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 869
Population of cities and provinces, ques. 1535
Prohibition, 2665
Railway Act, disagreement with Senate, power and telephone clauses, 4164
Railway Committee, permission to sit while House is in session, 1864
Revenue, expenditure, ques. 1217

Mignault, Mr., K.C., 462, 4670

Migratory Birds, 4604

Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 2097; 2r., com., 2164; 3r., 2305

Militarism, 1888

Military Defaulters' Disqualification Bill. 1r., 2198, 2293

Military Escort of Roman Catholic Bishop, ques. 2296

Military Hospitals Commission, 1264. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Military Service Act
Administration
Expense of, ques. 601, ques. 645, ques. 749, ques. 973, ques. 1306, ques. 1438
Localities: Montreal, ques. 973; L'Islet, ques. 979; M.D. No. 3, ques. 1076; Hull, ques. 1306; M.D. No. 4, ques. 1439; Wright, 2399
Persons: Archambault, Dr. J. U., ques. 1306; Boudreault, Mr. Benjamin, ques. 1439; Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566; Cousineau, Mr. L., ques. 1306; Harris, Mr. S. L. Dale, 3926; Labelle, Mr., ques. 1306; Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612; Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066; Woodbury, Mr. Harry, ques. 2048
Uniformity of, res., Sir Sam Hughes, 1308
Amdts. by Order in Council, 2294
Conscientious objectors, 781, 1929
Defaulters, 134, 227, 264, 346, 351, 396, 451, 461, 545, ques. 883, 971, 1910, 2250, 4238
Deserters, 72
Disfranchisement of, 496, ques. 1957, 2198, 2293
Evaders, Chicoutimi, 409
Imprisonment of, ques. 2566
Return of, 1866
Shot at, alleged, 1208
Draftees sent overseas, ques. 2297
Exemptions, ques. 884, ques. 1108
Farmers, and, 1233
Guelph Novitiate, 4620
Motion, Sir Sam Hughes, 1218; withdrawn, 1259

Military Service Act—*Con.*
Number conscripted, ques. 972
Police employed, ques. 972, ques. 973

Military Votes Overseas, Judge Gibson, ques. 1440

Militia
Allowances, 1886
Annual drill, 4495
Associations and bands, 1892, 4495
Barrack labourers, etc., 1899
Barriefield Militia buildings, 3985
Cadets, 1888, 1892
Command pay, 1886
Department
Audit of accounts, ques. 2199
Engineers' service and works, 1892
Headquarters and district staffs, 1893
Officers, peace rank, 1890
Overseas administration, Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt charges, 1099
Printers in department plant, 312. *See also* Printing Bureau
Salaries, 1532
Permanent force, 1898, 4495. *See also* Militia Act Amdt.
Rifle ranges, 1894-8
Steam shovels, ques. 1907
Surveys, 1899
Training areas, 1900
Transfers and promotions, report tabled, 40
Transport and freight, 1899
War record of, 1887
War units, continuation of, 1887

Militia Act Amdt. Bill (Permanent Force). 1r., 3469; 2r., 3966; com., 3968, 3971; 3r., 4002; amdt., Mr. Robb, neg., 4002

Militia Council, report tabled, 40

Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2690; 1r., 2692; 2r., com., 2753-4; 3r., 2856; Senate amdts., 3782

Mines and Minerals
Canadian Mining Institute, 4492
Coal, lignite briquetting, 4488
Committee, 114
Copper refineries, ques. 1106
Mineral rights in Dominion lands, 4251-7. *See also* Dominion Forest Reserves
Non-ferrous metals, 1052, 3681
Prospectors' tools, etc., 4007
Returned soldiers as prospectors, 4045

Mines Branch estimates, 4489

Minister of Marine, speech at Verdun, 3241

Ministers of the Crown
Absence from Parliament, of. *See* Address
House of Commons and, 1002

Ministers of the Crown—*Con.*
Resignations
Hon. T. A. Crerar, 3193. *See also that title*
Hon. T. W. Crothers, 139
"Minto," icebreaker, ques. 3242
Model Towns. *See* Garden Villages
Molloy, Mr. John Patrick (Provencher)
Budget, 3309. Protection, 3309; farming and tariff, 3311; industrial unrest—Victory loans, 3313; elections, 3314
Hutterites, 1382
"Montmagny," Government steamer, ques. 1613
St. Peter's Reserve, ques. 1076, ques. 1613
Sheep industry, pure-bred stock, 2994
Moncton and Buctouche Railway, 1382
Money. *See also* Banks
Bank and Dominion notes, figures at end of war, 634
Bronze coins. *See* Currency
Gold held against notes, 635
Monk Station roadway, ques. 1438, 2202
Montreal
Admiralty Court, ques. 1440
Conveyance of mails, ques. 979
Port, labour at, ques. 3997
Terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
Montreal-Ottawa highway, 2791-2
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners Bill. 1r., 3293; 2r., com., 3757; 3r., 3761
Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Air Board Bill, 2051
Bankruptcy Bill
Order of court, 2010
Trustee, replacement of, 2005
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3961, 3965
Canadian National Railway
Capital stock, 1829
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1723
First meeting, 1665
Head office, 1665
Civil Service
Efficiency, inquiry into, 1560
Salaries, high and low, 3811
War bonus, 2925
Wounded soldiers, positions for, 997, 1002
Combines, 4596-7
Criminal Code—aliens and British subjects, 4359-61
Demobilization, Canadians in British units, 2175
Fisheries, refrigerator service, 2890
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 870
Highways, 786
Housing scheme, 2544, 2550-2, 2560
Morphy, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Income war tax—trainmen's expenses, 2990-1
Judges' salaries, 4226, 4371
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2662
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1334
Militia, permanent force, 3970
Naturalization, property rights of aliens, 4260-1, 4270-1
Pensions, 4179, 4181, 4195, 4206-9
"Unmarried wife," 4295
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Purchasing Commission, 3811
Quebec officer charged with embezzlement, 2294
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2621-34
Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2632
Telephone companies, 2643
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3129
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2762-3
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066
Trade Commissioners, 4493
Weights and measures, 2150-1
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 997, 1002
Morris, Col., ques. 2565
Mothers' Pensions, 156
Mounted Police. *See* Royal Northwest
Moving Pictures, 267
Mowat, Mr. Herbert Macdonald (Parkdale)
Air Board Bill, 2057
Bankruptcy Bill, 1986-8, 1994, 2274
Farmers and, 2007
Order of court, 2010
Trustees, 2003, 2006
Board of Commerce, 4558-60, 4566
Civil Service, efficiency of, 1558
Divorce Court Bill, 3783, 3786-8
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4585
Electrocution Bill, 1957
Fire prevention, 1582
French River waterway, 1082
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 761, 4012-3
Judges' salaries and duties, 2312, 2956
Militia, permanent force, 2982
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2620-4, 2637
Power clause, amdt., 4147; withdrawn, 4165
Telephone companies, 2643
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, Hydro-Electric, 3073; amdt., 3082; neg., 3133; 2nd. amdt., 3133; agreed to, 3134
Universal military training, 1891

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Bell, Col. McKelvey. *See under this head,* Soldiers
Bruce report, 4071
Canadian Army Medical Service, 358, 513
Censorship, 1110
Dominion Elections Act. Amdt., 4652, 4658
Dominion water powers, 2512, 2515
Doukhobor lands, 2043
Easter adjournment, 886
Farmers' sons overseas—labour shortage, 140
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 942
House of Commons, Wednesday evening sittings, 929
Kinmel Camp riots, 315, 357
Labour situation in the West, 2798-9
Lobster, canned, 715
Marlow, Col. F. W., ques. 3066
North Bruce, returning officer, ques. 2406
Oil, Peace River district, 4135
Pratt, Lt.-Col., statements of and reported resignation of High Commissioner, 647
Printing Bureau strike, 314, 398
Sedition, 3291, 4134
Seed grain, 1029
Shaughnessy, Lord, report interview, 648
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Director of Medical Services, 3240, 3472, 4240
Soldiers, penal servitude, cases, 1029, 1163
Trade discrimination against Canada, 115, 229, 314
Winnipeg strike, 3069
Postal employees, replacement of, 2855
Witley Camp riots, 462

Murray Bay
Ferry, 4335
Train service, 2449

Musicians, travelling, immigration of, 1942

Myers, Mr. Edward Thomas Wordon (Kindersley)
Budget, 3526. Tariff revision — wheat prices, 3526; returned soldiers and the land—income tax, 3529; natural resources of Western Provinces—tariff, 3530; optimism, 3531
Eston, Sask., experimental farm, 2979
Live stock, pure-bred, 2993-4
Shipbuilding, 2261
Wheat
Crop of 1919, 3471
Shipment facilities, 2261

Napadogan, ice at., ques. 972

National Battlefields Commission, 138, 4482

National Gallery, 2797

National Research Institute, 1565, 1709. *See also* Industrial

National Service Registration, ques. 1075, ques. 1076, ques. 1306, ques. 2296, ques. 2296, ques. 2296
Assistant Registrars, payment of, ques. 1907
Bagot County, ques. 1307
Employees, ques. 2145
Expenditure, ques. 2296
Rental, ques. 2145
Salaries, ques. 1306, ques. 1440, ques. 2565
Unpaid accounts, ques. 2296

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Natural Gas, Pelican Rapids, 4605

Naturalization, 1046. *See* British Nationality; Immigration

Natural Resources. *See* Dominion Lands; Mines and Minerals
Development of, 302, 3283

Naval Air Bases, ques. 1532

Naval Service
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 1340, ques. 1534
Canadians in Royal Navy, 1434, 1483
Courts martial, members of, ques. 1534
Department of
Report tabled, 111
Staff and salaries, 2811
Destroyers, ques. 880, ques. 1534
Discharge of men, 1959, 1996
"Hochelaga," dismissal of officer, ques. 1340
Kingsmill, Admiral, ques. 1340
Ministerial statement, 2810
Newfoundland R.N.R. ratings, ques. 1611
Pay claims, ques. 746
Recruiting, ques. 646, ques. 747
Seymour Narrows battery, ques. 975
Trawler No. 30, ques. 975
"Tuna," H.M.C.S., sale of, ques. 1534
Wireless, separation allowance, ques. 1905

Navigation, Aids to, 2608-10

Negroes, Rioting in England by, 3741

Neil's Harbour, 2781

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward Walter (North Oxford)
Bank mergers, 1095
Bankrupty Bill
Order of court, 2010
Trustees, 2006, 2012
Board of Commerce, 4506, 4551-3
Budget, 3547. Cost of living, 3547; tariff and profits, 3549; business profits war

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward Walter—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tax, 3551; tariff and freight rates, 3552; taxes, tariffs and tax-free bonds, 3553
Canadian National Railway Company
Commission control, 1403
Executive Com., 1673
Cost of Living Com., 4313
Daylight Saving, 899
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 691
Immigration of illiterates, 1961, 1964
Income tax, number of taxpayers, 3726
Militia pensions, 2757-8
Pensions, 4182-98, 4201-10
Prohibition, 2351
Public ownership of railways, 692
Purchasing Commission, 3205
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2626-34, 2640
Telephone companies, 2643-4, 2649
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3131
Railway crossings, 937
Seed grain advances, 626
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2763, 2769

New Carlisle postmaster, ques. 727

Newfoundland. *See* Steamship services

New Harbour, N.S., 2783

Newspaper Postage, ques., 727

Newspapers and Periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1562, 2016, 4483

Newsprint Control, ques. 613, ques. 752

Newsprint Control Bill. Res., 4535; 1r., 4549; 2r., 4662; 3r., 4663

New Westminster, railways, and, 423, 426

New Zealand, markets in, 2222

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Judges' salaries, 4369, 4373

Nicholson, Mr. George Brecken (East Algoma)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 143. Returned soldiers, 143; housing—capital and labour, 144, 145; tariff, 144; Department of Labour—franchise, alien enemies — Bolsheviki, 145; returned soldiers — patronage — commissions, 146; General Pau—prohibition—His Majesty's complimentary banquet to President Wilson, 147; Prime Minister and Peace Conference —Canada's war record, 148

Nicholson, Mr. George Brecken—*Con.*
Board of Commerce, 4499
Canadians in Imperial service, 1997
Canadian National Railway, 1402-19
Combines, 4571
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 683, 1137
High Cost of Living Com., 4009
Special report, motion for concurrence, 4307-8, 4333
Immigration Act Amdt.
Illiterates, 1962
Interned alien enemies, 1947
Land for soldiers, 3071
Liquor, illegal exportation, 960
Little Current, 2789
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1527
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1333
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4287
Post office appointments after strike, 4352
Prohibition, 2669
Public ownership of railways, 682
Purchasing Commission, 3205
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2627
Telephone companies, 2649-50
Railway engineers—cattle on track, 2617
Rural postmasters, 2035
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769
Titles, 2720
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2951

Nickel, 1053, 3681

Nickle, Mr. William Folger (Kingston)
Board of Commerce, 4519
Coasting trade with United States, 1110, 1209
Criminal Code
Election by prisoner, 4366-7
Unmarried registering as married, 2160
Divorce Court Bill, 1662, 3761, 3779, 3883-91
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 858
Good roads, 3910, 4416
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 677
Immigration, orchestras, 1943
Income tax, 3736
Judges, 3716
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3728
Industrial unrest — after-war conditions, profits, sympathetic strikes, etc., 3025
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1336
Militia pensions, 2755-60
Militia, permanent force, 3967, 3971, 3985
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4283-5
Public ownership of railways, 680

Nickle, Mr. William Folger—*Con.*
Railway Act Consolidation
Disagreement with Senate
Form of resolutions, 4157
Free conference, rep. 4067
Power clauses, 4159
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities; Hydro-Electric, 3105, 3109
Railway crossings, 700
Railway situation, responsibility for, 678
Returned soldiers, appointments to Civil Service, 290
Scientific research, 1566
Seditious books, etc., 4367
Titles, 1441, 1479, 2395
Correction of report, 2615
Motion for adoption of Com.'s rep., 2696, 2713-4, 2722, 2743
Votes and Proceedings, and Journals, 3292
Wounded soldiers
Civil Service positions for, 987
Disability, insurance against, 994
Vocational training for under-age, 1018

Nile Voyageurs, 4380

Nipissing Lake, water power, ques. 1341

Non-ferrous Metals. *See* Mines

Non-sectarian Schools. *See* Education

North Bruce, Returning Officer, ques. 2046

Northern Canada, development of, 302

Northern Construction Company, 1645

"Northland" Inquiry, rep. tabled, 111

North Sydney, works at, 1263-78

Northwest Territories, Commissioner of, 4045

Nova Scotia
Fair wage officer, ques. 1907
Fishing fleet, 1866

Nova Scotia Carriages, Limited, ques. 3066

Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., 2342

Noxious Weeds, 4091

Nurses, Military, residence for at Kingston, ques. 3377

Oath, administered by private parties, 2016

Oaths of Office Bill, 2

Ocean Freight Rates, 1051. *See also* Waterborne traffic

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., 2452

"Official Record," 431

O'Halloran, Mr., 4021

Oil-bearing Lands
Leases, ques. 2199
Northern Alberta, 4070
Peace River district, 4135
Shell Transport and Trading Co., 929, 4070

Old Age Pensions, 157

Oleomargarine, 2201, 3708

"One Big Union"—Calgary, ques. 2143

O'Neill, Mr., contractor, 1274

Ontario, North, Vacancy, 4

Ontario, Prohibition Votes, 2663

Ontario and Quebec, Northern, colonizing of, ques. 748

Opposition Leadership
Congratulations by Sir Thomas White, 27
Mackenzie, Mr. D. D., announces his election as temporary leader, 21-2
Robb, Mr., Chief Whip, 3

Orchestras, admission to Canada, of, 1943

Orders in Council under War Measures Act, 4486. *See also* War Measures Act Extension
Alien enemies, deportation of, 1977
Number passed, ques. 2145

Ottawa. *See also* Parliament Buildings
Central Station, ques. 1213
Government arrangement with, 2495, 4380
Highways, 2791
Hunter Building, 2507
Public buildings, lighting, 2503
Wellington street, repairs, 2495

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, 2855

Ottawa-Hull Bridge, 2790

Ottawa Improvement Commission, 138. *See also* Ottawa

Ottawa Improvement Commission Bill. Res., 4246; 1r., 4251; 2r., com., 4380; 3r., 4386

Ottawa River Dams, 2796

Oyster Culture, ques. 609. *See also* Fish

Packing Companies
Overcharges, 3281
Taxation of, 4478

Palmer, Rev. Kennedy H. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Panet, Mr. Louis Charles, 4

Papineau, Mr. Louis Joseph (Beauharnois)
Bust of Sir Robert Borden, ques. 2050, ques. 2295

Papineau, Mr. Louis Joseph—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway, ques. 1212
Civil Service, state of, 4605
Fuel Controller, ques. 2145
Leases of oil lands, ques. 2190
Public health, social welfare, ques. 1205
Rate of exchange, ques. 2145

Pardee, Mr. Frederick Forsyth (West Lambton)
Budget, 3532. Tariff and popular unrest, 3542; profiteering, 3544; income tax—tax-free bonds, 3545; duties of labour and of capital, 3546
Daylight Saving, 918
Housing scheme, 2547
Judges' salaries, 2955
Railway Act Consolidation: transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3123
Shipping, transfers, 3928

Parent, Mr. George (West Quebec)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 540. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 540; returned soldiers, 541; highways—housing—Northern Quebec, Ungava, 542; excess profits tax—Military Service defaulters, 544; Quebec and national unity, 545
Bankruptcy, remuneration of trustees, 2013
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Consolidation Bill, 3821
Canadian National Railway
Deficit, 2456
Quebec, conditions in, 2457
Dominion water powers, 2517, 2529
Parliament Buildings, 2331-41
Pilotage, 2806
St. Charles River dredging, 2788
St. Laurent, Isle of Orleans, 2785
St. Lawrence ship channel, 2608
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769-70
Steamers, "Lady Evelyn" and "Princess," ques. 3680

Parent, Dr. Rufus H., ques. 1213

Paris Agency, 1901

Paris or French Foot (measure), 952-4

Pariseault, Lieut., ques. 884

Parkinson, Lieut.-Col., ques. 1441

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Speaker; Deputy Speaker; House of Commons

Parliament Buildings, 2331-41
Allocation of space, joint Committee with Senate, 3782, 3585, 3680
Materials, construction, plans, probable date of completion, etc., 2331-41, 4621

Parliamentary Documents, distribution of, 2455

Parliamentary Restaurant, Committee on, 115

Paroles, McMillan, Pearson and Heaton, 4070

Party Government and parties, 15, 27, 32, 37, 55, 69, 97, 108, 125, 268, 344, 371, 376-391, 412, 440, 489, 515, 530, 566, 570, 807, 1633, 1746

Patent Medicines. *See* Proprietary

Patent Record, 3842

Patent, Trade Mark and Design, Copyright and Timber Marking Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3808; 2r., 4021; com., 3r., 4023

Patents, Commissioner of. *See* Patent, etc., Bill

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic

Patronage, 146. *See also* Highways
Canadian National Railway, 1639
Civil Service and, 387. *See also* Civil Service
Medical men and, 171
Port Hastings, 961
Postmasters, 410, 412
Printing Bureau and, 387

Pau, General, visit of to House, 137, 141, 147

Peace, 1, 125. *See also* League of Nations; War; Reconstruction
Armistice, terms of, 2042
Celebration of, 4238
Costa Rica, message, 2

Peace Conference, 446
Canada's position in, 248, 777
Canada's representation at, 1, 14, 18, 132, 142, 148, 169, 182, 242, 249, 265, 272, 351, 367, 389, 421, 474, 478, 495, 530, 1381, 3676
Poland and Ukrainians, etc., 3472. *See also* Poles

Peace Treaty, 2096
Civil and religious liberty, 2043
Copy of terms, 4239
Labour provisions, 4239, 4692
Eight-hour day, 2044
Ratification, 2200
Signing of, 3473
Summary, 2146

Pearson, Sir Arthur, 2874

Peat, 4489

Peck, Lieut.-Col. Cyrus Wesley, V.C. (Skeena)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 463. Thanks for reception—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—answer to criticisms of leaders of Canadian Corps, 463; Cambrai, 464; La Vicoigne—Sir Arthur Currie's care of soldiers' lives, 466; his promotion—Mons, 467; Canadian soldiers and British press and public, 468; Sir Charles Ferguson, 469; reconstruction, support of public opinion needed—women's war work, 470; Kinmel Camp riots, conduct of Canadian soldiers at Rhyl—Union government—Liberals and Unionists—free trade, 471; Grand Trunk Pacific—unifying effect of the trenches, 472
British Columbia salmon and halibut, 1535
Budget, 3676. Prime Minister and Peace Conference—free trade, 3676; social unrest—income, inheritance and land values taxes, 3677
Enters House of Commons Chamber, 185
Massett wharf, ques. 603
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1501
Pensions, 4174, 4178, 4180, 4293
Railway Act—municipal rate bargains, 4141
Soldiers' graves, 332

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac Ellis (South Renfrew)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 185. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 185-186; Col. Peck, V.C., 185; victory and peace, 186; returned soldiers, 187; Liberal party, 189; finance, 191; tariff, 193
Agricultural implements, duties on, 3694, 3705
Arthurs, Col. James, M.P., ques. 2653
Bankruptcy, 2472-3
Bureau of Statistics, 3178
Business profits war tax, 3710
Canadian National Railway, 1410
Capital stock, 1816
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1773
Finance, Parliamentary control, 2137
President's salary, 1658
Canadian Press news service, 4485
Canal statistics; salaries, 3178-9
Cold storage, 2984, 2987
Combines, 4568-71, 4588
Draper, Mr. P. M., Printing Bureau, ques. 3999
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4586
Electric wiring in public buildings, 2505
Exchange, rate of, 1362

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac Ellis—*Con.*
Fire prevention, 1574-81
Good roads, 4409
Government agricultural publications, 2991
House of Commons, cross benches, desks for, 2503
Housing scheme, 2562
Income war tax, 3718-23
Bad debts, 3722
Garment factory operators, 3994
Travellers on commission, 3990
Insurance Act Amdt. (actuaries), 3988
Letter postage rate, 4621
Military Service Act, 1312
Naturalization, 4128-9, 4258-9
Newsprint control, 4538
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4250
Oysters, 2899
Pensions, 4200, 4204, 4206
"Unmarried wife," 4287
Proprietary medicines, 2487, 3824
Purchasing Commission, 3207
Railway mail service, 2087-9
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3872-3
Exemption from legal process, 3866-7
Notice of expropriation, 4016
Technical education, 3174-5, 3895-7
Titles, 1468
War expenditures, 1362
Weights and measures, 953, 2152-9
Wheat, market for, 1711, 2998-3000
Wool, 2989

Pelee Island, 4033

Pelican Rapids Gas Well, 4605

Pelletier, Mr. Francois Jean (Matane)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 393. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—industrial unrest, 393; cost of living, 394; soldiers' land settlement—immigration—War-time Elections Act, 395; national unity—titles—military service defaulters, 396; "Light in the window," 397
Canadian National Railway, 1831
Cold storage, 2984
Industrial unrest, after-war conditions, etc., 3017
Lumber purchases for railways, ques. 1217
Order, relevancy, 2725
Pilotage, 2808, 3160

Pembroke wharf, 2787

Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 1616. Res., 4033; 1r., 4033; 2r., com., 4171, 4199, 4274; 3r., 4335
Amdt., Mr. Lemieux, neg. on div., 4336
"Unmarried wife," 4198-9, 4274

Pensions, 17, 79, 92, 107, 159, 294, 323, 343, 497, 502, 588, ques. 882
Board, ques. 1790, 2448, ques. 3066
Appointments and returned soldiers, ques. 605
Employees, ques. 611
Vancouver office, ques. 3377
Committee, 139, 424, 550, 3926, 3997
European war and active militia (vote of $28,000,000), 3000
Number, etc., ques. 1076
Orders in Council tabled, 312
Payments, ques. 1307
Widows of Generals, 2448

Permanent Force. *See* Militia Act Amdt.

Peticlerc, Mr. Joseph, 164

Petitcodiac River, 2898

Piche, Lt.-Col., ques. 600, ques. 2871

Pictou Island, 2793

Pilotage, 2610
Report tabled, 185. *See also* Canada Shipping

Ploughs, Duty on, 3690. *See also* Agricultural implements; Budget

Poles and Ukrainians, etc., 3472, 4465, 4534, 4620, 4690. *See also* Peace

Pollution of Navigable Waters Bill. 1r., 2199

Pomeroy, Major A. L., Inspector of Farms, ques. 2567

Population
Cities and provinces, ques. 1535
Trend to urban centres, 896

Porter, Mr. Sydney P., 1638, 1834

Port Felix, Custom House, 956

Port Hood Wharf, 2782

Portland Cement, duty on, ques. 1612

Port Mann, ques. 979

Port Nelson. *See* Hudson Bay

Postmaster General
Report tabled, 40
Representation in House of Commons, ques. 1974. *See also* Ministers

Post Office. *See also* Industrial unrest; Strikes
Calgary employees after strike, 3194
Letter carriers
Bonus, 2084
Overseas service, 2444
Toronto, 1341
Letter rate, 4621
Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 3068
Mail carriers, 413
Mail contracts, rural mail, rural post offices, surplus, 2079-96

Post Office—*Con.*
Mails and Canadian National Railway, 2087, 2094
Ottawa-Pembroke service, 2034
Outside service, salaries, 2079
Postmasters, rural, 413, ques. 1536
Quebec City, ques. 2751
Quebec and Hamilton, ques. 2750
Refusal to deliver mail, 1435
Rural mail boxes—parcel post, 2093
Rural mail couriers, 2926
Salaries and allowances, 1435, 2016
Statistics, ques. 2903
Toronto, Montreal, and Winnipeg, ques. 2750
Transatlantic mails, 886, 929

Post Office Appointments Bill. 1r., 3809; 2r., com., 4345; 3r., 4355

Power Companies. *See* Electric and Power Companies; Canadian National Railway

Power, Mr. Charles Gavan (South Quebec)
Allowance to officers, ques. 1663
Argue, Lieut.-Col. J. F., ques. 3068
Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., speech at Verdun, 3241
Canadian National Railway
Directorate to include a returned soldier, amdt. 1637, neg. 1638
Lines to be included, 1686
Steamships, 1689
Canadian Pacific Railway Station, Quebec, ques. 3587
Civil Service vacancies, ques. 2049
Daylight Saving, 923
Employment agent, Quebec, ques. 1791
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1573-8
Fiset, Dr. Michael, ques. 1791
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Forest Products Laboratories, ques. 3068
Gregory, Mr. William T., ques. 601
Immigration Act Amdt.—conspiracy, 1948
Industrial unrest, eight-hour day, after-war conditions, etc., 3032
Influenza patients, ques. 845
Kinmel Camp riots, ques. 3469
Lake St. Joseph hotel, ques. 3067
Lévis Rifle Association, ques. 1213
Marine Department, Quebec buildings, ques. 1217, ques. 1439
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1523, 1531
Militia
Permanent force, 1898
Staff positions and returned soldiers, 1893
Units and members, war record of, 1890
Pensions, 4288-92, 4297

Power, Mr. Charles Gavan—*Con.*
Piché, Lt.-Col., ques. 600
Public Health, social welfare, 1206
Quebec terminal facilities, ques. 3469
Questions and answers, complaint of contradiction, 648
St. Louis Road property, ques. 604, 2769-70
Soldiers
Courts martial, 3470
Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, ques. 1307
Returned
Port of debarkation, 2402
Usurers and, ques. 977
22nd Battalion, 1616
Russia, in, 1216
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2770, 2773-4
Allegations of Lt.-Col. McKelvey Bell, 3422
Solicitors, Department of Railways and Government Railways, 1591-2
Strikes, 1918, ques. 619
Titles—Com. to consider. Points of order—unanimous consent, and acceptance of principle, 1482
War bonus, arsenal and marine employees, 2926
War service gratuity, ques. 1791
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2945

Pratt, Lieut.-Col., charges by, 1099, ques. 1213, ques. 1216, ques. 1483

Precious Metals in Nickel Ores, 3682-9

Press, The, 201-3, 246, 267
Attitude of, 2917
Freedom of, 350
Government advertising, 1822
Public announcement of ownership, 1562

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 1912, 4135

Prevost, Mr. Jules Edouard (Terrebonne)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 521. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 521; allegations of Gen. Hughes and Gen. Smart, 522; after-war problems, 523; prices, 524; tariff, 525; excess profits tax, 526; Union government, 528; French Canadians—grants for housing, highways, public health, 529
Casualties amongst French Canadians, ques. 644
Catholics, enlistment of, ques. 3998
Exemption tribunals, ques. 1438
Georgian Bay Canal, ques. 843
House of Commons reading room, 318, ques. 843
Military Service Act, ques. 2296
National Service Registration, ques. 1306, ques. 1440
War tax, income, exemption, ques. 611

Prices. *See* Canada Food; Combines; Cost of Living; Board of Commerce; Budget; Industrial unrest

Prince Edward Island
Greater production grant, ques. 601, ques. 2566

Prince of Wales, 420
H.R.H. visit to Canada, 2629

Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry. *See also* War
Travelling accommodation, ques. 1307

Printing Bureau, 424
Commission of investigation, 1812
Editorial Com., 1435
Expenses, ques. 844
Printing done by, ques. 844
Report, 229, 230
Strike, 398, 513, 1561
Statement by Minister, 312

Printing Com., 113, 115

Printing and Stationery Dept., 4687

Private Bills Com., 112

Private Bills Discussed
Athabasca, Grande Prairie and Fort Vermilion Railway, 2778, 4534
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 4344
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 3782
Senate amdt., 3214
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 1211, 2015, 2295
Senate amdts., 2903
Grey, Margaret, divorce, 4533
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway, 1404
London and Port Stanley Railway, 1184

Privilege
Borden, Sir Robert—Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
Bureau, Mr.—Statement of Mr. H. A. Mackie, 4002
Edwards, Mr.—Report in Ottawa Journal, 1997
Fournier, Mr.—Public ownership of railways, 1866
Gauvreau, Mr.—Hansard, correction, 970
Lemieux, Mr.—erroneous report of speech of Mr. J. D. Reid, 3378
Stacey, Mr.—misunderstanding of remarks of Mr. Lemieux, 3422

Privileges and Elections Com., 112

Privy Council Department, salaries, 4486

Production, grants to encourage, ques. 2566

Profiteering. *See* Board of Commerce; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Industrial unrest

Prohibition, 2, 137, 147, 223, 343, 403, 437, 456, 490, 531, 588, 2658. *See also* Intoxicating Liquors; War Measures Extension

Properties Leased by Government 3377

Proportional Representation, 3069, 4620

Proprietary Medicines
Alcoholic content of, ques. 646
War tax, ques. 1107

Proprietary Medicine Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1259; 2r., com., 2479; ref. to special com., 2653; com., 3823; 3r., 3938

Prorogation, 4701

Protection. *See* Budget; Tariff

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Bankruptcy, 2279, 2469-70, 2474
Budget, 3460. Taxes—economy in public expenditure, 3460; good roads, 3461
Canadian National Railway, coal, ques. 1211
Civil Service, specialists, 1184
Currie, Sir Arthur, proclamations by, ques. 607
Customs and Inland Revenue, salaries, 954
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 855
Fort William, railway lands, ques. 883
Franchise, 4622
Good roads, 3908
Hanna, townsite of, ques. 1535
Hart, Mr. James I., ques. 602
Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 2791-2
Judges' salaries and duties, 2311, 2958, 4226, 4370, 4375
Exemption from income tax, 4234
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., 2453
Port Mann, ques. 979
Repatriation Committee, ques. 613, ques. 1340
Ridley, Mr. John, ques. 2398, ques. 2566
Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216
Speaker, Mr., living allowance, 2445

Provident Fund. *See* Intercolonial

Provincial Autonomy. *See* Housing; Highways; Technical Education

Public Accounts, 138
Committee, 113

Public Buildings, 2508, 4610. *See* Parliament; *also names of localities*

Public Debt. *See* Budget; War expenditure

Public Health, 2, 15, 21, 25, 94, 97, 135, 184, 214, 223, 456, 490, 504. *See also* Health Department Bill
Department of, 82, 174, 301, 431, 445, 4380
Appointments, 1182
Director General, 2572
Infant mortality, 336
Medical profession and, 1378

Public Health—*Con.*
Provincial rights and, 1369
Scientific research and, 1390. *See* Scientific
Tuberculosis, 498
Soldiers, returned, amongst, 183

Public Information Department, 40, 203, ques. 728, ques. 728, ques. 748, ques. 750, 4673
United States Representative, ques. 2145. *See also* Public Information

Public Ownership of Railways. *See* Canadian National
Shaughnessy, Lord, and, 1630, 1820, 1825

Provincial Subsidies, ques. 744

Public Welfare, Department of, proposed, 156

Public Works, 2780-97
Department
Cleaning, 2495
Clerk of Works, 2502
Concentration of works under, 1262-3
Contingencies, inspection service, 1278
Deputy Minister, 2330
Reform in, 2496
Report tabled, 40
Solicitor, 1270-8
Staff and salaries, 1262, 1266, 2330
Travelling expenses, 2331
Expenditure on, 44, 47
Ottawa
Hunter Building, 2507
New departmental building on Wellington St., proposed, 2507
Parliament Building, 2331-41
Public buildings, elevator service, lighting, heating, cleaning, repairs, furniture, etc., 2494-6, 2504
Rentals, 2505-7
Quarantine stations, 2503
Tender and contract, works not done under, 1263

Pugwash Spur, ques. 3067, ques. 4239

Purchasing Commission, appointments, 3470

Purchasing Commission Bill. Res., 3810, 4439; 1r., 1162; 2r., 3195-3211, 3215-27; amdt. (6-mos. hoist), 3220; neg., 3226; com., 3227
Commission, membership, powers, etc., 3227, 3232, 3236, 3810
Directors, 3228
Estimates, 3238
Records, 3236
Requisitions, 3237
Staff, 3228
Supplies to be purchased, 3238
Tender, 3239

Quarantine, 4682

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2449

Quebec Bridge, ques. 977

Quebec City
Canadian National Railway, improvements, ques. 978
Canadian Pacific Railway station, ques. 3587
Employment agent, ques. 1791
Federal buildings on Grand Allee, ques. 976
Kent House site, ques. 976
Military hospitals, ques. 844
Ross Rifle Factory, ques. 976
Terminal facilities, ques. 3469

Quebec Harbour and Port
Property and insurance, ques. 601
Spirituous liquors entered at, ques. 1533

Quebec Oriental Railway, ques. 605

Quebec Province
Northern, resources of, 542

Quebec Railway, Light and Power Co., 2504

Quorum. *See* House of Commons

Radiotelegraph, 2794, 2848

Radziwill, Princess, ques. 618

Rails, Canadian, sent overseas, 2239, 3863

Railway Act Amdts.
1. Coastwise and inland water rates. 1r., 71
2. Consolidation. 1r., 357; 2r., ref. to standing com., 936; com., 2617, 2929, 3073; 3r., 3157
Disagreement with Senate, 3293; message—consequential amdts., 3473; free conference: proposed, 3473; proposal accepted, 3679; managers appointed, 3738; meeting appointed, 3782; sitting of House not suspended, 3948; report, 4012; considered, 4064
Amdt. to clause 325 (the Board and tariffs), motion to insist, 4136-7, agreed to, 4139; amdt. to clause 374 (Power companies), motion to not insist, 4139, agreed to on div., 4165; amdt. to clause 376 (Telephones), motion to not insist, 4166, agreed to on div., 4169; Senate concurrence, 4456
3. Crossings. Res., 697; 1r., 701; 2r., com., 936; 3r., 1029
4. Location. 1r., 2342; 2r., com., 2510

Railway Belt Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 5; 2r., com., 592; 3r., 625

Railway Commission
Daylight Saving, decision, 1422
Officers of, and Civil Service Commission, 2633
Report tabled, 71

Railway War Board
Daylight Saving, and, 907, 910
Railway time tables, 929

Railways. *See their several titles, including* Government *and* Canadian National
Cash subventions by provinces, ques. 604
Cattle on tracks—charge against engineers, 2617
Daylight Saving and. *See* Daylight
Railways extending into United States, 688
Level crossings. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill (Crossings)
Public ownership of. *See* Grand Trunk Pacific Receivership

Railways and Canals Department
Deputy Minister of, ques. 1215
Lumber purchases, Matane, ques. 1217
Salaries, 1588

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee, 112
Leave to sit while House is in session, 1864, 1886

Raw Materials within the Empire, 1053

***Read, Mr. Joseph** (Prince, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 214. Victory loan, 214; Department of Health—food control and European contracts—Union government, 215; general election, 216; Canada's immigrant citizens, 217; Hon. Mr. Calder—returned soldiers, non-productive employment, 218; shipbuilding—Liberalism, 219; tariff, 221
Civil Service, employment in, disadvantage of, 962
Daylight Saving, 901
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 947
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, motion for, 690
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 822

Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209

Reading Room. *See* House of Commons

Reciprocity, 309, 794. *See also* Tariff

Reclamation of Dominion Lands by Drainage Bill. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 639, 708; 3r., 784

Reconstruction. *See* Board of Commerce; Budget; Highways; Housing; Immigration; Industrial unrest; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Soldiers' Land Settlement; Technical education; War, demobilization

Red Cross. *See* Canadian Red Cross

*Deceased April 6

Redman, Mr. Daniel Lee (East Calgary)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (mover), 13. Canadian Expeditionary Force, 13; Governor General, appointment of His Excellency, Duke of Devonshire — late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Peace—co-operation of British Empire and United States—Paris Conference—Canada's war record, 14; reconstruction—public health—housing, 15; vocational training — highways — franchise—immigration—industrial unrest, 16; returned soldiers—land settlement—pensions, 16
Allied soldiers, settlers, 3881
Divorce Bill, 3781
Fire prevention, 1584
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1922
Immigration, exclusion of certain classes, 1922
Militia pensions, 2754
Soldiers, wounded, Civil Service positions for, 982

Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904

Registration. *See* National Service

Reid, Hon. John Dowsley (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Department of Railways and Canals
Salaries, 1588
Solicitor, 1592
Canadian National Railway. *See also, under this head,* Canadian National Railway Company Bill
Construction and betterments, 3190, 4614
Death of employee, compassionate allowance, 3175
Expenditure, estimated, 4688
Intercolonial Railway, 2133
Labour trouble, reported, 1617
Operation, 4615-8
Patronage, 1642
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3190, 4618
Private cars, 1590
Rates, 4171, 4615-8
Canadian National Railway Company Bill, 1395-1404, 1405-22, 1620-30, 1640-7, 1653-9, 1667-71, 1676-95, 1705, 1713-6, 1724-5, 1750-4, 1760, 1766-70, 1774, 1779, 2098, 2133-6
Com., suggested ref. to., 1623
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1713-6, 1724, 1769
Charters, schedule of, 1766
Directors, 1627, 1630, 1640, 1654
British Columbia, from, 1629
Executive Com., 1667
Management and operation, 1677-81, 1691

Reid, Hon. John Dowsley—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Powers to construct under Order in Council, 1767
Provinces, representation of, 1370
Railways to be included, 1677-81
United States, in, 1693
Securities, 1769-70
Canals
Power development and export, 1599
Trent, 3188-9
Welland, deepening, work for returned soldiers, 1592-1610, 3175-87
Civil Service
Com. of inquiry, 1709
Salaries, 1591
Coal, railway contracts for, 1909
Correction of report of speech, 3188, 3221, 3378
Custom houses, as storage places for liquor, 956, 964
Daylight Saving, 919
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572-3, 4583-7
Freight rates on raw sugar, 3471
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 701-8, 938-948
Government railways, reference to ministerial statement, 1589
Private cars, 1590
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 399
Highways Aid Bill, 730, 785, 3899-3926, 4391, 4423, 4426-8
Amdt. (agreement with Province), 4431
Lévis station, 2458
Location of railways, 2510-1
National Research Institute, 1709
Paradis, Mr. M., claim of, 3189
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 936, 2617-52, 3134
Senate disagreement, 4064-9
Board control of rates, 4136, 4139
Telephone companies, 4166
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3134
Railway crossings, 697-701, 936-8
Railways and Canals Department
Salaries, 1588
Solicitor, 1592
Railways and steamships, 4683-5
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1023
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2567, 2798
St. Lawrence River water powers, 1796
War Board, railways and Daylight Saving, 909, 929
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2939

Reid, Mr. John Flaws (Mackenzie)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 585. Tariff, 585, 589; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — Government's land policy, 587; prohibition—returned soldiers, pensions—land settlement, 588; farmers, workers and manufacturers, 590
Agriculture, live stock, 2970
Briquetting lignite, 3472
Budget, 3593. Income tax—tariff, 3594; undue profits, 3596; agricultural implements—markets and prices, 3597; operation of grain elevators—agricultural implements, 3598; insurance of returned men, 3599
Daylight Saving, 926
Export of feed, Fort William Grain Company, ques. 2048
Good roads, 3916-8
Immigration, illiterates, 1953
Shipbuilding, ques. 610, ques. 644
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2948

Repatriation Com., ques. 1340

Representation Act (1914) Amdt. Bill (Fraser Valley). 1r., 4; 2r., com., 625; 3r., 727

Returned Soldiers. *See* War, soldiers

Revenue Bills
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 3154; 1r., 3738; 2r., com., 3988; 3r., 4003
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill. Res., 3151; 1r., 3738; 2r., 3988, 4003; com., 4003; 3r., 4012
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. Res., 3154; 1r., 3738; 2r., com., 3988; 3r., 4003
Dependents, 3992
Garment factory operators, 3994
Military pensions, 3994
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1586-7; 1r., 1588

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland). *See* Speaker

Rhyl. *See* Kinmel

Richardson, Mr. Robert Lorne (Springfield)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 376. Young men and politics, 376; abolition of partyism — Union government — Liberalism, 377; tariff, 378, 391; party tyranny — Senate reform, 380; Liberalism defined, 381; leaders needed, 383; history of party, 384; vicious features of party, 385; public expenditures, 386; Printing Bureau and patronage—Civil Service — translators — Debates Com., 387;

Richardson, Mr. Robert Lorne—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Canada's troops—war work of Canadian women, 388; Peace Conference and Canada's representation, 389; Mount Carmel, 390; national unity, 392
Board of Commerce, 4509
Budget, 3654. War and aftermath of war, 3654; parties and protection, 3655; Liberal party and the tariff, 3656; tariff commission — East and West, 3660; public ownership—Civil Service—regulation of profits, 3663; Union-War government, 3664
Budka, Bishop, 1917
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1755
Directors, 1635
Head office, 1648
Public ownership, 1630, 1757, 1760
Canadian Press news service, 4484-6
Conner, Mr., Immigration Agent, 2590-3
Cost of Living, 4323
Daylight Saving, 891, 923
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Government printing, Editorial Com., 1435
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1210
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 1116, 1152
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1924
Immigration
Exclusion of certain classes, 1916
Deported conspirators, amdt., 1951
Treatment of immigrants, 1916
Judges' railway expenses, 2641
Militia, permanent force, 3972
Newsprint Control, 4541
Prohibition, 2673
Public ownership of railways, 1630, 1757, 1760
Railway Act, local freight rate agreements, 4139
Subsidies, mistaken policy of, 1297
Titles, 1451, 2731
Winnipeg strike, 2799

Rideau Hall, 2500-2

Rideau Junction townsite, ques. 2398

Ridley, Mr. John, ques. 2566

Rimouski and overseas mail, 886, 929

River Beaudette-St. Zotique roadway, ques. 2144

Roads. *See* Highways

Robb, Mr. James Alexander (Chauteauguay-Huntingdon)
Agricultural implement duties and freight rates, 3697-8, 3706
Béland, Dr., M.P., welcome to, on release from German prison, 4
Board of Commerce, 4528-30
Business of the House
Legislation to be brought down, 1616, 2398
Weekly statement of prospective legislation, 599
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3956-60
Canals, contracts, system of, 1598-1600
Canadian Trade Commission, ques. 644
Caughnawaga Reserve, 2902, 4057-8
Civil Service, enlisted men, 2925
Committee, Standing, 2
Cost of Living, 4316
Customs, rebate of duty, ques. 646
Dairy products and the war, 2966-8
Delayed returns, 886
Dominion water powers, 2513-7, 2523
Exhibitions, 2973
Toronto fair, 2997
Export trade, Trade Commission, etc., 2238
Farm help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1958
Flour mill machinery, 4006
Franchise Bill, probable date, 2906
Good roads, 3902, 4392
Grain trade—operation of elevators, 4087, 4099-4100
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 686
Greece, supply of wheat to, ques. 2907
Housing scheme, 2540, 2564
Income tax and judges' and others' pensions, 3711, 3719
Income, taxable, gross, ques. 2294
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 3
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2061-7
Militia
Accounts, audit of, ques. 2199
Permanent force, 2968, 2974
Amdt. to 3r. of Bill, 4002
National harbours and grain trade, 3751
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4005
Pension cases, 3003
Rails from Canadian railways sent overseas, 2239
Railways
Public ownership of, 686
Provinces and branch lines, 695
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 708
Schools and religious teaching, 2413
Seed grain advances, 1040, 1042, 4047
Sharpe, Lieut.-Col., death of, 3
Siberia, economic commission, ques. 613
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Trade discrimination in Britain, 72

Robb, Mr. James Alexander—*Con.*
War expenditure
Vouchers for overseas payment, 1710
$350,000,000 vote, 2237
War Measures Act, 2148
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2942, 2950
Weights and measures, 2149
Wheat, free, 3707
Winnipeg strike, postal employees, 2508

Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216

Ross, Commander J. K. L., offer of destroyer, ques. 880, 1534

Ross, Mr. Duncan Campbell (West Middlesex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 500. Sir Arthur Currie, 500; demobilization — prospective deficit, 501; vocational training, pensions, land settlement, 502; franchise — War-time Elections Act, 503; public health—farmers and profiteering, 504; Daylight Saving — interior terminal elevators, 505; rural credits—tariff, 506; national unity, 507
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1669-70
Daylight Saving, 903
Fisheries, officers, 2893, 2895
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2065-6
Railway Act Consolidation; transmission lines on highways; Hydro-Electric, 3091
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 641

Ross, Mr. P. D. 2915-7
Buildings owned by, rental of, ques. 1438

Rosslyn, 3191

Ross Rifle, ques. 976, 1614

Roumania. *See* Foreign trade

Rowell, Hon. Newton W. (President of the Privy Council)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 358. War's effect on Canada's national status—Canada and Germany contrasted, 358; Imperial War Conference, 359; Dominions and foreign affairs — Imperial War Cabinet or Council, 360; the Dominion and the Crown — Imperial War Cabinet and Parliament of Canada, 362; Dominions and Prime Minister of Great Britain, direct communication, 365; consulting Parliament, 366; Peace Conference, Canada's representation — League of Nations, 367; Russia, Bolshevism, 368; Canada's war troops, Gen. Sir Arthur Currie, 370

Rowell, Hon. Newton W.—*Con.*
Air Service, mail by, 2036
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Consolidation Bill, 3821-2
Budget, 3401. Victory bonds, 3402; Hon. Mr. Crerar and prices—iron, steel and coal industries, 3405; national debt, 3406; tariff revision, 3407; cost of living and industrial unrest, 3409; Bolshevism, 3412; unity and strength, 3413
Cabinet secrets, alleged revelation of, 3628, 3631
Canadian National Railway, 1747
Public ownership, 1749
Canadian representation at Washington, 2202
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association —oath, 2016
Civil Service
Overmanning of, 4671
Postal workers' correspondence, 2342
War bonus, 2314, 2924-8
Consular officers, payments to, 1900
Dominion Police, pay of, 2925-6
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4576-80
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 2074
Good roads, 4392-5
Government by Order in Council, number of orders passed, 4487
Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3196
Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435
Health, 1366-80
Social and industrial conditions, 1366
Health Department Bill, 843, 1164, 1182-3, 1186-1206
Housing scheme, ministerial explanation, 2532, 2539, 2551-64
Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Ministerial statement, 1044
Naturalization, East Indian immigration, cables and passports, resources of the Empire, Canada's status, War Graves Commission, etc., 1047-70, 4125-6
India, famine in, 2616
International Joint Commission, 1901-4
Lake of the Woods, technical and control boards, 2067
Mounted Police Bill, Senate amdt., 3809
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2026, 4482
Newsprint control, 4663
Ocean rates, 1051, 2069
Paris agency, 1901
Peace Treaty, 2146
Eight-hour day and, 1996, 2044

Rowell, Hon. Newton W.—*Con.*
Pensions
Commission, expenses, 2448
Com., 139
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4172-96, 4199-4208, 4274-99
Resolution and explanation, 4023
Taylor, Mr. John, 3002
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4279
Vote, $28,000,000, 3000-4
Postal Service
Canadian National Railway and mails, 2094
Finance and expenditure, 2032, 2040, 2092
Mail contracts, 2079-81
Ottawa-Pembroke service, 2034
Postage rate, suggested reduction, 2041
Postmasters, substation and rural, 2030
Post Office officials serving overseas, 2040
Rural mail, 2081
Salaries and allowances, 1435, 1794. *See also, under this title,* Winnipeg
Prohibition, 2675-82
Purchasing Commission Bill, 1162, 3195-6, 3223-7, 4441-52
Salaries of Commissioners, res., 3810-6
Railway Act Consolidation, disagreement with Senate, 4160
Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Appropriation accounts tabled, 40
Supply; Ministerial explanation; history of force, war record, etc., 2313-30
Royal Northwest Mounted Police Bill, 2510, 2695-6
St. Lawrence water powers, 1995
St. Lawrence River Power Company, 2396
Shale Oil Company, 1056
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2761-78
Officials, 4674-6
Titles, 2739
Transatlantic mails, Rimouski and Halifax, 929, 1794
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1016
War appropriation; demobilization appropriation, 2564
War Measures Act, Orders in Council under, 4135
War tax on cheques—postage stamps for, 2031-2
War Trade Board, 2072
Washington, Canadian representation; War Mission, 2070, 2076, 2202
Winnipeg strike, 3843-5
Post office employees and, 2508, 3809, 4345

Royal Air Force. *See* War

Royal Assent, 1111, 3213, 4701

Royal Military College building, Clerk of ques. 4377

Royal Naval College, 2850

Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 173, 4672
Appropriation accounts tabled, 40
Supply: Increase of the force; history, war record, etc., 2313

Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2509; 1r., 2532; 2r., com., 2695; 3r., 2752; Senate amdt., 3809, 3823

Royal Society of Canada, report tabled, 138

Rural Credits, 506

Ruthenians, 1938, 3472. *See also* Poles

Ste. Anne de Bellevue, soldiers' hospital, ques. 1212

Ste. Barnabé Island, ques. 4464

St. Catharines Bay and Tadoussac service, 411

St. Charles River
Belanger vs. The King, 1021
Contract for damming, ques. 677
Works, 1279, 2788

Ste. Famille wharf, 2786

St. Gedeon, postmaster, 410, ques. 972

St. John Harbour, 2359

St. John Harbour Commission Bill. Res., 4299; 1r., 2r., com., 4306; 3r., 4339

St. John and Quebec Railway Bills
1. Gagetown and Westfield. 1r., 41; 2r., com., 696; 3r., 784
2. Centreville and Andover. Res., 2567; 1r., 2568; 2r., com., 2799; 3r., 2800

St. Laurent wharf, 2785

St. Lawrence
Coal trade, shipping for, 4335
Dams, 886
North shore, communication, 411
Ship channel, 2608
Water power. *See that title*

St. Lawrence River Power Company, 2396

St. Louis Road property, ques. 604. *See* Gustave

St. Malo Workshops, ques. 1212

Ste. Marie wharf, ques. 1958

St. Pierre-Miquelon mails, 2092

St. Stanislaus Novitiate. *See* Military Service, Guelph

St. Zotique-River Beaudette roadway, ques. 2144

Saguenay and Labrador winter communication, ques. 2565

Salmon Fishing Licenses. *See* Fisheries Act

Salvarsan, sale of, ques. 2144

Sanders, Lieut. J., ques. 3067

Saskatoon public building, 739

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 406. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —French Canadians, 407; enlistment in Chicoutimi and Saguenay, 408; draft evaders—cost of living—woman suffrage, 409; patronage, local postmasters, 410, 412; returned soldiers, 410; North shore communication, 411
Boudreault, Mr. Benjamin, ques. 1439
Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566
L'Hereux, Maj. Napoleon, ques. 978
Military Service Registrar, Montreal, ques. 973
Pariseault, Lt., ques. 884
St. Gedeon, postmaster, ques. 972
Saguenay-Labrador, ques. 2565
Tadoussac-Labrador, ques. 3327

Saw Pit Wharf, 2782

School and Dominion Lands in Taber irrigation district, 4210

Schools, Dominion, non-sectarian, 2403. *See* Education

Schools of Navigation, 2601

Scientific Research. *See* Industrial

Scotch Cove, 2782

Scott, Mr. Frank Stewart (South Waterloo)
Budget, 3302. Siberian expedition—tariff—shoe manufacture, 3302; business profits tax—income tax, 3307; Canada's record, 3309
Canadian National Railway, 2111
Public ownership of railways, 2111

Seaweed, 2787

Secretary of State
Powers of in naturalization. *See* British Nationality
Report tabled, 138

Sedition and Seditious Propaganda Com,, 1956, 3285. *See also* Criminal Code; Immigration; Naturalization

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code

Seed Grain, ques. 979, 2446, 4047, 4054-5

Seed Grain Advances Bill. Res., 625; 1r., 629; 2r., com., 1029; 3r., 1111

Seguin, Mr. Paul Arthur (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
National Service Registration, ques. 1907, ques. 2296

Selkirk, postmaster, ques. 1308

Semolina, 3681

Senate
Cabinet Ministers in, 406, 1002-11
Speaker of, living allowance, 2444

Sergeant-at-Arms, Deputy appointed, 4

Sexsmith, Mr. John Albert (East Peterborough)
Bran and shorts, 4007
Cow testing, 2982
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2465-7
Good roads, 794, 3901
Income tax, farmers and, 3733
Military Service Act, 1323
Oleomargarine, 2982
Pensions, 4184
Railway Act Consolidation — telephone clause, 2644-8, 4168

Seymour Narrows Battery, ques. 975

Shale Oil Company, 929, 1056, 4070

Sharpe, Lieut.-Col. Sam, D.S.O., M.P., death of, 3, 549

Shaughnessy, Lord, 648, 1630, 1820, 1825

Shaw, Mr. Hugh Murray (Macleod)
Budget, 3583

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 78. After-war problems—pensions, 79; franchise, 80; aliens—Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 81; Health Department, 82; public revenues and taxation, 84; Civil Service Commission, 85; Civil Service salaries, 86
Canadian National Railway, 1649
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 1211, 2295
Civil Service
Appointments by Commission, 2633
Reclassification, 2292
Divorce Court Bill, 3785
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4580-3
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 3464
Pensions and disability, ques. 882
Proprietary medicines, 2482
Soothing syrups, 2491
Public Health Bill, 1175, 1182-5, 1205
Public health and social conditions, 1366

Sheard, Mr. Charles—*Con.*
Soldiers' votes, statement of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, 4135
Titles, 2705
Transmission lines on highways; powers of municipalities, 3100, 3117

Shell Oil Company, 929, 1056, 4070

Shipbuilding, 43, 53, 123, 219, 1688, 4682
Canada's achievements for war, 19
"Canadian Volunteer," ques. 3998
George, Right Hon. David Lloyd, opinion of, 2253
Government programme, ques. 613, ques. 644
Vote of $30,000,000, ministerial statement, 2202, 2251
Tariff and, 2217, 2223
Vessels built by Government since 1917, ques. 610

Shipping. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Inter-imperial, 1051
Registration, 2602
Shortage of Canadian tonnage, 2207

Ships. *See* Vessels

Siberian Economic Commission, ques. 613, ques. 747, ques. 1535

Siberian Expedition, 143, 227, 334, 3297, 3741
Alleged imprisonment of Canadian soldiers, 4000
Draftees in, 321
Liquor for, ques. 845
Return of, 971, ques. 1216
Statements by Ministers, 319, 1062

Sick Mariners' Fund, 40, 2615

Sifton, Hon. Arthur Lewis (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Budget, 3260. Hon. Mr. Crerar's resignation, 3260; taxation methods—tariff changes — people seeking special favours — tariff commission, 3261; after-war problems, 3262

Sifton, Sir Clifford, 1908

Signal Service, 2610

Simpson, Mr. Thomas Edward (West Algoma)
Budget, 3565. Canada's debt incurred at home—pensions, 3565; cost of living, 3566; iron and steel industries and the tariff, 3567

Sinclair, Mr. John Ewen (Queen's P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 457. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—highways—public health, 458; production and marketing, 459; P.E.I.

Sinclair, Mr. John Ewen—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
railway, broadening the gauge, 460; fisheries and returning naval men—Orders in Council — deserters — franchise, 461; aliens—national unity, 462
Agricultural Gazette, 2990-1
Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296, ques. 4464
Cold storage, 2983
"Earl Grey," icebreaker, ques. 2145
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2287-9
Good roads, 4434
Greater production grant, ques. 600, ques. 2566
Judges' salaries, 4223
"Minto," icebreaker, ques. 3242
Oyster culture, 2892, 2898
"Prince Edward," car ferry, 4618
Prince Edward Island Railway, 460, ques. 4377
Soldiers at Halifax, 1663

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 51. Mr. McKenzie, leader of the Opposition — late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 51; victory and peace, 52; highways and housing, provincial rights—shipbuilding, 53; Military Service Act, 54; Union government—party, 55; patronage and graft—public loans, 56; food and Food Board—prices—industrial unrest, 57; Civil Service—trade with the United States, 58; efficiency, 60; Government commissions, 61; labour and reconstruction, 62
Air Board Bill, 2051, 2057
Alien enemies, property of, ques. 1535
Amherst
Doctors, payments to, ques. 3377
Internment camp, 2565, 3848
Mineral Water Company, ques. 3997
Anti-loafing, ques. 883
Arisaig Wharf, 2780
Ballantyne's Cove, 1302
Bankruptcy Bill, 2004
Bear River, ques. 3242
Bliss, Dr. C., ques. 3397
Board of Commerce, 4556-8, 4566
British Columbia fishing licenses, 934
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Business Profits Tax, ques. 1791
Canada Food Board, ques. 602
Canada Shipping Act, 3756-7, 3931-7
Canadian Expeditionary Force, ques. 1440, ques. 2798
Canadian Generals, portraits of, ques. 1905

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Canadian Mission in London, ques. 1905
Canadian National Railway
Abandoned lines, 1709
Annual meeting, 1810
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1721
Directors, 1671, 1810
Finance, parliamentary control, 1417, 2124
Fiscal year, 1706
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1676
Steamships, 1681-4
Canadian Northern Railway, net earnings, ques. 2462
Canadian vessels requisitioned by Admiralty, ques. 1908
"Canadian Voyageur," steamer, ques. 1212
"Canadian Warrior," steamer, ques. 3327, ques. 3470, ques. 4241
Canals
Positions on, and returned soldiers, 3177
Welland, deepening of, 3181-4
Canso
Distressed seamen, 2614
Harbour master, 3158
Cars and rails, contracts for, ques. 1907
Censorship, Hazel Hill and Canso, ques. 847
Civil Service
Appointments, 963
Commissioners, 2909, 2916
Efficiency, 1559
Overmanning of, 4672
Combines, 4570, 4592-7
Copyright, 4022
Dominion Elections Act, 4621, 4629, 4648-51
Dominion Parks, sites in Western Nova Scotia, 2304
Dominion water powers, 2513, 2515
Duchemin, Mr. H. P., ques. 1536, ques. 1791
Economic Commission to Siberia, ques. 1535
Economy, 4051, 4673
Experimental Farms, 2977
Fair wage officer, Nova Scotia, ques. 1907
Farm tractors, ques. 1536, ques. 2048
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2286-9, 2464-6
Fish and Fisheries
Compulsory inspection, 951
Lobsters, 714-726, 2894, 2899, 2900
Oysters, 2894
Protection service, 2848
Salmon (Fisheries Act Amdt.), 3758-61
Twine and cordage, 3708
Waste, utilization of, 3341
Foreign credits, Italy, 3831-3
Fort Lawrence, dredging, ques. 3680

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Freight rates
Farmers and, 3698
Raw sugar, on, 3471
Gold, prohibition of export, 1103
Goodwin, Dr. B. E., ques. 4070, ques. 4465
Gordon. Hon. Major Rev. C. W., ques. 1440
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 702-7, 938-9
Government-owned vessels, 974-5, ques. 1306
Grand Etang, 2609
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1185
Guysborough public building, ques. 846
Halifax
Harbour master, 2802
Pilotage rate, 2694
Terminals, ques. 2398
Heatherton-Canso mail route, 2090
"Helena," motor boat, ques. 3998
Homestead entries, ques. 751
House of Commons—questions and returns, 648
Housing scheme, 2562
Immigration Act Amdt.
Discharged seamen, 1979
Illiterates, 1966
Penalty on transportation complaints, 1978
Immigration and Colonization Department, 2572
Income war tax, 3717-8, 3725
Losses, 3991
Unmarried women, 3993
Intoxicating liquors, illegal handling of, ques. 883, 960
Judges
County Court, 1769, ques. 2565
Salaries, 4375
Land values tax, 3839
Lands for school purposes, ques. 848
Live stock shipments, 2603
Livingstone's Cove, 2780-1
Loans, public, 4242
$100,000,000, cost of, ques. 1907
Lobster, canned, 714-726
"McKee," steamer, ques. 1212, ques. 2397
Marine hospitals, 1201
Marine rates, ques. 4241
Matches, stamps on, 969
Military Service
Deserters and absentees, ques. 879
Expenditure, ques. 973
Guelph Novitiate, 1248
Militia
Pensions, 2759
Permanent force, 2986
Morris, Col., ques. 2565
Mulgrave services, 1302, 1304
National harbours, 3743-4

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
National Parks, 4051-2
Naturalization, 4270-2
Naval recruiting in Prince Edward Island, ques. 646
Naval Service, 2836
Bronze Star, ques. 602
Discharge of men, fisheries needing help, 1959
New Harbour breakwater, 2783
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1564, 2021-3
Old-age pensions, 1268
Parliament Buildings, 2334
Patriotic Fund, 1164
Pensions, 4188, 4199
"Unmarried wife," 4281
Pictou Island, 2793
Pilotage, 2612, 2803, 2804, 2807, 3159
Port Felix custom house, 956
Postage rate
Letters, suggested reduction, 2041
Newspapers, ques. 727
Post Office supplies, 2091
"Prince George," steamer, ques. 746
Provident Fund Act, ques. 2045
Provincial subsidies, ques. 744
Public Health Department, 1191
Appointments, 1182
Public Works, Nova Scotia, 2781
Purchasing Commission, 3230, 3238-9, 4454
Railway Act Consolidation — telephones, 4167
Railway crossings, 936
Railways, subventions to, ques. 604
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 709-713
Rideau Junction townsite, ques. 2398
Royal Naval College, 2850
Rural postmasters, ques. 1536
St. John Harbour Commission, 4302-3, 4337-8
Seed grain, 627, 1035-40
Shipbuilding, 1688, 2211, 2259-61, 4683-4
England, in, cost of, 2213
Permanency in Canada, 2260
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1770-2
Soldiers' Settlement Board, 1075
Soldiers' Land Settlement
Nova Scotia loans, ques. 847
Solicitors, ques. 883
Statistics Act Amdt., 596
Steamship services, 1283, 1284
Steam shovels for Militia Dept., ques. 1907
Taxation, statistics of, 3839
Technical education, 3167-73, 3793, 3896
Telephone companies, 2646
Trawlers
Built in Canada, 2213
Sale of, ques. 751

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
"T. J. Drummond," steamer, purchase of, ques. 2397
War Purchasing Commission, ques. 1216
War Trade Board, 2073
Weights and measures, 2149
"Willihad," steamer, ques. 616
Wine Harbour, 2783
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 2603-5

Slate River, 3191

Slides and Booms, 4607

Smart, Brig.-Gen., charges by, 1099, 1483

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Daylight Saving, 893

Social Hygiene Conference, ques. 3068

Social Welfare. *See* Public Health

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 81, 1896, 4673
Department of
Allowances; vocational training, 2776
Buildings, etc., vocational training, 2764
Deputy Minister, 3586
Director of Medical Services, resignation of, Col. F. McKelvey Bell, 3240, 3422, 3472, 3926, 4674
Hospitals, 2774
Maintenance of patients, 2770
Officials without overseas record, 4240
Parliamentary Secretary, resignation of, Mr. F. B. McCurdy, 185, 974, 4676
Report tabled, 270
Representation in House of Commons, 974
Staff and salaries, 2761, 2772, ques. 4240, 4479

Soldiers' Land Settlement, 88, 96, 153, 185, 300, 323, 343, 395, 413, 446, 588
Board, ques. 1075
Salaries, 2452
Solicitors, ques. 883
Land from forest reserves, 2953
Offers of land, ques. 610
Royal Air Force, inclusion of, 1437
Santa Lucia, troops at, ques. 615
See also Soldiers' Land Settlement Bill; Dominion Lands and Parks; Dominion Forest; Reclamation

Soldiers' Land Settlement Bill, 1616. 1r., 2291; 2r., com., 3848, 4012; 3r., 4073
Board of Commissioners, 3873
Compulsory purchase, 2875
Default, resale, 3882-4
Exemption from seizure under ordinary laws, 3885
Free soldier grants, 3879, 4014
Garden villages, 4012. *See that title*

Soldiers' Land Settlement—*Con.*
Indian reserves, land from, 3875, 4015
Lands sold to Board free of commission, 3891
Liens, statement of, 3888
Loans on stock, fruit trees, etc., 3890, 4014
Regulations, 4014
School lands, 3879
Security, 3887
Surveys, 3890
Taxation, 3888
Title to land, 3874

Soothing Syrups. *See* Proprietary

Sowden, Mr. Felix M., ques. 729

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)
Living allowance, 2445
Rulings and statements of
Adjournment—matter of urgent public interest—leave to discuss (Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt's charges), 1099, 1101
Appeal from decision to House—Daylight Saving, 1432
Bills
Introduction, unprinted, not in order, 3754
Motion to commit, limits of debate on, 2617
Second reading, limits of discussion, 3200, 3818, 4506-9
Chair to be addressed, 3639
Committees
Appointment of members opposed to principle, 1482
Reference in House to proceedings of, 3590, 3603
Report of—to be accepted as regular, 4313, 4320
Amendment of, procedure in, 2722
Clerical errors, correction of, 2616
Daylight Saving
Motion, form of, 928
Time of meeting of House under, 1432
Debate, special latitude of, 4141
Debating same subject twice—Mr. McMaster's amdt. to the Budget allowed, 3260, 3677
Divisions—not needed if no contrary voice, 4527
Galleries of House, 1910
Internal Economy, Board of, report under Rule 9, 605
Language: "defraud the electors," 1325; "culprit," 1326; "miserable, cowardly slander," 1334
Lapsed order
Member speaking at time of lapse continues only by consent, 399
Reinstatement, motion for, not debatable, 398

Speaker (Hon. Edward N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements—*Con.*
Member speaking may not interrogate another, 3638
Motions, form of, 2722
Withdrawal of, 1259
Newspapers referring to proceedings of the House, 3660
Orders of the Day: appropriateness of discussion on calling, 271, 318, 357, 2201, 2202, 2294, 2399, 3472, 3473, 4239, 4335
Attack on Government not in order, 3194
Questions only, no debate, 1435, 1483
Reading of document, 1711
Privilege
Address instead of message from Senate, 642
Limitation of speech, on rising to, 1998
Procedure under general resolution takes precedence over procedure subsequently set, 398
Question in interruption of speaker, 275-6
Questions and answers
Answers not debatable, 648
Copies, supplying of, 612, 647
Reading of documents from outside criticising members of House, 1488
Reconsideration, 4140
Relevancy, 643, 878, 1330, 1335, 1337, 1382, 4146, 4150, 4167, 4506
Senate
Amdts., advisability of form of, 4153, 4157
Non-concurrence in, form of motion, 3810
Conference with, no suspension of sitting of House, 3948-9
Message to, motion not debatable, 4170
Reflection upon proceedings of, 4148, 4154
Six months' hoist, 903
Unanimous consent, 936, 1479, 2653, 3175, 4140
Bill, amdt. on. 3r., 696
Necessary, resuming speech on lapsed order, 399.
Written speeches, 117

Stacey, Mr. Frank Bainard (*Fraser Valley)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 412. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—party government, 412; Soldiers' Land Settlement, 413; Indian reserves—rural mail carriers and postmasters, 414—amdts. to B.N.A. Act—national unity, 415

Stacey, Mr. Frank Bainard—*Con.*
Budget, 3390. Farmers and the tariff, 3390; after-war troubles, 3391; industrial unrest, 3392; reasons for vote, 3394
Representation Act Amdt., 4, 727
Soldiers' Land Settlement
Compulsory purchase—Indian reserves—amdt., 3875-9, 4016
Payments, 3882

Stamp Taxes, alleged abuses under, 334

Standardization, Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 3842

Standing Orders, Com. appointed, 112

Starrar, Mr. Hall, ques. 616

Statistics
Imperial, 1057
Industrial, 1917, tabled, 550

Statistics Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 139; 2r., com., 595; 3r., 625

Stead, Mr. R. J. E., appointment, 280

Steamship Services
Australia and New Zealand, 1105
Baddeck and Iona, 1296
France, service advocated, 1291
Freight services, 1285
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
Grand Manan, 1301
Great Britain, ques. 1107, 1282
Gulf of St. Lawrence, ques. 3827
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1301
Liverpool, 1294
Magdalen Islands-Pictou, 623
Need of, 1290-6
Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, 1303
Newfoundland, 1283, 1294
Petit de Grat and Mulgrave, 1303
Petitcodiac and Cumberland, 1303
Pictou and Montague, 1304
Pictou, New Glasgow and Mulgrave, 1304
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, 1304
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or, 1304
Railway subsidies vs. steamship, 1296
South Africa, 1289, 1291
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
West Indies and South America, 1283

Steam shovels for Militia Department, ques. 1907

Steel Plate Plant, Dominion Steel Company, 2209, 2251-60

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 96. Returned soldiers—land settlement, 96; Liberal party—Union government—public health, 97; immigration, 99

*Name changed: formerly Westminster District. *See* pp. 4, 625, 727

Steele, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Canada Food Board, ques. 2750
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 2015
Civil Service, Committee to inquire into efficiency of, 1554
Daylight Saving, 911
Divorce, 3781, 3790
Famine in India, 2616
Fish, Canadian, marketing overseas, ques. 2750
Immigration
Medical examination of passengers, 1974
Prohibiting certain classes, 1924
Mail contractors, 2088
Mennonites in Ontario, 1925
Orders in Council, number passed, ques. 2145
Parliament Buildings, 2337
Portland cement, duty on, ques. 1612
Proprietary medicines, 2479-81, 2485, 3826, 3938
Opium and derivatives, 2489-92
Public Health Bill, 1189
Child welfare, 1375
Rural postmasters, 2089

Stefansson Expedition, 2849

Stevens, Mr. Henry Herbert (Vancouver Centre)
Air Board Bill, 2051
Board of Commerce, 4470
Budget, 3315. Foreign credits—tariff, 3316; war and protection, 3318; high cost of living, 3319; coal duties and freight rates, 3329
Canada Grain Act Amdt.—grain trade, operation of elevators, 3947-9, 4077-84, 4090
Chinese immigration, ques. 751
Civil Service, appointment of returned soldiers, 281
Combines, 4569
Copper refineries, 1106
Daylight Saving, 911
Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, ques. 604
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 872
Foreign trade—credits and ships, 2167, 3835
Grain on Great Lakes, ques. 599
Immigration, restrictions, 769-773
Judges, County Court, 2954
Judges' salaries, British Columbia, 2305, 2310
Mounted Police, service in Northwest Rebellion, 2322
Panama Canal, trade via, 1283
Railway Act Consolidation; transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3083

Stevens, Mr. Henry Herbert—*Con.*
Telephone companies, 2646
Transatlantic flight of Hawker, 2564
Vancouver harbour, 4021
Vancouver pension office, ques. 3377
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1011, 1020

Stewart, Mr. John A. (Lanark)
Insurance Act Amdt.—"actuary," 3987
Judges and income tax, 4230
Prohibition, 2351, 2356
Proprietary medicines, 2480-2, 2486
Coal tar derivatives and opium, 2490
Purchasing Commission, 4450

Stewart, Mr. Thomas Joseph (West Hamilton)
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 4345
Railway Act Consolidation
Commission's control of rates, 4142
Reconsideration of clause 325 objected to, 2929, 4140
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2943
Telephone companies, 2650

Stewart, Maj.-Gen. J. W., 2868

Stock Feed, purchase of, 2447

Stock Yards. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill

Strikes. *See* Industrial Unrest

Submarine, gift to Canada, 229, ques. 2868

Sugar, raw, freight rates on, 3471, 4683

Supply, Com. of, ordered, 592

Supply, 842, 954, 1044, 1105, 1262, 1282, 1483, 1588, 1886, 2016, 2067, 2202, 2251, 2291, 2313, 2359, 2440, 2493, 2761, 2780, 2808, 2887, 2952, 2959, 3175, 3827, 4033, 4475, 4601, 4664

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supreme Court
Chief Justice, allowances to. *See* Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles
Final appeal, 1059

Surveys, 4049-51, 4055
Geodetic, 4045
Military, 1899

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Air Board Bill, 2060
Board of Commerce, 4512
Civil Service
Efficiency, 1561
Transfers, 1269
War bonus, 2929
Daylight Saving, 896
Good roads, 3904

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Grain trade—elevators and mills, 4091
Immigration, 1884, 1910, 2595
Industrial unrest, causes of, 2929
Labourers needed, 3905
Live Stock Amdt. Bill—price of butter, 2064-5
Mail contractors and city postmen, 2081
Noxious weeds, 4091
Pensions Board; appointments and returned soldiers, ques. 605
Public Health Bill, appointments, 1184
Railway Act
Senate amdts., telephones, 2645-50, 4154
Rural mail delivery and closing of offices, 2086-7, 2928
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2767-9
Terminal elevators, ques. 880
Titles, 1478
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 995

Sweeney, Cpl. George, ques. 3067

Sydney Wharf, 4613

Taber Irrigation District Bill. 1r., 3997; 2r., com., 4210; 3r., 4211

Tadoussac-Labrador winter communication, ques. 3327

Tariff. *See also* Address; Budget; Taxation
Boots and shoes from United States, ques. 978
Commission, 311, 484
Implements and raw materials, 142, 514
Luxuries, on, ques. 749
Proposed amdt. of Mr. McMaster, 794

Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066

Taxation. *See also* Address; Budget; Tariff
Commissioner of, 2798
Staff of, 3712
Methods, 830
Provincial taxation of Dominion lands, 709

Taylor, John, pension case of, 3001

Taylor, Senator George, death of, 885

Technical Education Bill. Res., 3164; 1r., 3175; 2r., com., 3791, 3891; 3r., 4136
Question as to time of presenting, 1616

Telegraphs and Telephones
Government, 4608
Nova Scotia, 2793

Thanksgiving Day Bill. 1r., 1305-6

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 298. Union government, 298; Orders in Council, 299; women's franchise—Opposition leader—land for soldiers—immigration, 300; Health Department—foreign trade, 301; highways—aerial navigation and Canada's great hinterland, 302; world commerce via Canada by airship, 305; Canada's lead in great enterprises, 306
Immigration, medical examination, 1975
Mining machinery, 3692
Naturalization, 4273
Red Cross Society, 3168
Scientific Research, 4462
Shale oils, 3692-3
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2763-4, 2766, 2771
Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070
Yukon Act Amdt., 503-5
Yukon Placer Mining Amdt., 629-632
Yukon, wheat growing, 2973

Thompson, Lt.-Col. Alfred, M.P., ques. 747

Thompson, Mr. Thomas Henry (Hastings East)
Daylight Saving, 906
Income tax, 3714-5

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Air Board Bill, 2057
Board of Commerce, 4568
Budget, 3579. Representative government, 3579; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 3580; free trade or protection, 3581; income tax, 3582
Judges and income tax, 4234
Naturalization, 4263
Prohibition, 2682-4
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 823
Titles, 2739

Timber purchases in Canada, 1361

Time. *See* Daylight Saving

Titles
Address to His Majesty the King, motion for (Mr. Nickle), 1441
Amdt., appointment of Special Com. (Mr. J. D. Reid), 1464
Amdt., to change phraseology (Sir Thomas White), 1479; agreed to on div., 1481
Committee report, 2359
Correction, 2615
Day fixed for discussion, 2617
Motion to adopt (Mr. Nickle), 2696; agreed to on div., 2749
Amdt. (Mr. Nicholson, Algoma), 2722; neg. on div., 2749
Address to the King acknowledged by H.E. the Governor General, 3377

Tobin, Mr. Edmund William (Richmond and Wolfe)
"Bayfield," steamer, ques. 608
Boots and shoes from United States, ques. 978
Canada Registration
Persons registered and cost, ques. 728
Use made of information, ques. 728
Canadian National Railway, ties, 3900
Commanders Thurston and Seddon, ques. 608
Grand Trunk Provident Fund, ques. 1213
Kingsmill, Admiral, visit to Victoria, ques. 1340
Kohn, Mr. Louis, Secretary, Economic Commission to Siberia, ques. 747
Land grants to railways, ques. 975
Members of Parliament, sessional indemnity, ques. 749
"Mildred McColl," H.M.C.S., ques. 747
Military Service Act
Defaulters, ques. 883
Exemptions, ques. 1108
Expenditure, ques. 645
Men of 19 years, registration of, ques. 615
Police employed, ques. 972, ques. 973
Regulations in force, ques. 646
Militia, permanent force, 3984
Montreal terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
Naval air bases, ques. 1532
Naval Service, Canadian ratings in Grand Fleet, ques. 608
Ottawa
Central Station, ques. 1213
Federal Hotel, lease of, ques. 2045
Proprietary medicines war tax, ques. 1107
Seed grain, ques. 979, 1030
Soldiers' Land Settlement, ques. 610
"Stadacona," H.M.C.S., ques. 747

Tolmie, Mr. Simon Fraser (Victoria City)
Air Service
Air Board Bill, 2060
Aviation in Canada, ques. 1340
Mails by, 2036
Budget, 3569. Tariff and Japanese competition—development of natural resources, 3570; labour unrest, 3571; dairy products, beef and pork, 3572; British embargo on Canadian cattle, 3573
Cold storage, 2986
Good roads, 4429
Judges' salaries, 2958
Live stock, pure-bred sires, 2995
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2988
Wrecking plants, 2605

Toronto
Deputy Postmaster, 161, 276
Euclid Hall as hospital, ques. 749
Harbour improvements, 2363
Letter carriers, 1341

Toronto and Niagara Power Company. *See* Railway Act Consolidation; Electric and Power Companies

Toronto Suburban Railway, ques. 1678

Tourist Traffic, 4046-53

Town Planning and garden villages, 761. *See also* Housing

Tractors, ques. 1536, ques. 2048

Trade
Commission and Commissioners, ques. 664, ques. 1905, 3831, 4493
Development of, $150,000 vote, 3840
Discrimination in Britain, alleged, 72, 115, 140, 229
Embargo, 567
Export, reference in Speech from the Throne, 2
Exports and Imports, report tabled, 550
Foreign, and credit, 3831-7
France, 1099
Italy, 3808
Japan, 4019
Roumania, 1110, 1615-8, ques. 3241
Sir Clifford Sifton and, 1908
United States, 58
Great Britain, trade with and credits to, 1353-61

Trade and Commerce Dept., 335, 4605

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 293. Peace Conference, Canada's representation — Civil Service Commission, 293; reconstruction — resignation of Parliamentary Under Secretary—returned soldiers, 294; pensions—censorship, 295; industrial unrest—women's franchise and election—Government labour and social programme, 296; tariff, 297; national unity, 298
Budget, 3394. Finance and currency, 3394; remedies for existing difficulties, 3397; tariff, 3398; income tax, 3399; real wealth, 3401
Industrial Relations Commission, 4621
Public Health, 1186, 1376
Social welfare, child welfare, 1200-5
Technical education, 3792

Transatlantic Flight, ques. 2143, 2564

Trnsatlantic mail service, 1711, 1794

Transcontinental Highway, 1401

Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Transmission Lines on highways. *See* Railway Act

Trawlers
Building and use of, ques. 746
Sale of, ques. 751
T-30, ques. 975, ques. 2397, 3472

Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880

Trudel, Mr. Alfred, ques. 2921

Tuberculosis and Indians, 4062

Tuck, Mr. Donald, 279

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 307. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —Opposition leadership, 307; Canada's soldiers — League of Nations — tariff, 308; reciprocity, 309; manufacturers—expenditures on Government railways, 310; taxation — tariff commission—War-time Elections Act, 311; highways—printers in Militia Department plant, 312
Budget, 3262. Procrastination charged, 3262; finance, 3263; cost of living, 3264; customs and other taxes, 3265; naval policy, 3266; Canada and free trade, 3268
Canadian National Railway
Lines to be included, 1682
Term of office of directors—vacancy—annual meeting, 1814
Gloucester, fisheries officer, 2893
Guelph Novitiate, 1253
Lobsters and hatcheries, 723, 2901-2
Marshall, Lieut. Hall, ques. 1790
Petit Rocher as site for experimental farm, 2965
Technical education, 3170

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas Mitchell March (West Calgary)
"Belgian-Canada," 2587
Canadian National Railway, 1832
Daylight Saving, 926
Divorce Court Bill, 3780
Dominion Parks, 4053
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4586
Frozen beef, 1287
Highways, 790
Immigration
Deported conspirators, 1950
Hutterites, 1876, 1941
Illiterates, 1963
Offices in the West, 2588
Prohibiting certain classes, 1940

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas Mitchell March—*Con.*
Judges' salaries, 2308, 2312
Post office appointments after strike, 4354
Post office officials enlisted, 2040
Public Health, social welfare, 1192
Railway Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3120
Railway branch lines, 792
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1001
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2324
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2947

Ukrainians, 1933, 1937, 2343, 3472. *See also* Poles, Ruthenians

Unforeseen Expenses, report tabled, 138

Uniats, 1384

United States
Canada's relations with, 153
Canadians entering and returning, 1110
Immigration legislation in, 2281
Prohibition in, 2659
Trade with. *See* Foreign trade
War and, 14, 117

Units of Electrical Measure Bill. 1r., 139; 2r., com., 713; 3r., 784

Universal Military Training 1891

Unprovided Items, 2461

Vancouver District Pension Office, ques. 3377

Vancouver Harbour Bill. Res., 3742; 1r., 3757; 2r., com., 4017; 3r., 4021

Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070

Vaudreuil-Soulanges mail, ques. 2566

Venereal Disease, 1373. *See also* Public health

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Canadian National Railway, labour representation, 2138
Dominion Police—Henri Bourdon, ques. 1440
Military Service Act, M.D. No. 4, ques. 1438
Public health, 1377

Vessels
Canadian, requisitioned by Admiralty, ques. 1908
Cold storage on steamers, ques. 882
Government-owned, ques. 1306
Employees on, ques. 609
How engaged, ques. 974
Names
"A. J. McKee," ques. 1212, ques. 2397
"Alert," The, 966
"Bayfield," steamer, ques. 608

Vessels—*Con.*
Names—*Con.*
"Brant," steamer, 2607
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 608, 746
"Canadian Volunteer," ques. 3998
"Canadian Voyageur," steamer, ques. 1212
"Canadian Warrior," ques. 3327, ques. 3470, ques. 4241
"Champlain," steamer, ques. 616, 2006
"Earl Grey," icebreaker, ques. 2145
"Helena," ques. 3998
"Hochelaga," steamer, ques. 606, ques. 609
"Lady Evelyn," steamer, ques. 3680
"Lottie Russell,' steamer, ques. 746
"Mildred McColl," H.M.C.S., ques. 747
"Montcalm," steamer, ques. 1978, 2607
"Montmagny," C.G.S., ques. 1613
"Princess," steamer, ques. 615, ques. 3680
Steamer to replace, 2797
"Prince George," steamer, ques. 746
"Stadacona," H.M.C.S., ques. 747, ques. 880
"Tyrian," steamer, 2793-4
"Tuna," steamer, ques. 746, ques. 1905
"T. J. Drummond," ques. 2397
"T-30," trawler, ques. 975, ques. 2397, 3472
"Willihad," steamer, ques. 617

Vickers, Limited, trawlers built by, 2214

Victoria, Astrophysical observatory, 4045

Victory Loan. *See also* Budget
Cost of (1918), ques. 2798
Montreal brokers, ques. 1612
$50 bonds, ques. 2047

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lobtinière)
Board of Commerce, 4507, 4531-2, 4561-4
Canadian National Railway
Capital stock, 1776, 1853
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1765-9
Directors, 1783
Securities of other companies, 1781
Circulation and reserve, ques. 614
Cost of Living Com., 4309
Dominion Parks, expropriations for, 2302
Enlistments and conscriptions, ques. 614
Federal district, 4385
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Force contracts, Government policy in, 1603-9
Gold shipments, ques. 614
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 693, 1112, 1261
Judges' salaries and duties, 2311
Lévis station, 2458

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Loans, taxed and tax-free, 2246-8
Mineral claims on Dominion lands, 2298-9, 2300-01
Railway crossings, 937-8
St. Charles River works, 1023
Schools and religious teaching, 2404
Shipbuilding, ques. 613
Soldiers' dependents, payments to, ques. 644
Telegraphs and telephones, 4609
War expenditure ($350,000,000), transportation, 2243

Vimy Ridge, 1058

Vocational Training. *See also* Technical Education
Governor General's Speech, 2
Soldiers, of. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Under-age soldiers, for, 1011

Votes and Proceedings. *See* House

Voters' Lists, provincial, 2446

Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties, 3707

Wallace, Mr. Thomas George (West York)
Railway Act Consolidation, 2620, 2642
Telephone companies, 2642, 2650

War
Aerial craft and forces, 1263, 2866
Commanders Thurston and Seddon, ques. 608
Royal Air Force, ques. 646, ques. 1611
Argyll House. *See, under this title,* Overseas administration, Headquarters Staff in London
Armistice, 1
Prolonged, 111, 550
Battles
St. Julien, Cambrai, Mons, 205, 337, 464-7
Ypres, second battle, 545
Belgium, restoration of, cablegram, 1955
British Remount Commission, ques. 976
Canada's record, 201, 420, 499. *See also, under this head,* Overseas Administration
Canadian Army Dental Corps, 2871
Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2869-71
Canadian Cavlary Brigade, 2866
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 388, ques. 1307
Enlistments in, ques. 2904
Files, mislaid, ques. 1108
Religion and nationality, ques. 3998
Resolution of gratitude, 4696
Rifles and ammunition, 338, 1614
Routine orders tabled, 40

War—*Con.*
Canadian Field Comforts Association, 2874
Canadian Military Y.M.C.A., 2874
Canadian Officers' Club, 2874
Canadian Railway Troops, 2868
Canadian Red Cross Society. *See that title*
Canadian War Contingents Association, 2874
Casualties. *See also under this head,* Overseas Administration
Canadians as prisoners of war, ques. 1077
French Canadians, ques. 644
Chaplains, 2871
Correspondence, production not in public interest, 753
Currie, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Arthur. *See that title*
Decorations for Canadians, 327, 339, 2861
Demobilization, 118, 207, 322, 501, 1058, 4535
"Aquitania," SS., port of landing, 2292
Farmers' sons, 1958
Men in garrison, 2236
Ministerial statements, 1793, 2861, 2874
Plans. *See below,* Overseas Administration
Port of landing, 2402
Progress of, 971
Strikes delaying, 3741
Troops awaiting embarkation, entertainment and occupation for, 648
Deserters, ques. 879. *See below,* Military Service
Director of Military Estates, 2871
Enlistment
Chicoutimi and Saguenay, 408
Quebec, 443
Expenditures, ques. 2798. *See also* Budget; War Expenditures Bill
Summary by Departments, 1345
Vouchers for overseas payments, 1710, 1789, 1865
Forestry Corps, 2869
German fleet, 266, 1289
Germany's surrender, 1
Hospitals
Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296
Doullens, bombing of, 2870
Etaples, bombing of, 2870
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, ques. 1212
St. Dunstan's Hostel, 2874
Troyes, 2871
Imperial Munitions Board. *See that title*
Indemnity
Cable from Prime Minister, 928
Canada's claim, 450, 773, 929
I.O.D.E. Clubs, 2874
Khaki University, 2873
"Llandovery Castle," sinking of, 2870
War—*Con.*
Maple Leaf Clubs, 2874
Medical Service, financial administration, 2885
Memorials
Building, ques. 1216
Scholarships, 340
Ypres memorial, 4465
Military Service. *See also* Military Service Act
Conscientious objectors, 372
Conscripted men in active service, ques. 610
Defaulters and slackers, 263, 418
Cost and control of registration, ques. 610
Enlistments and conscriptions, ques. 614
Hull, Pontiac and Wright, ques. 602, ques. 603
Totals May-December, 1917, ques. 609
Registration and men of 19 years, ques. 615
Naval Service
Boys in, ques. 607
British Admiralty and, ques. 603
Bronze Star for, ques. 602
Canadians in British Grand Fleet, ques. 606, ques. 608
Coast protection, ques. 745, 1263
Courts-martial, ques. 607, ques. 1534
Increase of pay, ques. 607
Newfoundland ratings in, ques. 606
Prize money, ques. 607
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, ques. 603
Nursing Sisters, 2870
Overseas Administration
Canada's forces at the front, organization of, 204
Brigades and divisions, 2865
Canadian troops, control and administration, 2858
Outside Canadian corps in France, numbers, 2858
Canadian war records, 2043, 2872
Decorations won by Canadians, 2861
Canadians for Mesopotamia, Palestine, North Russia, 2860
Charges by Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 513, 522, 575, 1483
Base Commandant at Dunkirk, records of, ques. 1216
Cinematograph films, 2872
Demobilization, 2857, 2874
Documents, 2878
England, discharges in, 2861
Steamship accommodation, 2877
French Canadian Brigade, 150, 331
Headquarters Staff in London, 2879
Names, 2880

War—*Con.*
Overseas Administration—*Con.*
History of operations, forthcoming, 2857
Mails for soldiers, 2864
Ministerial statement — Sir Edward Kemp, 2856-87
New organizations in active service, 2859
Overseas Military Council, 2860
Overseas Purchasing Comm., 2871
Stores, horses, etc., disposition of, 2862
Trophies, 2043, 2864
Paintings, 2872
Paris Conference. *See* Peace; Reconstruction
Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic
Pay Corps, 2871
Provinces, respective war records, 265
Records and documents, preservation of, 330. *See also under this head,* Overseas Administration
Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904
Rifles, Canadian and Lee-Enfield, 1614
Roumanian border, proposed guard by Canadians, 1618
Royal Automobile Club, 2874
Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Cavalry squadron to Siberia, 2316
Siberian Expedition. *See that title*
Soldiers. *See also that title*
Canadian, and British public opinion, 468
Canadian Generals, portraits of, ques. 1905
Canadian, in Ireland, ques. 849
Canadian, in Imperial service, 1997
Canadian, in Russia, ques. 1216
Casualties, 2873
Censorship of letters, 1663
Complaints, alleged suppression of, 1618
Crucifixion of Canadian by, Germans 2872
Dependents, ques. 644
Widowed mother, ques. 1908
Equipment allowances for officers, ques. 1663
Furloughs in France, 271
German-Canadians, 376
Gratuity, war service, 343, ques. 1791, ques. 4241
Irregularities
Camp disturbances, 2876, 2886
Kinmel (*see that title*) 357, 424, 437
Trials and sentences overseas, 1029, 1163, 1434, 1435, 1959, 3469, 3470
Parade in London, 2874
Pay and Allowance Board, ques. 3998
Pensions. *See that title*
Prisoners in Germany, 2873
Regulars vs. Irregulars, 200

War—*Con.*
Soldiers—*Con.*
Returned, 95, 105, 135, 159, 177, 183, 187, 222, 294, 328, 353, 410, 418, 445, 548
Civil Service and, 280, 291, 962
Positions for wounded: motion (Mr. McCurdy), 981; withdrawn, 1002; amdt. (Mr. Morphy), 998; withdrawn, 1002
Community life and, 768
Disability, industrial, Government insurance against, 994
Employment of, 218, 1607
Garden villages for, 761
Halifax, at, discharge or leave for, 1663, 1711
Land settlement, 502
"Northland" inquiry, report tabled, 111
Occupation for, 764
Officers, rank in militia after peace, 1890
Paralytic patients, ques. 749
Parliament, in, 473
Portland, reported debarkation at, ques. 647
Repatriation, cost of Committee, ques. 613
Technical education, 756
Treatment of, Government policy respecting, 753
Usurious practices against, ques. 977
Vocational training, 502
Quebec, province, in, ques. 971
Under-age soldiers and, 1011
Service medal, ques. 883
Sickness and disability
Influenza patients, ques. 845
Patients in England, ques. 615
Total disability, ques. 1213
The honoured dead
Bodies, ques. 1107
Graves, 332, 2861
Votes, 3135
War record of Canadian soldiers, 308. *See also, under this head,* Overseas Administration
Trophies, 1349, 2864
Universities, work of, 2870
United States, part in, 14, 117
Units
Princess Patricia's C. L. Infantry, 550, ques. 616
22nd Battalion, demobilization of, 1616
War Service button, 343
Women's work, 388, 470

War Credits in Europe, 1352. *See also* Trade

War Expenditures Bill ($350,000,000). Res., 1343; 1r., 1366; 2r., com., 2166; 3r., 2343

War Graves Commission, 1057, 1061

War Measures Act, 1163
Orders in Council passed under, 4135
Powers under, 652

War Measures Act Extension Bill. 1r., 1433; 2r., 1566, 2097, 2148

War Purchasing Commission, ques. 1216, 3198, 3202, 4307
Letter from Canadian firm criticizing, 3236

War Revenue Act, violation of, ques. 1791

War Service Gratuities, 4241

War-time Elections Act. *See* Address; Ukrainians; Franchise

Washington, representation of Canada at, 1074, 2070-9, 2201

Water-borne Traffic, control of rates, 2929. *See* Railway Act Amdt.

Waterhen Lake, reclamation, 709

Water-power, development and export, 1599-1600
French River, 1077
Lake Nipissing, 1341
St. Lawrence River, 886, 1796, 1901-4, 1956
Documents to be printed, 1995
St. Lawrence River Power Co., 2396

Water Supply. *See* Public health

Ways and Means, Com. of, 592, 3081, 2952, 4689

Weights and Measures, salaries of inspectors, ques. 2296

Weights and Measures Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 952; 1r., 954; 2r., com., 2149; amdt. (Mr. Jacobs), 2151; agreed to, 2158; 3r., 2290-1; Senate amdts., 4021

Welland Canal, 1592-1610
Contracts to be laid on the table, 1609

West Indies, ques. 1533
Cable, 3840

Westman, Mr. Eldon, Toronto, 277

Westminster. *See* Representation Act

Wharves, piers, breakwaters, 40

Wheat
Crop and prices, 1919, 3471, 4466
Export, ques. 1790
Financing crop, 977
Flour duties, 2681
Free, 3706
Greece, contract for, ques. 2907
Market for, 1711
Ships to carry, 2259, 2261
United States' crop, 2259

Wheeler, Mr. Seager, wheat specialist, 2970-2

Whidden, Mr. Howard Primrose (Brandon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 221. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 221; aliens—Liberal party—returned soldiers, 222; housing—prohibition, 223; public health—vocational education, 224
Budget, 3422. Mr. Cannon, 3422; industrial unrest, 3423; tariff reductions, 3425; reasons for vote, 3426
Canadianizing immigrants, 1924
Immigrants, undesirable, 1923
Peace Treaty, 1382
Prohibition, 2669
Technical education, 3800

White, Hon. Sir Thomas, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Finance). *See also* Leader of the House
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 27. Leader of Opposition—mover and seconder, 27; war and victory—Peace Conference, 28; Germany must pay—demobilization and reconstruction, 29; unemployment — construction of railways—housing, 30; export trade—highways—franchise—House of Commons, 31; League of Nations—party government, 32
Agricultural implements—duties on, 3694-9, 3705
Drawback on duty, 3699
Freight rates on, 3697-8, 3703
Auditor General, death of, 116
Auditor General's report, 514, 744
Baker, the late Lt.-Col. George Harold, M.P., 2224
Bank and Dominion notes, 634
Bank mergers, 1089
Bankruptcy, 2275-7
Béland, Hon. H. S., M.P., welcome to, on release from German prison, 3
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Budget Speech, 1712, 3135. Cost of the war to Canada, 3136; national debt, 3136-7; loans and maturities, 3137; national assets and resources, 3139; industrial production — foreign trade, 3141; revenue and expenditure, 3143; tariff and taxation proposals, 3144; railway rates and coal duties, 3145; income and business taxes, 3147; tariff revision, 3150; resolutions, 3151
In reply, 3605. Conscription of wealth, business profits war tax, 3606; tractors—war and finance, 3607; currency and exchange, 3609; victory loans, press advertising and support, brokerage, interest rate, 3611-13; calling in of

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
In reply—*Con.*
loans—prices, 3615; income tax, 3616; land tax—credits for foreign trade, 3617; cost of living, 3619; prospects, 3620; fiscal policy, 3621; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 3622; increased public expenditure — national unity, 3624
Business profits war tax, 3709-10
Cabinet Ministers, House of Commons and Senate and, 1005
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1646
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1734
Directors, appointment of, 1634
Term of office of, 1646
Expenses to be paid out of revenue, 1699, 1704, 2103
Head office, 1651-2
Labour representation in directorate, 1643
Orders in Council, 1692-3
President's salary, 1657
Public ownership, 1734
Canadian Press news service, 4482, 4486
Censorship, 1110
Chartered Banks' excess circulation, 633-7, 1103
Currency Act—bronze coins, 637
Customs war tax, 3708
Daylight Saving, 647, 886, 923, 970, 1208, 1434
Ottawa time and Parliamentary time, 1342
Railway time, 1434
Dominion Iron & Steel and Nova Scotia Steel & Coal, 2342
Doukhobor lands, 2044
Economy in expenditure, 4246
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208
Farmers' sons overseas—labour shortage, 141
Finance Dept., salaries, 4475-7
Fishing—twine and cordage used in, 3708
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 856, 971
Flint, Dr. Thomas B., death of, 1341
Foreign exchange, 2239
Foreign trade, credits, etc., 1351, 1360, 2190
Belgium, 1360
Roumania, 1615, 1618, 3241
Fraternal Societies—Insurance Act Amdt., 1567
Galvanized iron, 3681, 3689-90
Gold
Prohibition of export of, 1102
Reserves, 636

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
Good roads, 4412
Government measures, time of presentation, 1616
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 316, 1127-37, 1159
Exchequer Court and, 664
Government's position under, 694
Resolution for, 649, 653
Grand Trunk Railway
Finance, 4245
Proposed taking over of, 657
Government offer, company's counter offer, 659, 694
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1184-85, 1210
Greece, supply of wheat, 2907
High Commissioner, reported resignation, 647
Horse racing, 1710
House of Commons
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 185
Committees, standing, 2
Easter adjournment, 886
Legislation to be brought down, 2399
Privilege—address from Senate instead of request by Message, 642
Questions and returns, 648, 886
Saturday and morning sittings, 3376
Vacancies, 1615
Wednesday sittings, 929, 1109
Income war tax, 3710-38
Assessment, date of, 3737
Children, allowance for, 3725
Depreciation, renewals, etc., 3720-1
Timber limits, etc., 3721-2
Judges, 3715, 3719
Life insurance, 3718
Living expenses, no allowance for, 3725
Losses, 3991-2
Members of Parliament, sessional expenses, 3992
Number of taxpayers, 3726
Personal and living expenses, 2980, 3990
Publicity of assessment, 3717-9
Returns—penalties, 3736-7
Shareholders of tax-paying corporations, 3725
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3727-9
Undistributed profits, 3727
Industrial Relations Commission, 1432
International Waterways Commission, 462
Kinmel Camp riots, 357, 424
Statement and cables, 512
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 2, 4, 5
Loans
Authorized and to be made, 2245-50
Borrowing powers and loans made, 2343-4

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
Loans—*Con.*
Printing of bonds in both languages, 4475
Taxed or tax-free, 2246-7
$75,000,000, New York, 4198
$100,000,000, domestic, 2245-6, 4242-6
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, et al, 513, 647, 1101, 1502
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1257
Ministerial changes, 139
National Transcontinental Railway, summary, 665
Newsprint control, 2240, 4536, 4540-8, 4662-3
Nickel, 3685-9
Oleomargarine, 3708
Ottawa, the Dominion Capital, planning of, 4249-50
Ottawa Improvement Comm., 4246-51, 4385-6
Packing companies, taxation of, 4478
Patriotic Fund, 1164
Peace Conference, 1382, 2200
Cable from Prime Minister, 929
Ploughs, duties on, 3691-3705. *See under this head,* Agricultural
Printing Bureau strike, 424
Prohibition, 2654
Res., 2346-58
Public ownership of railways, 1734
Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209
Reciprocity, in effect a binding agreement, 3670
Returning soldiers, entertainment and occupation for, 648
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1025
Sharpe, Lt.-Col. Sam, D.S.O., death of, 3
Soldiers' complaints, alleged suppression, 1618
Soldiers sentenced to penal servitude in England, 1163
Supply, interim vote 1919-20, 842
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget; Address
Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 808
Taylor, Hon. Senator George, death of, 885
Titles, 1458, 1479, 2729
Amdt. to motion for abolition of—appointment of Com. to consider, 1464, 1479
Trade discrimination against Canada, 72, 115, 140, 230, 314
Transatlantic flight of Hawker, 2565
Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties on, 3707
War correspondence not produced, 753

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
War expenditure
Vote of $350,000,000, 2166, 2190, 2239-50, 2343-4
"Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2241-5
Ministerial explanation, 1343
Vouchers for overseas payments, 1711, 1789, 1865
War indemnity, 775, 929
Wheat, market for, 1712
Winnipeg strike, 2616, 2753
Witley Camp,, 462-3

White, Mr. William Henry (Victoria, Alta.)
Budget, 3573. Hon. Mr. Sifton and Hon. Mr. Calder, 3574; aliens, 3575; tariff, 3576; Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3577
Franchise, 4626
Naturalization, 4129, 4264-6, 4272
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2318, 2330
Seed grain, 1041
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 816

Wholesale Grocers. *See* Private Bills

Wigmore, Mr. Rupert Wilson (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Coal ships, Sydney-St. Lawrence, ques. 3471
Grand Manan steamship service, 1301
Public Health, 1194, 1196
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 998
St. John Harbour, 4301
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769

Wilson, Mr. Gordon Crooks (Wentworth)
Railway Act Consolidation, Senate amdts., telephones, 4156

Wilson, Mr. James Robert (Saskatoon)
Budget, 3537. Land settlers needed, 3538; oil—tariff, 3539; land tax, 3541; wheat prices, 3542
Canadian National Railway, 1418
Highways, 739
Housing scheme, 2538, 2552
Pensions, 4297
Saskatoon letter carriers' strike, 2084
Shipbuilding, 2261
Wheat crop, shipping of, 2261
Wheat, experiments of Mr. Seager Wheeler, 2970
Wilson, President, banquet to by His Majesty, 103, 148

Wine Harbour, 2783

Wireless, 2794, 2848

Witley Camp, 462, 3472

Woman masquerading as man, 2440

Woman Suffrage, 226, 296, 300, 405. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Women in the public service, 341

Wool. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt.

Woollen Trade
British orders in Canada, 1363
Exports, ques. 845

Worsdale, Cpl. R. W., ques. 3067

Wrecking Plants, subsidies to, 2603-6

Wright, Mr. H. O. (Battleford)
Budget, 2587. Record of the Government, 3587; farmers and wheat prices, 3588; tariff and free trade, 3589

Yapp, Mr., agent for woollen sales, 1363

Yarmouth Bar, 2783

Year Book, 3839

Young men and politics, 376, 383

Yukon, Government of, 4045

Yukon Act Amdt. 1r., 5; 2r., com., 592; 3r., 625

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amdt. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 629; 3r., 649